



Critical Mass 2015 National Mass Care Exercise

Mass Care/Emergency Assistance After-Action Report



July 24, 2015

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Introduction	3
Executive Summary.....	3
Exercise Overview	3
Overview of Exercise Objectives.....	4
Common Task Force Feedback	4
Strengths.....	4
Consensus	4
Difference of Opinions	4
Exercise and Task Force Specific Comments & Recommendations.....	5
Exercise Comments.....	5
Coordination Cell Comments.....	6
Sheltering Task Force	6
Feeding Task Force Comments	7
Mass Care Resource Management Tool	8
Reunification Services Task Force	8
Task Forces as a Whole	9
Summary	10
Appendix A – Participant Feedback Forms	11
Strengths.....	11
Opportunities.....	12
Improvements.....	13
Appendix B – Participant Roster	14

Introduction

The National Mass Care Exercise (NCME) is held on an annual basis in keeping with Strategic Goal 1.4 of the *National Mass Care Strategy*, “Improve the effectiveness of disaster exercises in building mass care capacity, including scenario planning”. The NCME is sponsored by a state and supported by the FEMA Region and Headquarters as well as the mass care providers that comprise the whole community.

The 2015 National Mass Care Exercise sponsored by Texas and held in Austin, Texas from June 8th through June 8th was the 4th National Mass Care Exercise. The first three were hosted by Florida in conjunction with their annual full scale hurricane exercise. This exercise, designated Critical Mass 2015 was the first to be hosted by another state, Texas, and one with a non-hurricane scenario.

This After Action Report provides a synthesis of the comments that were made in interviews conducted with Evaluators, Controllers and Task Force Leaders during the exercise as well from comments made during the Hot Wash which occurred following the exercise on June 11th.

Executive Summary

The Texas Division of Emergency Management (TDEM) must be commended for their perseverance in hosting the exercise while they were fully involved responding to a major flooding event. The State had not had a major disaster in approximately five years so welcomed the opportunity to host the NCME to test their capabilities and capacity to meet the immediate needs of survivors. Texas started planning over one year ago and their exercise was nominated and approved as a National Exercise Program exercise for 2015.

Due to the flooding incident, the exercise was modified from four to three days and the exercise play was adjusted to meet the situation at hand. Of note, is that TDEM did suggest be careful of the scenario you choose – it may come alive!

Even with the constraints, over 75 Mass Care/Emergency Assistance providers actively participated in the NCME representing the whole community: the public, non-governmental organizations, all levels of government and the private sector.

No two NMCE’s are the same, the scenarios vary, the objectives are based on what the state would like to test, and the players vary based on the Region and the focus of the exercise. The exercise provided an excellent opportunity to build relationships, provide needed Mass Care/Emergency Assistance training, and a chance to strengthen and develop task force criteria.

Exercise Overview

A Type 1 incident occurring outside of FEMA Region VI has caused a national requirement to find extended shelter for over 1,000,000 people. Texas has been asked to provide shelter for as many out-of-state citizens as possible (Texas agreed to accept 300,000 evacuees).

Over the next few days, remnants of a pacific tropical storm moves slowly across Throckmorton, Young, Jack and Wise Counties into the Dallas-Arlington-Fort Worth Metroplex and Northeast Texas, dropping heavy rainfall, peaking at over 40 inches. Dam failures ensue in the north central and north east Texas areas with cascading failures descending toward the greater Houston area. Hundreds of thousands of Texans are displaced, thousands are injured and many are deceased or missing. The state of Texas becomes overwhelmed and requests federal assistance

Overview of Exercise Objectives

Objective 1: Assess ability to effectively coordinate Mass Care operations at the state, regional and national levels

Objective 2: Examine the capability and capacity to coordinate and support Mass Sheltering operations

Objective 3: Examine the capability coordinate and provide immediate and sustained Mass Feeding operations

Objective 4: Assess ability to coordinate and simultaneously provide mass Critical Transportation support during evacuation

Objective 5: Examine emergency preparedness plans that incorporate reunification procedures and processes for citizens who have become separated from their families as a result of a disaster

Common Task Force Feedback

There are a variety of different opinions on the Task Forces and how to structure them, but there is one opinion that seems to be fairly universal – Task Forces work. Bringing subject matter expertise from multiple agencies to solve mass care issues helps states achieve more cost effective responses, ensures shortfalls are identified before they become operational millstones, creates an immediate linkage between national resources and the state when those resources are needed, and ultimately enhances client services.

