

**National Building Museum**  
**Community in the Aftermath: The Alternative**  
**Housing Pilot Program**  
**Building a Framework for Future Disaster Recovery**  
**June 19, 2008**

Chase W. Rynd: Good evening. Welcome. My name is Chase Rynd, I'm the executive director here at the National Building Museum and it's my pleasure to welcome all of you to this evening's special presentation. This series illustrates the variety and the scope of topics that the museum covers in its mission to explore our built environment. Tonight, a panel of speakers will focus on the challenges of providing post-disaster housing in the Hurricane Katrina and Rita ravaged areas of the Gulf Coast. It is clearly evident that the effects of those devastating storms are still being felt today. Indeed we are reminded once again about the impact that disasters, both natural and man-made, have on our built environment when we see the current news coverage of the epic flooding that is now taking place in our country's Midwest.

Tonight's program is the first of the "Community in the Aftermath" lecture series. This series grew out of the Museum's Building in the Aftermath series, which was conceived following the terrorists' attacks in 2001, to examine disaster in our built world. That series was revived following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita when the Museum examined the causes and effects of the flooding in the Gulf Coast region. Over the next three years, Community in the Aftermath will follow the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Alternative Housing Pilot Program, which is a grant program to develop more viable, versatile, readily-available, and cost-effective post-disaster housing for the areas affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

In addition to covering the performance of the housing, we'll also cover the progress of the program's grantees. To assess the effectiveness and local impact of the initiative, FEMA asked the Department of Housing and Urban Development to evaluate the program. And so, this series is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Emergency Management Agency in partnership with this Museum. We are truly grateful for their support and to Dana Bres, who is a Research Engineer with HUD, for helping us coordinate this series. This evening's program will lay the groundwork for the series by

providing background on the Alternative Housing Pilot Program, who is involved and the current status of the program.

We are pleased to have a distinguished panel of speakers with us tonight. In order of appearance, they are: David Garratt, who is the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Disaster Assistance Directorate for FEMA; Kevin Neary, who is the Deputy Assistance Secretary for Research, Evaluation, and Monitoring, Office of Policy Development and Research at HUD; Randy Kinder, who is the Program Manager of the Alternative Housing Pilot Program at FEMA; and Todd Richardson, who is the Director, Program Evaluation Division, Office of Policy Development and Research at HUD. Full biographies of our panelists are available in the handout on your chairs, and following their individual presentations, the panelists will reconvene on stage to take your questions. Also, Dana Bres will be available to answer any technical questions during this time. And now, ladies and gentlemen, please welcome, David Garratt.

David Garratt: Thank you, Chase, and thank you all for coming. It's good to see you here. You all know the story. Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, for many, many years responded to disasters in which there was a compelling need for temporary housing, i.e. housing that is brought in from the outside because there is insufficient, organic, existing housing in the disaster area. FEMA typically used, or routinely used three forms of temporary housing. Those would be manufactured homes, those would be park models, and those would be travel trailers. We used these for many years, we have used them in many different disasters and, by and large, they sufficed reasonably well; adequately, if not, terrifically.

Then came Katrina. And during Katrina, we had to deploy over 140,000 different forms of travel trailers, mobile homes, or manufactured housing and park models. And those units sustained a degree of national scrutiny that this program had never received before and that national scrutiny revealed or produced a national opinion. And that national opinion was that there's got to be a better way of responding to the needs of disaster victims than travel trailers, than park models, and manufactured homes, or at least there have got to be more ways of responding to the needs of disaster victims.

And so, Congress came up with the Alternative Housing Pilot Program. They gave FEMA \$400 million and they charged us with what is really an exceptionally neat and

visionary duty. And that is to take that \$400 million, work with states that were still wrestling with the impacts of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita and work with those states to develop alternative forms of housing that not only would serve the needs of disaster victims right now, who are in desperate need of housing, but it would also allow FEMA and the federal government, in particular, our partners in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, to evaluate these units and determine, are any of these worth adding to our tool box? Are any of these units disaster-worthy? This was a very pure, a very clear direction from Congress. But like most things that appear to be pure, pure to be clear, they're not always simple. And we've run into our share of challenges trying to implement the Alternative Housing Pilot Program in the four states who competed for the funding that was made available with that program and have pursued their own individual Alternative Housing Pilot projects.

However, as difficult and challenging as this process has been, I would not trade it for anything because what we are learning through this process, whether it be from a technical standpoint, whether it be from a relational standpoint, whether it be from a contractual standpoint, are lessons learned. Lesson after lesson is being learned in this process. And even though we haven't made the progress that we'd like, we haven't gotten nearly as many alternative houses stood up across the four states as we'd like, there are reasons for that and those reasons have produced lessons, and those lessons are things that we're factoring into how we're going to do business in the future, and that's the whole point of this particular effort, is that Congress has said to us, "Take this money and go out and learn what you can with this. As a by-product of it, you're going to help people out who need help right now, but learn what you can and then come back and tell us what you've learned."

