From:	(b)(6)	
To:	(b)(6)	
Subject:	:: FW: OCP/CCTA proposal	
Date:	2016/03/02 15:33:00	
Priority:	: Normal	
Туре:	Note	

FEMA and OCP remain at an impasse. George proposes a 6pm call today (same group as yesterday). Can I give you a call when you have a sec?

Office of the Deputy Secretary
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Office: (b)(6)
Mobile

From (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2016 3:24 PM

Cc: Selim, George; (b)(6)

Subject: FW: OCP/CCTA proposal

(b)(6) and (b)(6)

To: (b)(6)

George is out temporarily this afternoon with a personal issue. He asked me to report the status of our efforts to come to consensus, per yesterday's call. OCP drafted 6 proposals to enhance prevention planning in the \$39 million, FEMA wasn't willing to agree to any of them in full last night. George Selim and (b)(6) talked this morning and based on that Conversation, OCP modified the proposals (in track changes edits in the attached document) in an effort to come to consensus. FEMA responded (in comments in the attached document) and is still not able to agree with any of them in full. We believe we've reached an impasse and would like to have a call at 6PM or later with the same group from yesterday at noon. Timing is tight because we have a meeting on the whole \$50 million with OMB tomorrow at 11, and with appropriations staff on Monday afternoon. Additionally, S1 will testify to HSGAC on Tuesday and OLA has told us CVE and the \$50 million will come up.

Thank you,

Office for Community Partnerships
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
(b)(6)
(NAC)
(7th and D)
(Mobile)

To (Selim and (Secretary)) The readout I received indicated that (Secretary) Specifically identified these are workable and if not, if specific changes would make them so are remains true now. Regards, (NAC) Office for Community Partnerships U.S. Department of Homeland Security (NAC) (To thand D) (Mobile) From: (Selim, George) (NAC) (To thand D) (Mobile) From: Selim, George (NAC) (To thand D) (Mobile) From: Selim, George Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 5:42 PM To: (Selim) To: (Selim, George) (NAC) (To thand D) (Mobile) From: Selim, George Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 5:42 PM To: (Selim) To: (Selim) (Seorge Selim) (NAC) (To thand D) (Mobile)	From:(b)(6)
Stope Stop	Sent: Wednesday, March 2, 2016 2:11 PM
Cc. (b)(6) Subject: RE: OCP/CCTA proposal Di(6) / George -	
Subject: RE: OCP/CCTA proposal Please see attached for FEMA's response. Happy to connect with you have time.	
Please see attached for FEMA's response. Happy to connect with you have time. - \(\begin{align*} align	(b)(6)
Please see attached for FEMA's response. Happy to connect with you have time. - \(\begin{align*} align	Subject: RE: OCP/CCTA proposal
From (b)(6) Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2016 1:31 PM To: Selim, George; (b)(6) Cc (b)(6) Subject: RE: OCP/CCTA proposal All, George Selim and (b)(6)	(b)(6) / George –
From (b)(6) Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2016 1:31 PM To: Selim, George; (b)(6) Cc (b)(6) Subject: RE: OCP/CCTA proposal All, George Selim and (b)(6)	Please see attached for FEMA's response. Happy to connect with you have time.
To: Selim, George; (b)(6) Subject: RE: OCP/CCTA proposal All, George Selim and (b)(6) spoke earlier, and they want to try again to come to a consensus opinion to present to leadership. The readout I received indicated that (b)(6) specifically identified the definition, set percentages of work, and specific deliverables as being issues that FEMA couldn't agree with. We've addressed those issues in the attached in track changes. Please let us know if these are workable and if not, if specific changes would make them so. As a reminder, it is our position that the CCTA slides do not need to be changed in any significant way if we come to consensus on these principles, we believed that was true in the initial draft of these principles and remains true now. Regards, b)(6) Office for Community Partnerships U.S. Department of Homeland Security (NAC) (7th and D) (Mobile) From: Selim, George Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 5:42 PM To: (b)(6) Cc: (b)(6)	_ (b)(6)
To: Selim, George; (b)(6) Subject: RE: OCP/CCTA proposal All, George Selim and (b)(6)	
Subject: RE: OCP/CCTA proposal All, George Selim and \(\begin{align*} \begin{align*} \leftilde{\text{SP}(6)} \\ \ \ \ \ \ \end{align*} \) George Selim and \(\begin{align*} \begin{align*} \leftilde{\text{SP}(6)} \\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	
All, George Selim and (b)(6)	Cc (b)(6)
George Selim and (b)(6) spoke earlier, and they want to try again to come to a consensus opinion to present to leadership. The readout I received indicated that (b)(6) specifically identified the definition, set percentages of work, and specific deliverables as being issues that FEMA couldn't agree with. We've addressed those issues in the attached in track changes. Please let us know if these are workable and if not, if specific changes would make them so. As a reminder, it is our position that the CCTA slides do not need to be changed in any significant way if we come to consensus on these principles, we believed that was true in the initial draft of these principles and remains true now. Regards, b)(6) Office for Community Partnerships U.S. Department of Homeland Security (NAC) (7th and D) (Mobile) From: Selim, George Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 5:42 PM To: (b)(6) Cc: (b)(6)	Subject: RE: OCP/CCTA proposal
to present to leadership. The readout I received indicated that (b)(6) specifically identified the definition, set percentages of work, and specific deliverables as being issues that FEMA couldn't agree with. We've addressed those issues in the attached in track changes. Please let us know if these are workable and if not, if specific changes would make them so. As a reminder, it is our position that the CCTA slides do not need to be changed in any significant way if we come to consensus on these principles, we believed that was true in the initial draft of these principles and remains true now. Regards, b)(6) Office for Community Partnerships U.S. Department of Homeland Security (NAC) (7th and D) (Mobile) From: Selim, George Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 5:42 PM To: (b)(6) Cc: (b)(6)	All,
we come to consensus on these principles, we believed that was true in the initial draft of these principles and remains true now. Regards, b)(6)	to present to leadership. The readout I received indicated that $(b)(6)$ specifically identified the definition, set percentages of work, and specific deliverables as being issues that FEMA couldn't agree with. We've addressed those issues in the attached in track changes. Please let us know if these are
Office for Community Partnerships U.S. Department of Homeland Security (NAC) (7th and D) (Mobile) From: Selim, George Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 5:42 PM To: (b)(6) Cc: (b)(6)	we come to consensus on these principles, we believed that was true in the initial draft of these principles
Office for Community Partnerships U.S. Department of Homeland Security (NAC) (7th and D) (Mobile) From: Selim, George Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 5:42 PM To: (b)(6) Cc: (b)(6)	Regards,
U.S. Department of Homeland Security (NAC) (7th and D) (Mobile) From: Selim, George Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 5:42 PM To: (b)(6) Cc: (b)(6)	(b)(6)
Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 5:42 PM To: (b)(6) Cc: (b)(6)	U.S. Department of Homeland Security (NAC) (7th and D)
	Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 5:42 PM To: [b)(6)
	(b)(6)

(b)(6)	
Subject: OC	P/CCTA proposal
(b)(6)	

George

Thanks again for making time to talk this afternoon, really appreciate your willingness to assist.

This afternoon our team worked through options develop CVE components to the existing framework FEMA had planned for CCTA, please see attached. I think we are going to try to jump on the phone with your team shortly, does **6pm** work for everyone?

If so, here is conf call info:	(b)(6)
Thanks,	

Sender:	(b)(6)		
Recipient:		8	

Recipient:

Sent Date: 2016/03/02 15:33:01

Delivered Date: 2016/03/02 15:33:00