Although everyone agrees that Task Forces are an effective tool for larger events, there are multiple opinions on how they should operate and, to some extent, what they should be working on.

Strengths

Task Forces have been utilized in several recent large events and they have demonstrated their effectiveness. Simply put, they earn their keep by creating operational cost efficiencies and they solve the kinds of unique challenges that every disaster, but particularly large events, presents.

An even greater benefit that Task Forces have brought about is a heightened discussion of Mass Care on a national level. Holding a National Mass Care Exercise is a huge breakthrough for the Mass Care/Emergency Assistance portion of ESF #6 and has spurred ongoing Mass Care discussions and planning at state and local levels which might not have occurred without this impetus.

Consensus

Following are some of the commonly expressed thoughts found in feedback from the 2015 NMCE:

- It would be most beneficial if states had standing Task Forces already in place into which national partners could be inserted.
- States need to provide Task Forces with precise direction about what they should be accomplishing.
- All of the Task Forces need to be linked to a common operating picture.
- Task Force Leaders need training on how to manage Task Forces.
- Every state is different and consequently it may not be possible to have a “one-size fits all” protocol for Task Force operations.

Difference of Opinions

There continues to be disagreement in several key areas including:

- Whether Task Forces should be operational, strategic or both.
- If there should be a “coordination cell” and, if so, what its role should be.

In all of the National Mass Care Exercises held to date there has been a tug of war in terms of what should be the focus of the Task Force. Some of this tussle is due to the natural process of group formation. Always, during the first day of each exercise, Task Forces have expressed frustration with communication, not understanding their role, not having enough information, feeling left out, not having appropriate linkage with the State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC), and the list goes on. Usually, by the afternoon Task Forces have begun to settle in and express less frustration and more interest and enthusiasm for what the group is doing.

The question of whether Task Forces are strategic or operational will continue to be discussed but, chances are, the truthful answer is “both.” Task Forces will work at the discretion of the state and will receive their tasking based upon the demands of the operation. Disaster events are fluid and unpredictable by their very nature so perhaps the focus should not be so much on couching Task Forces as “operational” or “strategic” and instead use language around problem-solving and long-range planning.

A second area of widely disparate opinion surrounds the purpose of the Coordination Cell. Some feel it should be a decision-making body. Others think it should exist as a liaison capacity to provide communication between Task Forces. The concept of a “coordination cell” came about in prior NMCEs specifically to resolve the significant communication issues that surfaced between Task Forces. All of the communication issues in every NMCE have arisen from disconnects to a common operating picture.

The jury is still out on the purpose of the Coordination Cell, but it does beg the question: If a common operating picture (the Mass Care Resource Management Tool) was available to all Task Forces in real time, would a “Communication Cell” still be needed?

Exercise and Task Force Specific Comments & Recommendations

Exercise Comments

Observations

- As a whole players expressed that the exercise provided them with a great opportunity to learn about partner organizations and the planning tools.
- Now in its fourth year, the exercise demonstrated a similar rhythm to prior year’s with “storming, forming and norming” exhibited in each Task Force. However, each year the formation process goes more quickly and more smoothly evidencing that the Task Force concept is becoming institutionalized within Mass Care.
- Texas did an excellent job of providing an overview of the state to participants. The information shared in the state briefing was concise and informative. Definitely a best practice to share with other hosts in the future.