It's been a terrific effort thus far. It has yet to self-actualize but we've got high hopes for this particular effort and we're hoping that this effort will lead into a much larger national effort to examine and come up with new forms of alternative housing. There's a lot of stuff out there, there are a lot of neat ideas out there. It takes money and it takes time and it takes effort and it takes desire and resolve to go out and pursue all of those different efforts and we're prepared to do that, and I think you'll see a lot of that happen this year in this disaster season. But as far as the Alternative Housing Pilot Program is concerned, we've got a ways to go. We've learned a lot of lessons thus far, and it has been, and I'm certain that it will be a very successful program, again, in large part, not only because of the states, because of the great

working relationship that we have with our partners in HUD. And with that, I would like to turn the podium over to Deputy Assistant Secretary Kevin Neary, from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Kevin Neary: Thanks, Dave. The mission of HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research is to provide systematic information to help the nation make informed decisions about matters relating to housing and community development. We're really excited to be working with FEMA on the AHPP because evaluations are something we do, and because the AHPP is fundamentally related to HUD's mission of providing housing and supporting community development.

I first started doing program evaluations in 1978 and I've been doing them ever since. So it should come as no surprise that I'm a big advocate of program evaluations and I'm very excited about the AHPP work that we're doing. But while I really believe in program evaluations, I tend to think that I see them a bit differently from the way a lot of people look at them and I'd like to address two specific ways in which I think I differ from many people on evaluations. For one thing, I'm always surprised when people at HUD who are administering programs resist our efforts to evaluate their programs. Somehow people have the idea that we'll be finding that their program is ineffective and they don't want us to expose them.

In my experience, every program starts from good intention and a logical idea. No good evaluation that I know demonstrates complete program failure and I can't imagine that the AHPP evaluation will find that AHPP is a bad idea. Programs can be duplicative. They may be inefficient. They may not be cost-effective. They may have unfortunate consequences. But every program I've ever been associated with did good things. Evaluations demonstrate the good the programs do even if they also indicate how programs might be improved.

The other misconception I think folks have about evaluations is that they are a part of a feedback loop that implies linear improvement. So we design programs, we implement programs, we evaluate programs, and then based on what we learned, we improve the programs. I suppose that happens to some degree with ongoing programs, but in my experience, that doesn't happen very often. And of course, the AHPP isn't an ongoing program. It's an episodic response to a particular set of circumstances. Rather than being part of a formal feedback loop, I'd like to think of evaluations as our writing history. We, usually, can anticipate future needs or how programs will be designed to address them. We do know

however what we are confronted with now. To my mind, what we're doing with the AHPP evaluation is the following; we are going to carefully describe the circumstances in which we find ourselves. We're going to describe our efforts to address those circumstances. We're going to define the outcomes that we think are important and we're going to document how things turn out over the period of time we can monitor them.

Specifically, evaluation is going to document these things; the process each grantee implements, we're going to look at the production, delivery, installation, and durability of the housing. We're going to be assessing community impacts, in terms of such things as police, fire, utility, and schools. And we're going to be evaluating the impact on individuals, notably such things as health and social and economic well-being. We plan on issuing at least these reports, one on each state's program after implementation is substantially completed. We'll do an interim report on each state after households have been in residence for about 12 months, and we'll do a final report that will address all the issues I mentioned covering the period 2007 through 2011. If we do a good job with our evaluation, at some future time, people will be able to apply what we're doing to their circumstances. That's what I hope we do here. I hope someone in the future who's trying to implement a program to help people recover from a disaster will be able to read what we produced. I hope they'll be able to adapt what we're dealing with to their circumstance and I hope that their efforts will be better, based on what we learned from the AHPP. Thanks a lot, and let's hear from Randy.

Randall Kinder: While we're waiting just a few minutes, it is a pilot program so we're having trouble with the screen here. Well, I'm doing the presentation. I need the pictures. I'm better with pictures than anybody. Sorry for the delay but I need the presentation to know what -- to go forward. First of all, welcome for being here today, this evening. I thank you for taking the time. I am Randy Kinder. I'm the Program Manager for AHPP, and I will be giving you a brief overview of the pilot program itself. Each one of you should have individual designs in front of you or on your seats. Those designs are preliminary designs, the actual designs that we used for the projects themselves. You may have ones that you like better than others and during this series, we will be evaluating and discussing each one in particular, but this evening, we're going to do an overview of the overall program. There we go. Thanks to IT. As I said, you may have a favorite design that you see, a building design and we will be

evaluating and discussing each one of these during the different series, but tonight we'll just give a brief overview of each one of these.

As Dave mentioned, this was an appropriation from Congress for \$400 million. It's an exciting program. And some of the lessons learned thus far that we've been listing chronologically, keeping track of is, one thing is, when this was done back in October of 2006, each one of the grantees or the proposals had a great concept and project, but no one at that time actually had infrastructure in place to actually do this project. So when the grant award was made and then we actually just signed the agreements, they had to put together a team, so some of the processes have been slow or halted because of certain infrastructure that they needed to put in place. I'm asked repeatedly, "How do you compare what one state is doing to another?" and that's impossible to do. You cannot compare apples to oranges. Each one of these projects are different. Each one of the people implementing them are different, the agencies within that's doing it.