Recommendations

- Might be beneficial to explore the possibility of a coordination cell and virtual Task Forces in a future exercise as another option for Task Force involvement.

Logistics Notes for Future Exercises

The following suggestions were given for future exercises:

- Provide name tags and table tents for participants.

- Ensure that each Task Force has one or more individual briefings prior to the start of the exercise so that all players understand:
 - The operations of the State.
 - The role of the Task Force.
 - The Mass Care tool.
- When setting up scenarios it's important to tell players not only "what" has happened but the impact that the event will have. For example, if you say that a bridge is out provide context for the impact that bridge closures has – X number of people cross that bridge daily; alternate route takes people 60 miles out of the way, etc.

Coordination Cell Comments

Observations

- Conflicting opinions were expressed regarding the coordination cell as follows:
 - The original intent of the coordination cell was to provide communication synchronization between Task Forces, the MC Coordinator and the SEOC. It was not meant to be a decision-making entity, but rather a liaison entity. During the exercise the coordination cell did their own projections which caused different data sets and confusion for the Task Forces.
 - The current role of the coordination cell needs to be looked at. During the first hour it seemed to be a duplication of efforts with the Task Forces. The coordination cell was creating the assumptions and not coordinating with the Task Forces.
 - This view of the coordination cell appears to be working well for Texas but wouldn't necessarily work in other states.
 - We want to demonstrate that a small group of SMEs can handle this to resolve the bandwidth issues that could occur with having giant Task Forces.
 - Get rid of the coordination cell. It's a layer that doesn't need to be there at all.

Recommendations

- Bandwidth issues have been an expressed concern in all four National Mass Care Exercises. Utilizing Virtual Task Forces has been suggested but never tested. It would be interesting to see if a small cell of Task Force Leaders could accomplish the same goals working virtually with their Task Forces.
- More thought needs to be devoted to the purpose and function of the coordination cell to:
 - Avoid creating multiple decision-making layers.
 - Ensure seamless communication between Task Forces, SEOC and MC Coordinator.

Sheltering Task Force

Observations

- The Sheltering Task Force noted that they did not address access and functional needs or potential unmet needs based on demographics and felt this would be a critical component to real-life Task Force activities, but also noted the artificiality of the exercise environment.
- The Task Force appreciated the mass care resource management tool and learned a tremendous amount in working with it and the other partners at the table.
- They expressed some frustration with forward planning and then being pulled in operationally for imminent arrivals and dam failures.
- Due to "real-life" operations this Task Force had the smallest number of participants.
- Task Force members felt it would be important in a real event to have a member of the state either leading or sitting in on the TASK FORCE to provide the state perspective.
- Despite co-location of the Shelter Task Force and Feeding Task Force and implementation of a coordination cell, communication between the Task Forces was still challenging. Communication

issues have been the primary feedback given in all past exercises. While much diminished in the Texas exercise, more work needs to be done to streamline communication between all of the groups to ensure that all are using the same assumptions in their planning.

- Possibly as a result of the real operation occurring in TX, the Sheltering Task Force did not know where the shelters were located, but Task Force access to this kind of information would be essential in a real event.
- It may have been an artificiality of this exercise, but household pet and service animal considerations need to be a part of the Sheltering Task Force. There will always be issues with household pets and those organizations need to be represented on the Task Force.
- Later in the exercise we learned that ESF-8 was playing, but there was no connection with what they were doing and the Sheltering Task Force.

Recommendations

- The focus of the Task Forces (both Feeding and Sheltering) continues to be a point of frustration in the exercises. Observers noted that participants are “operational” people and so getting them to think strategically is challenging at the outset.
- Being pulled in both strategic directions and operational directions during the exercise is also a point of frustration. In terms of recommendations for actual implementation of Task Forces, recommend that we look closely at the Task Force materials and provide suggestions for states to hold an orientation to the State, the job expectations for Task Force members, etc.
- As intra-Task Force communication continues to be an issue, more work needs to be done to tighten down the role of the Coordination Cell and its members and provide an internal battle rhythm for Task Forces that ensures cross-communication between Task Forces begins and is maintained.
- Ensure pet organizations are represented on the Task Force.
- Ensure that all necessary organizations have representation on the Task Force. (Ex: ESF-8)

Feeding Task Force Comments

Observations

- Task Force members observed that there were too many people in the room which made decision-making more difficult.
- Would be helpful if resource management were available within State WEBEOCs
- There are great SMEs in the group which gives us a lot of strength.
- The Task Force doesn’t have visibility on shelter locations so while the Task Force was able to calculate capacity, they were not able to determine where to locate kitchens or what kind of distribution network will be needed. While this may seem like an operational issue, feeding capacity isn’t solely determined by meal production. If all the meal production is coming out of one kitchen and the delivery locations are six hours away that’s a problem. The Shelter Task Force needed more granular information to make a true assessment of capacity.
- All Agencies knew resources what was available and where there were shortfalls.
- Good inter-agency cooperation – quick decision-making.
- We were quickly able to put the pieces in place for all the other decisions.

Recommendations

- Multiple players from the same organization are an artificiality of the exercise. Ensure that players understand that this is a learning opportunity for everyone and in a real event there would not be multiple personnel from the same agency.

- Provide enough granularity so that Task Force can formulate capacity projections and projections for the numbers of kitchens needed.
- It might be beneficial to have someone familiar with the state leading the TASK FORCE.
- Our group should have been better located. We needed to put feeding suppliers, feeding agencies together in the room.
- We would recommend the thought of a BEOC so that all of the businesses could be together in a room.
- More communication is needed between Task Forces alone as well as the Task Forces and the SOC.
 - We had a general lack of information. We know that’s typical in an event.
 - A lot had to do with the exercise artificialities.
- While it might not be the role of the Task Force to direct operational activities, the Task Forces do need to know where shelters are, what menus are needed and other granular information so that we can accurately determine resource shortfalls – for equipment such as kitchens and for food stuffs.

Mass Care Resource Management Tool

Observations

- The Mass Care Resource Management tool needs to evolve into something beyond a simple spreadsheet so that all Task Forces have visibility into one spreadsheet.

Recommendations

- Socialize the Mass Care Resource Management tool with all players first thing to they can see how it works. This helps to get the players engaged in the 30k foot level as opposed to tactical.
- Because adult learners tend to need to be hands on – it might be beneficial at future exercises to have a trainer go to each Task Force in the beginning and demonstrate the tool for the Task Force.

Reunification Services Task Force

Observations

- The Reunification Services Task Force spent a lengthy amount of time defining and scoping reunification in the context of the State of Texas.
- As the newest TASK FORCE concept to be tested, Reunification still has work to do to define itself and how it will operate.
- Players felt that it was an excellent learning opportunity and that the right players were at the table.
- Great attention was given to covering every aspect of reunification.
- One of the important first steps for a Reunification Services Task Force is to identify the key stakeholders within each state.
- Because the concept of a Reunification Services Task Force is still so new, understanding agency capabilities and how they inter-relate can slow down the Task Force.
- Calls that took place before the exercise were very helpful.
- The Task Force helped the State understand why it needs to expand its definitions of reunification and the resources that would be needed in a large event. For example initially the state did not perceive folks calling in from outside the impact area as a state level issue, but when it was understood the magnitude of calls that could be coming into a local community’s 911 center, the state could see where locals would be overwhelmed and seek state assistance through a centralized phone bank for reunification.
- The state began to identify triggers when national reunification partners may need to be engaged.

Recommendations

- Reunification is a complex issue involving many state agencies. Every state has highly unique structures in place that would need to come into play for reunification. Because of this, reunification needs to become a larger national topic of discussion for MC/EA. This suggests that States would be well advised to have standing reunification Task Forces into which national players could connect during an event.