For an example, real quick, Mississippi is using the Emergency Management Agency whereas Alabama elected to have a city implement it. You're going to find each one will have different hurdles and obstacles that they have to overcome, so it's impossible to compare that one is on target, one is not, and I like to -- as we had our AHPP Conference last week, I reiterated all the time, we're not competitive anymore. Each one of these grantees are working together so that any of these units or the implementation of them could be put in FEMA's toolbox as Dave mentioned when he was speaking.

We have 29 projects that were submitted, five were selected. They were rated, graded, a different system was used. Out of the 29 projects, five were selected, two from Mississippi, one from Louisiana, one Texas, and one Alabama. They will be evaluated over a four-year period, the final results expected in 2011. Each one of these grantees have had a different time that the grant award actually happened starting with April of '07 for one grantee all the way to January of '08 for the last one. And there again, each one of them were done at a different because of different things going on within the state, dealing with CDBG money, the agency that's involved had different parameters they had to work out. So it has been a little bit time consuming but it's moving forward now, although all of them will be implemented by 2009, midsummer of 2009.

This is the AHPP timeline. As I said, the first unit occupied was in the spring of '07, and currently there are 2,677 units occupied in the State of Mississippi so the evaluation process has already been taking place. We will have a report from HUD in September of '08 and then we will provide that report to Congress on the first evaluation. Then we will also evaluate the other states as they progress along. In 2011 is the final report that's due to Congress then there will be periodical reports between now and then. They have two years from the time that the grant was awarded for implementation. This is site selection, actual infrastructure on the properties because sometimes, whereas in Mississippi they do a swap on individual properties but in Alabama, they're making two developments.

So there's a lot of difference in how the timeframes work, but all of them will be done, like I said, in mid-2009. The primary objective of this project was to identify, implement, evaluate alternative disaster housing options. As Dave said, the Gulf Coast states were the ones asked or authorized to participate. That was so that we could also do a secondary initiative and that's house people that were affected by Katrina and Rita. But that is not the primary goal and we are not a housing initiative. We are repeatedly asked about housing everyone. We cannot house everyone. The funds were not there to do that. It's a pilot program to see how we test, not only the units, but the implementation of these units.

The Alabama project is unique in that the State of Alabama partnered with some CDBG funds, Community Development Block Grant money, purchased some property that's not in flood plain and has two developments. Basically, they'll have 200 houses built there, a hundred of them being AHPP. They're going to utilize the funds from these -- sell these proceeds to build more houses and to even provide housing for firefighters, police force, essential personnel. As you see this unit here, it's a modular home. It comes in a two and four bedroom layout. It is expandable, it can be added on to, and the unit can be deployed within a 500-mile radius. This is part of the testing and evaluation. These units will run anywhere from about 900 square feet to 1,300 square feet. They are being built by a partner with Mitchell Homes and Palm Harbor Homes out of Florida.

It's a very interesting program. They will also have community services, they'll provide -- they've worked with the Bush-Clinton Foundation for parks, recreational services in the community, they have a covetous [sounds like] set-up. They are going to offer incentives. The first year will be a program to where they're rent-a-homes at a fair market value, a HUD

fair market value of rent. Then also they can go to home ownership. They're going to offer Yard of the Month, will get one month's free rent. They're really making it a community development. It's an interesting program.

Next is the Mississippi project. The Mississippi project is two projects, one being the Mississippi Park Model and the Mississippi Cottage. Now a lot of people refer to the Katrina Cottage, in all of the press that I read about, it says, "The Katrina Cottage in Mississippi." The people in Mississippi do not like to hear that because the Katrina Cottage is a Lowe's designed house that we'll get to in a minute. The Mississippi Cottage is a manufactured house that is being manufactured by a variety of manufacturers in Mississippi, Indiana, Alabama, different locations that they used. The two projects consist of -- the eco-cottage is a totally green aspect and they have just now provided the RFP for that so that unit has not been built yet. No one is living in it. They are doing more like what FEMA does in a disaster scenario. They're putting these units in group sites, commercial sites and individual lots.

To date, like I said, they have almost 2,700 units in. Their goal was to reach 3,100 with the amount of money they have. And then when these units are brought back in, they'll refurbish them and they're partnering with nonprofits to develop communities. Habitat as a matter of fact is working out a deal right now with Mississippi to add a 200 to 300 square foot addition to the unit so it'll meet local zoning codes for square footage restrictions in some of the jurisdictions. It's a unique program. It's similar to the travel trailer. It will withstand wind speeds up to 150 miles an hour. The park model is very unique. It's 396 square feet. I've been in one and I think most people here on the panel have been in them. They're very impressive.