Task Forces as a Whole

Observations

- No matter what Task Forces are established, they have to have linkage. For example, during Hurricane Sandy there were three Task Forces operating at three different levels, but they did not have linkage together.
- All Task Forces need some understanding of the demographics they are serving as this information will inform the services that are needed/provided.
- When constituting a Task Force the State needs to articulate:
 - Why they are coming.
 - What the Task Force should work on.
 - What the Task Force should not work on.
 - A common operating picture between Task Forces.
 - A common operating picture of the operation as a whole.
- Every state is different, so when Task Forces stand up, the state needs to provide an orientation to each Task Force about how the state operates.
- Interesting to note that while the Task Forces (Shelter/Feeding) were located right next to one another, communication was still not happening between the Task Forces.
- You want to get economies of scale in certain areas where you can. For this reason, it's important that the Task Forces are linked together with a common operating picture.
- Task Force Leaders need training on how to do planning 3, 5 and 7 days out as well as tips for when the Task Force should be strategic and when it might need to be more operational.
- While the materials provide checklists for a variety of things, there's not a management checklist for Task Force Leaders.
- Task Force leaders don't really need training on the subject matter. They need training on how to manage a Task Force.

Recommendations

- Provide linkage between all Task Forces. This could be accomplished through an internal battle rhythm and shared visibility into one common operating picture.
- States need to ensure strong linkage internally between Task Forces as well as with the operation as a whole.
- Ensure Task Forces are provided with an orientation to the state and how it functions.
- As with the previous three exercises, communication between the Sheltering and Feeding Task Forces continued to be a challenge in this exercise. Even though the Task Forces were located side-by-side, communication still did not occur. Three things that continue to surface in the feedback to address this situation include:
 - Providing a battle rhythm for the Task Forces that ensures communication points throughout the day.
 - Finding a way to make the Mass Care Resource Management tool the common operating picture for all Task Forces. If a web-based accessibility couldn't be made available, perhaps Mass

- Care tool adjudication could occur twice daily through the Communications Cell to keep everyone on the same page (battle rhythm).
- Ensuring that Task Forces understand the scope of their efforts. Texas did a good job of corralling the Task Forces, but this is something that will come up in every state.
 - Consider ways the Task Forces can be linked to the JIC.
 - Develop training for Task Force leaders.

Summary

Again, Texas Division of Emergency Management deserves kudos for pressing forward with the exercise and as seen from the participants' feedback, it was most appreciated by all. Additionally, we were able to provide training for seven state mass care coordinators, who are now ready and able to EMAC to a state needing MC/EA assistance! And, one of the most positive outcomes of each exercise is that the lessons learned are taken seriously and steps are taken to see how best to modify, adjust, or request support in meeting the concerns raised from the prior year.

The 2016 National Mass Care Exercise will be hosted by Missouri with the scenario being based on a New Madrid event. Texas is supporting Missouri, as Florida assisted Texas, in helping them to develop the exercise, knowing that it is not an easy task and takes months of dedicated work involving the MC/EA stakeholders and planning for the visitors coming to the state to participate in the exercise.

ESF-6 practitioners owe a debt of gratitude to past, current and future National Mass Care Exercise host states and their Mass Care Coordinators. This feedback is provided with special thanks to:

The State of Florida (NMCE 2012-2014)
Michael Whitehead, State Mass Care Coordinator