The Louisiana project is -- there again, this is being run by the Louisiana Recovery Authority. It's a unique program also. It's basically a steel-framed construction. It's built on site. They're partnering with Lowe's. Worthington Steel is the manufacturer of the framing. They're partnering with Lowe's on the unit itself for the building materials. You buy the materials or they're buying the materials and then it's pre-cut or basically pre-cut, they install it right there on site. They are also going to use these units in infill sites and group sites; the infill site's in New Orleans, group sites throughout Louisiana. One in Lake Charles, one in Baton Rouge, one in New Orleans, and then the infill sites in -- what's the place called -- Hoffman Triangle in New Orleans, and other areas that they find that they can put them. They have single and multi-family units. The multi-family unit is called a Dovetail Unit. It will house

about ten families. They're going to build -- at each one of the sites, they hope to build three to five of those, and the rest of them will be individual homes. Like I said, this is a unique unit that will withstand 140-mile an hour wind and the whole point of this is then to offer them as home ownership. And there again, they hope to take the proceeds from it and build more homes, not only in New Orleans, but in the State of Louisiana.

The Texas project is pre-fabricated, panelized house. It's called the Heston Home. The house is assembled - I like to call it like a Lego set. It expands to any size you want it to be. It comes in a container. You can add to it. You can add with height. You can make an apartment complex out of it, a community center. Whatever you want to do, this unit basically can do that. It's assembled in ten hours by a crew of four people. I'm yet to see that the houses are on their way and I'm anxious to see exactly -- I have been in one, there's one on display in New Orleans but I'm anxious to see the actual unit on the ground and the response from the people in East Texas have been very well taken that it has been offered to them and they're going to replace these units with some of the homes that they had in East Texas. There will be ten units that will be stored, demobilized and stored, to be evaluated over a two-year period to see the durability of this unit. Its life span is supposed to be about 20 years.

The four-year evaluation by FEMA and HUD: building science, durability, cost, indoor air quality, and energy efficiency. We look forward to finding out not only about the units, but the social aspect of the units which is a quality of life -- because a lot of times, and I come from a disaster area myself, been in several disasters in the coast of North Carolina -- it's how well you feel you're recovering effects the actual recovery. And the people in the Gulf Coast right now, the ones that have a home to live in feel a lot better than the ones that are living in a travel trailer or finding other alternative housing which could or could not be used in the future.

The administration and what we can learn from the Administration of the Housing Programs, like I said from the very beginning, it's very unique that we have in Mississippi an Emergency Management Agency that assisted with Katrina in the housing, to start with, so they're a little more up to speed on what to do and what hurdles they may have out there, environmental issues, local jurisdictions, community buy-in. And then we go all the way to the City of Bayou La Batre where you have a mayor that also has a fishing business, so he's part-time mayor and a city council that they convene on Thursdays when needed. It's very unique to see that operation compared to Mississippi and then you move to Louisiana and you have a

Louisiana Recovery Authority that's been dealing in several billions of dollars of the Road Home Program and now they're asked to take on this and they're staffing and bringing people in, and getting them up to speed, and to Texas which is the Texas Department of Housing Community Affairs that there again, they were dealing in several hundred millions of dollars of CDBG with the staff of five people and then they were -- said, now we've got \$16 million to try to utilize as housing.

It's unique also that each one of them that are dealing with a different set of developers and contractors, with Mississippi, it put out an RFP and they're going to build a manufactured unit, and in Texas it's, specifically, the Heston Home, which is a unit that's built by one manufacturer, versus Louisiana where its contractors actually building homes on property; I mean, it's like a unique development, versus Alabama which has got a development but bringing modular homes in. So all these things will be evaluated and we hope to not only learn from the actual unit themselves but from the implementation of the unit and who is administering it.

Alabama is working with a nonprofit so that once they're done, the city then will turn it over to a nonprofit to run it. There're nonprofits involved in Mississippi. They're bringing nonprofits into Louisiana. You have the City of New Orleans that's involved also. It's a very wide range and unique to deal with each one of these and on a daily basis, we get numerous phone calls at our department, "What's next? What do we do next? What's around the turn?" It's just not the unit itself. That would be the simple part to say, "Okay, here they are. Just go out and build them." But we deal with all these other parameters, the jurisdictions involved and the local community buy-ins and every time we turn around, it's like we've got to make another turn to meet this group of people or to meet that group of people and I'm sure that in a disaster scenario, we may not have some of these restrictions that we have, but we have to deal with what it is today. That's my contact information. Anyone needs to and I'll be glad to answer questions after this is over with. I'll take the pleasure in bringing Todd Richardson up here to speak to you about the evaluation process.

Todd Richardson: If I can get this set up here. All right, I'm Todd Richardson and I direct HUD's Program Evaluation Division. My presentation has four key parts. I'll be a little repetitive with some of the things that Randy said but I'll try to avoid that. I'm going to talk about the hypothesis. We're going to test with the evaluation, how we're going to measure

quality of life, how we're going to measure the building science issues, and I'm going to conclude with some discussion about the implementation themes that we've identified today. Obviously, we're in an early stage in this program, so what we can talk about is what the implementation has been to date, but not whether things have been successful or not.

FEMA asked HUD to do this evaluation because HUD has both in-house expertise and a long history of doing similar types of projects. We've been working very closely with FEMA on this since the funds were appropriated. Dana Bres, who's sitting over here, was involved with and is the managing part of this evaluation. He was involved with the technical experts that were reviewing the original proposals of the 29 that Randy mentioned earlier.

Probably, one of the most exciting things for me and an unusual feature of this evaluation is that it is multi-disciplinary. It's not just the study about people, nor is it just the study about structures. It's actually a study about both and the interaction between people and those structures, and it has been very exciting working with Dana and the engineers as they learn about how we do studies on people and I've been learning about how they do studies in structures.

Now, when we set out to this study, we worked with FEMA to identify the questions we wanted to answer. We knew that there is really no right way to necessarily do disaster housing for every disaster. Every disaster is going to be different and so as has been mentioned earlier, there needs to be a toolbox. So we're taking a look into this evaluation from the perspective of what are the different tools and how could those tools work most effectively in different circumstances. So if we want to think back to Randy's presentation, there's really, as I see it, 11 different approaches, ranging from temporary to permanent that we're evaluating and I don't have a slide with these 11 different approaches but I'm going to summarize these briefly.

So in Texas, this is a temporary housing solution with the state housing and community development agency is constructing these homes from flat packs sort of snapped-together homes and they're doing two strategies in Texas with those homes. One is actually temporary, we're going to build the houses, people are going to leave them, we're going to tear them down and pack them back up. But they're also planning to use these houses as permanent replacement housing for very low-income rural homeowners, which is sort of an innovative approach.

In Mississippi, you have a state Emergency Management Agency that's building mostly single-wide manufactured homes in a fairly quick fashion, and those homes are being set up in three different ways. There's going to be temporary homes on a homeowner's property. They're going to be there, the homeowner's going to fix their current house up, and they're going to take the house away. They're also being used as permanent replacement housing in those jurisdictions where they're accepted by the jurisdictions. They're also being used as rental housing in commercial parks that are being owned and those rental units will eventually be owned and managed by a local housing authority that they've got a partnership with. And finally, they're going to be building permanent eco-homes which they're just in the process of developing right now.

In Louisiana, Louisiana Recovery Authority is developing stick-built homes and as Randy noted, there's sort of four strategies. They've got permanent rental housing for first responders on a military installation, they're building housing at Jackson Barracks. They're doing permanent homeowner subdivision for moderate income in Lake Charles. They're planning to do infill housing in a distressed urban neighborhood in New Orleans and that's going to be part of a larger urban revitalization strategy and finally, they're developing a community in an area that received a lot of displaced residents, in Baton Rouge.

And then finally, Alabama is unique in the sense that you take a small town that's in a very dangerous place and you say, "Let's move as many residents as we can to a safer place," so out of the flood zone. Because this is the place that gets hit by hurricanes all the time, so let's just build a new subdivision that's in a safer place so we won't have to do this again. And for all of these units we're looking at, we want to know how they perform over time, their role in overall community recovery and how the states administer these housing programs. Currently FEMA provides and manages temporary housing but this intervention is looking at what would be needed to have states play a role in providing more temporary housing. So we have a lot of things we're looking at here.

As researchers, we want to test hypotheses; we need these hypotheses to refine the questions and issues we are exploring. In this case, we are interested in both the human hypothesis: that larger and more designed appropriate units are healthier for families and help them recover, as well as the hypothesis that it is possible to develop and provide in a reasonable amount of time and cost, durable and design-appropriate housing post disaster. As researcher --

I'm repeating the lines I just read -- this evaluation has three components. An evaluation of what happened to the people provided the housing versus the alternatives, and how the housing affects an overall recovery in place. An important component of this part of the evaluation is the actual implementation. Without successful implementation, we cannot study the impact on the people or the place. HUD has hired the Social Science Research firm Apt Associates [phonetic] to study the people, the places, and the implementation. We're also looking at the design, construction, delivery, cost, and long-term durability of the housing units. And HUD has contracted with the National Association of Home Builders Research Center to do this part of the study.

Finally, with events like this one, HUD has contracted with the Building Museum to help us provide information to the public about what we learn as we learn it. Our approach to the quality of life evaluation is focused on the mental and physical health of participating households and attempts to gauge the success with which AHPP clients have returned to pre-disaster patterns of everyday life. The resumption of education and employment are important indicators of successful recovery, while the presence of substance abuse and the advents of domestic violence or health problems, obviously, are not. Our look at the place will focus on how the units fit into the community and are accepted by the community.

In our ideal world, we would be able to compare the families that served in the AHPP to another group that is exactly like them, a baseline, not receiving the units. And sometimes, this is possible when there are more applicants than units and selection is by lottery. It turns out in these cases, we compare the folks who are selected against the folks that applied and were not selected, kind of like a drug trial, right? And we thought we might be able to do that here if we had more applicants than units, and that might yet be possible in Louisiana which has a very large number of families that are still displaced. But the demand for the housing in the other three states has not exceeded the supply.