The State of Texas (NMCE 2015)
Larry Shine, State Mass Care Coordinator

The State of Missouri (NMCE 2016)
Deb Hendricks, State Voluntary Agency Liaison

Appendix A – Participant Feedback Forms

Strengths

- Having all stakeholders in one place makes it easier and effective to bring resources together quickly.
- Each agency representative had good grasp of their agency's resources
- Everyone wants to play well together, listen to each other and talk the challenges through.
- All agencies knew their capacities
- Quick decision making because feeding players and food players in the room together.
- The preparers of the meals were open to working with inventory on hand to develop menus.
- The players all seem to be pretty experienced and ready to roll with the punches.
- By utilizing multiple resources, there seems to be plenty of food to handle a large scale disaster.
- Great collaboration with industry partners and relief operation.
- Reasonable disaster scenario with real-life applications
- Good pace to the day. Minimal downtime
- Capacity of resources identified.
- Facility and location
- Registration Process
- Lively exchange of ideas
- Assumptions were challenged
- Wide-deep – subject matter expertise.
- Ability to ring key partners together who did not previously work together and create a functioning team.
- Spreadsheet for shelter – available data etc.
- High/Medium/Low criteria charts
- Input from other states
- Broad involvement of state and federal partners.
- An unexpected benefit has been side conversations – both strategic and operational that can be addressed real world, now.
- Players despite stepping into “real” operations mode, have been flexible to address the issues presented to them.
- Good interagency cooperation
- Knowledgeable players
- Rational scenario
- Agencies know their resource capabilities
- Open exchange of ideas
- All questions were openly received and response offered
- No competition among vendors or duplicate agencies exist. The focus was on the people and their needs.
- Good interagency cooperation
- Quick decision-making
- Knowledgeable SMEs at table
- Nice facilities
- Large number of feeding Task Force participants
- Incorporation of private industry in the exercise

- Groups working together
- Location set-up
- Group was able to reach decisions pretty quickly once it understood the process and settled in
- Good coordination between groups

Opportunities

- There were a lot of people in Feeding Task Force room. (Evaluator, observers, etc.) when only a core group of about 8 needed to be talking to each other. More people caused confusion.
- It might help to have a “dummies” list of considerations. Ex.: The group forgot about baby food. So the group needs to remember babies, toddlers, special foods, etc.
- Group needed to move from tactical to strategic thinking a lot sooner.
- Lack of communication between Task Forces and SOC
- Inconsistent numbers, which actual is real-life.
- Better communication on injects; coordination cell did not receive injects in a timely manner
- Not enough local, state SMEs available to support TF.
- As coordination cell, we did not receive critical updates from SOC
- Struggled with situational awareness and common operating picture.
- Too many side-conferences that interrupted focus of questions or decision that was being addressed
- Hard to keep up with all the injects that affected our decisions since only 1 person got hard copy. We often would lose sight of a key piece of data
- Lack of information – needed more
- Layout of room to group areas of responsibility.
- More communication between the groups.
- Ensure to get all representatives to engage in discussion
- Seek contributions, suggestions from all representatives.
- Lack of needed information. Shelter locations; closing of Mesquite, opening shelters.
- Too much time between scenario changes.
- Some sort of way to keep up the point play time frame. .
- I think the breakout sessions could be shorter.
- More leadership driven explanation of scenarios. Clearer info.
- Better outline of what group needed from players. I.e. – feeding how many people do we need to feed?
- Break up groups by functional sub-areas
- Fewer “leadership” Roles
- More whiteboards
- Parking lot for unresolved areas of discussion
- A whistle
- Somebody taking notes
- Exercise pace, a little slow
- Better understanding of strategic priorities at the onset
- Exercise pace a little slow
- Better understanding of strategic priorities at the outset
- Coordination between all Task Forces needs to occur very frequently. This also must occur with related ESFs, possibly ESF1 and the ESF that handles animal sheltering.
- State representatives on Task Force is a requirement – based upon the mission of the TF. Without the Task Force is flying blind

Improvements

- Observers should be segregated from players.
- Let players engage with each other, observers observe.
- The exercise should result in priorities, processes, identification of AOR (Area-Responsibilities)