Even so, without a control group in these other sites, we will be able to do pre and post analysis. What was the situation for the families before they got the units? What's the situation a year later? And then what's the situation two years later for these families, whether or not they're still living in this housing, where did they end up, what was the situation for them? For our place evaluation, we are largely depending on observations and discussions with informed experts to track how the units are accepted and fit into the community.

The proposed units are very different from one another. That's pretty evident from the presentation given by Randy. They're being designed to different and sometimes multiple building codes. Some are all or partially factory built and others are being built entirely on site. Our approach to the building science evaluation is to look at the unit construction, typically in a factory, then examine the performance of the unit in the field.

Basically, we want to answer the question of whether the unit will work. We are particularly interested in unit cost to construct and install, initial performance of the units, including durability, energy efficiency and air quality, durability based on the installed units, disaster resistance and re-use or adaptation on site. With respect to the quality of the housing, in some or even many cases, these units are better designed and well built than the damaged or destroyed units that they replaced. Because of the extensive involvement of engineers, architects and other design professionals, these units were designed to be livable, disaster resistant, and durable. Design of small spaces is particularly challenging as your margin for error disappears. The design teams for all these units have been able to craft very efficient spaces in the 600 to 1,200 square feet of these units.

While design is important, cost remains critical. We build relationships with the manufacturers to obtain information on the cost of production because most of the AHPP units are going to be factory-built, that information is often more detailed than with comparable site construction.

Initial performance and durability upon installation will be addressed through proven approaches relying on strategies that have been developed to improve housing for all Americans. In this photo, we are equipping selected units with wireless moisture sensors that will provide information on moisture levels, temperature and humidity in wall and ceiling cavities in the units. This information will be automatically sent to the building science team for review. This will serve to verify the anticipated performance of the building envelope. Initially, the building science process reviews the designs to ensure that we understand the construction approach. We then conduct site visits, perform tests and observe the unit's performance.

Essential to understanding the performance is determining the performance of the building envelope. To that end, we are conducting blower door and duct blaster tests of units to establish their performance. We will test units in all four states. Durability assessment will be

a challenge because we will work to predict the performance of units well into the future. We have conducted research in the past to identify strategies to enhance durability so those efforts will contribute to the durability assessment.

Disaster resistance comes from the design and material selection. Because these units are housing families impacted by hurricanes, that is never far from the minds of the designers. For example, although the international code defines several wind zones in the Gulf region, the homes are designed to higher standards. Combined with installation that are more robust than has typically been used, we expect these units to be naturally more disaster resistant. Near the end of the project, we expect to see units modified to provide more space. In fact, we've already seen that in Mississippi, the Habitat for Humanity has developed a way to make some of those units larger. Although, how that happens in some of the other sites will remain to be seen, we're going to continue to track that over time.

Obviously, this program demands a great deal of the local grantee in terms of management, planning, and coordination. We also see the challenges in affecting a plan for permanent housing at the community level as that by necessity requires greater consideration. We cannot test any of the hypothesis noted earlier unless the programs can be implemented. So it is critical to document how the programs are implemented. The implementation themes that we've identified today in our research are that strategies focusing on temporary solutions are clearly faster, with fewer community and infrastructure barriers to implement. In any case though, the local community must buy-in to the recovery plan. Providing grants to states without having an already established infrastructure for implementing the program creates a substantial lag time from the time of grant award to unit production. Permanent housing and any strategy requiring acquisition of land and site preparation can take a very long time. Environmental reviews and community approval for permanent sites are especially large hurdles that lead to project delays.

In addition, larger homes and higher standards for flood and wind protection actually limits the number of sites that units can be placed in comparison to say, the travel trailers, where travel trailers are much smaller, they can be placed in locations that these houses can't. And with that, I conclude the remarks here and open it up for questions.

Chase Rynd: Great so. Let's now open for questions. I have the mobile mic and please wait until I bring the mic to you to ask your questions because we are recording the program and so everyone wants to hear you. So, this gentleman here --

Male Voice: You had mentioned the environmental reviews for some of these developments. Do any of the NEPA requirements or do you waive any of those or can you get those waived or any local -- I assume because it's a federal project, all NEPA is applicable but can't there -- would working towards waiving some of those requirements be appropriate.

Todd Richardson: Well, certainly one of the challenges we've found with NEPA -- there's a couple of challenges. First off, NEPA applies to these projects like any other project so we don't have any special waivers for NEPA. One of the particular challenges in this project is that some of these projects, for example, in Alabama, they are using two sources of funding; CDBG funding for their infrastructure and their land and the AHPP money for constructing the units, and because of that they actually have to do effectively two environmental reviews, one for each program. So, these are the kinds of things we're observing and we're documenting, that this slows down the process some, to have to do these kinds of things. So this is the kind of useful information we're collecting in this study.

David Garratt: Randy, in Jackson Barracks, did we not invoke some authorities out of the regulation to allow us to, at least, accelerate some of the environmental requirements?

Randall Kinder: Right, in Jackson Barracks, because there have been reviews and environmental assessment, just recently through DOD, we did a category exclusion, a CATEX there and in some cases, this is something that not only in the evaluation but we're documenting because with all the federal agencies involved as Todd just mentioned, half with CDBG funds are used and having to do environmental from HUD and then come back, because FEMA funds are used and doing a FEMA environmental, this slows the process, and is there a way in the future that there can be -- one environmental process that we invoke for all of it to speed up the process, though we don't have this but we did do that in Jackson Barracks, yes.

Female Voice: Hi, I just wanted to know, of the \$400 million that was granted, how much of that money went directly to physically, or is going directly to physically building housing and how many units have actually been built or will be built under this program?

Randall Kinder: Under the program, \$388 million is going directly to the grantees. The evaluation part with HUD, \$6 million, and then \$6 million operation for administering the

program within FEMA, for the four years. Exactly how many houses are going to be built? Each grantee has a number that they are trying to achieve and more if the funds allow, which totals out to over 4,000 homes -- you can't do the math by taking the money and dividing and say, how much are the homes because you do have the cost of land, you have the cost of infrastructure, you have the environmental process reviews that have to be done, you have the administrative programs.

So it breaks down that each unit in each state has a different cost per unit with all of them being -- and which was part of the selection criteria, as cost was a factor, and Dana was involved with that but cost was a factor and each one of the units fall within line of what typical housing of this size would be.

Todd Richardson: But from an evaluation standpoint, cost is critical and benefits are also critical, so part of the evaluation is to look both at what the cost are, what's it cost for each of these different ways of providing housing and then what are the benefits associated with that housing, to make a determination, to be able to make good policy decisions.

Male Voice: Yes, just to follow up on what you just said, do you have any early results of what's the average cost for each of these units? And also, you mentioned the eco-cottage, do you have an average cost for those compared to the standardized models?

Randall Kinder: I can tell you that in Mississippi, the park model is running in \$33,000 a unit, to manufacture it. The eco-cottage, they have that out for bid right now. They do not have an exact cost on it. And the other units are running accordingly, some of the units, two-bedroom Mississippi Cottages \$50,000 to \$55,000.

Dana Bres: It's important to note though that on the cost, these are extremely solidly built units. They're units I think anyone of us would be perfectly willing to live in. These are not -- we say we're replacing a travel trailer with something that's different but it's also not only is it different, it's significantly better from both a space utilization standpoint as well as a comfort and a quality of construction. So some of the direct comparisons don't work as well as we might hope.

Randall Kinder: And the unit meets the characteristics of their environment. The front porch as you noticed, that may not be something that they need in Minnesota but that's a big advantage there and that's what they're used to. They're also designed with the metal roofs in Mississippi then some of the ones in Alabama are going to be the thirty-year architectural

shingles. They're very high-quality units. They're to withstand 150-mile hour winds. It's a very unique program in that each one of the units are designed well.

Male Voice: I have a question about homeownership versus rental. Do these individual projects typically consist or comprise totally of homeownership in one project and rental in another, and are there mixed developments in that respect? And then, what is the form of ownership or who is the owner, I guess, where these units would be used for renters? Is it the grantee or the local government or -- who actually owns those properties?

Randall Kinder: The answer to your first question is, typically it's 55:45 homeowners to renters in each one of the projects, typically, give or take. The answer to your second question, the grantees own the homes to start with. They are sometimes, like in Mississippi, they're looking at housing authorities to come in and take these houses. As a matter of fact, Mississippi had to change and pass some legislative law to allow them to sell these units to individuals because they are gift from the state, it really wasn't allowed under Mississippi law, prior, so now they can do that, and they're looking to partner with housing authorities, they're getting the nonprofits to -- then the home ownership programs that they're going to offer can be special services through, like in New Orleans, they're partnering with, possibly Fannie May, to come in and do a home ownership program for these people. So all of them are unique in what they're doing and who they're partnering with in each one.

Todd Richardson: Our long-term expectation is this is going to evolve over time. As they move from sort of an emergency to a permanent situation, the rental-owner situation is going to be very different from site to site, depending on the way it has been developed and the product that's there, so we'll be watching to see how that changes over time, and what happens -- what's the long-term end-use for some of these units.

Male Voice: Hi. This is a question for some of my colleagues. Actually, I'm at HUD but I'm going to pose a question to the FEMA representatives. I have two quick questions. The first is you mentioned the eco-cottage. To what extent have you actually spec green building standards for all of these units? And to what extent is the eco-cottage, which you mentioned is green, differ from or what are the features that are in that unit that are not in some of the others? I know there has been a particular concern in the trailers with regard to indoor air quality, so I wonder if you could address that question about the extent to which green building standards are going to be built into the units generally.

Randall Kinder: I'm going to defer to our engineer that was involved in the process of selection and has reviewed all of these designs. Dana?