Appendix B – Participant Roster

Name	Agency	Role
Controllers		
Michael Whitehead	Florida	Lead Controller
Peggy Mott	FEMA HQS	Lead Controller
Sara Whitehead	FEMA HQS	TF Controller
Justin Breeding	FEMA R6	TF Controller
Alvin Migues	TSA	TSA Controller
Evaluators		
Kam Kennedy	ARC	Hot Wash Facilitator
Cory Fast	FEMA R7	Evaluator - Sheltering TF
Jeff Blackwelder	ARC	Evaluator - Feeding TF
Adrian Walker	FEMA R7	Evaluator - Reunification TF
Simulated State Operations Center		
Larry Shine	TDEM	Human Services Branch Chief
Anna Tangredi	TDEM	Mass Care Deputy
Dan Knauft	ARC	ARC LNO
Joshua Mosely	TSA	TSA LNO
Julia Dailey	ARC	ARC DRO Rep
Neil McGurk	ARC	ARC DRO Rep
Task Force Coordination Cell		
Dan Porth	Arizona	Task Force Coordinator
Rick Schofield	ARC	ARC Planner
Summer Ray	TDEM	TDEM LNO
Al Vilet	FEMA HQS	Coach - TF Planners
Kathy Clark	TSA	TSA Planner
Feeding Task Force		
Edwin Lyons	Arkansas	Feeding TF Leader
Chad Ostlund	Minnesota EM	Deputy Feeding TF Leader
Jason Blum	FEMA R5	Feeding TF Situation Reporter
Mike Pickerell	FEMA R7	Feeding TF Planner
Paul Myers	TSA	Feeding TF TSA rep
Chuck Christian	Texas Baptist Men	Texas Baptist Men rep
Ray Gann	Texas Baptist Men	Texas Baptist Men rep
Mike Northern	Southern Baptists of Texas	Southern Baptists of Texas Rep
JD Evans	ARC	Feeding TF ARC Rep
Gaye Lynn Bailey	Feeding Texas	Texas Food Banks Rep
Jon Treadaway	Ben E. Keith	Feeding TF Ben E. Keith rep
Greg Morris	Sysco	Feeding TF Sysco rep

John Kyere	Texas Dept of Agriculture	Feeding TF rep
Chuck Johnson	US Foods	Feeding TF US Foods rep
Catrrina Kamau	USDA	Feeding TF USDA rep
Sheltering Task Force		
Dennis Dura	New Jersey DHS	Shelter TF Leader
Deb Hendricks	Missouri Emergency Management	Deputy Shelter TF Leader
Elizabeth DiPaolo	FEMA R8	Shelter TF Planner
Linda Landers	FEMA R6	Disability Integration Specialist
Bill Dorman	ARC	ARC LNO
Reunification Services Task Force		
Randy Templeton	Texas Dept of Family Protective Svcs	Reunification TF Leader
Warren Miller	Mississippi VOAD	Reunification TF Situation Reporter
Debra Emerson	Texas Dpt of Family Protective Svcs	DFDPS Rep
Susan Jensen	FEMA R5	FEMA Liaison
Katherine Galifianakis	ARC	Reunification TF ARC rep
Sharon Hawa	NCMEC	Reunification TF NCMEC rep
Observers		
Eddie Blackman	Southern Baptist Convention	Observer
Randy Garrett	Arkansas Baptists	Observer
Gibbie McMillan	Louisiana Baptists	Observer
Larry Cupper	Louisiana Baptists	Observer
Terry Henderson	Texas Baptists	Observer
Scottie Stice	Southern Baptists of Texas	Observer
Steven Hartsook	TSA	Observer
Will O'Neill	Texas School Safety Center	Observer
Catherine Toohey	Texas School Safety Center	Observer
Jo Moss	Texas School Safety Center	Observer
Steve Irwin	Convoy of Hope - Missouri VOAD	Observer
Chuck Healy	LDS Charities - Missouri VOAD	Observer
Michaela Koverman	FEMA R7	Observer
Marc Chmielewski	FEMA R5	Observer
Mark Keener	Sysco	Observer
Scott Clipp	Sysco	Observer
Steve Corkery	Sysco	Observer
Marcus Sorenson	Wise Company	Observer
Aaron Jackson	Wise Company	Observer
Alisa Ross	Texas A&M Student	Observer