Dana Bres: Okay, it's important to realize that the individual state grantees, Texas through Alabama, are doing the concept development and the speccing. HUD and FEMA are involved with not only the evaluation, but we're also reviewing the plans but these plans remain those of the states. The eco-cottage is a product that was specifically being designed to be more environmentally friendly. It's still a work in progress so we don't know exactly how green it will be. Certainly, it's starting pretty green and it's going to get deeper and deeper green as the process goes on. I'm sure there will be something there that says, "Well, you could have made it more green by doing this rather than that." The opportunity for that kind of Monday morning, quarter-backing presents itself on a constant basis. And anytime you get three design professionals in the room, you're going to get four opinions. So the grantees have the challenge to, kind of, take all that information in and then make the execution decision, are we going to do this or that? So the process in that respect is very good.

With the respect to the other question on indoor air quality, we expect that the quality is going to be quite good. The decisions being made upfront regarding the material selection have resulted in products which are naturally more friendly to indoor air quality. The mix of air at home, there's a lot of things contributing to the air quality. In the case of the Mississippi Cottages, there's very little particle board being used. Every place where particle board could be used in a HUD-code product, they're using oriented strand board, which has a different type of adhesive so it doesn't off-gas. So we're expecting the air quality will be quite good and we're getting ready to gear up to do the testing on all the units to validate that.

Female Voice: Hi. I think you mentioned that the Texas unit, the pre-fab unit had a 20-year life expectancy, is that the case in all the other models that you've developed? Seems like for a home ownership unit, you just about have it paid off and then you wouldn't have a house?

Randall Kinder: Probably, that's the manufacturer gives it a 20-year life. It's like a typical home, it would last longer. All the homes, the stick-built homes are like a normal house that you would have built. The manufactured housing is similar to mobile homes and the modular homes, if you're familiar with modular homes, there's not a whole lot of difference

between that and the stick-built other than where it's built. The materials used and so forth. So the life expectancy is a lot longer than that as far as what it realistically will do.

And in Texas by the way, their program's very unique. For the people in East Texas, and we've been working with the Internal Revenue Service, they are actually going to give these units to the people. So, when it's paid off, it'll be the day that they take possession, and in a lot of ways they will do a silent second or whatever, but they're working out so that these people do not have any tax liabilities or are not required to pay anything for them and they have an actual home to put on their property there in East Texas.

Dana Bres: The lifespan of some of the other units, for example, the Mississippi Cottage, if you were to look at a wall section of that unit and compare it to most of the homes that we live in, I would challenge you to find a significant difference. It begins from the outside with fiber cement siding, which has a 50-year guarantee from the manufacturer so it would be reasonable to expect that its lifespan is dramatically longer than the guarantee. Solid lumber core insulation, dry wall interior, every -- exactly what we would expect in our homes. So while they might articulate a shorter lifespan, one that seems artificially short, these things are going to perform every bit as well or better than many site-built homes.

Female Voice: What has been the public reaction to the design of the homes?

Todd Richardson: Could you repeat the question? I couldn't quite hear you.

Female Voice: What has been the public reaction to the design of the homes? How is the public reacting, the folks who are intended to move in?

Randal Kinder: The actual occupants? Is that your question?

Female Voice: Sure.

Randall Kinder: The occupants in Mississippi have -- the reaction has been very positive. Some of the press releases, one lady said that she felt like it was mansion compared to what she'd come out of. Another one said, "Try to pry this off from under my hands and put me back in a trailer." The reactions have been very positive. The local jurisdictions, because of the size of the units, it's been an educational process. And once they're educated on the units and see the units, then a lot of the time, they're very receptive. But when they look at their own zoning requirements and say, "Well, the minimum square foot in our area is a thousand square foot and you're bringing in a 790 square foot unit." A lot of times, that created a problem and it still creates, exists as a problem in some of the other states, and that's why

partnering with nonprofits is essential in adding to the actual unit size because the units are expandable. It's unique in what they're doing in Mississippi and some of the things that they've shown in Louisiana where they can't expand a unit to a bigger size.

David Garratt: Let me just follow up on that a little bit though because that's a very good question. And as Randy kind of indicated, we have reason to potentially suspect the veracity of the response from this population. They have after all been living in relatively, many of them in very cramped quarters prior to this for a long period of time, so we've taken them out of what is essentially a sardine can and we've put them into a bigger tuna can and, wow, it seems great by comparison, but how is a population going to potentially react if we are moving them into one of these units from their home that they have just been displaced from which was three or four times the size of that. So even though we're heartened by the fact that the reception has been pretty good to this, we also recognize that it may be driven in a large part by the fact that they're coming from something that is quite terrible by comparison.

Another point that was made here, and I think it's an interesting point as well, is that some of these units, for example, have a design life of 25 years. Well, the Post-Katrina Emergency Reform Act gave FEMA the authority, for the first time, to provide permanent and/or semi-permanent construction in a disaster area other than an insular area. Certain conditions apply. All other forms of housing have to be infeasible, unavailable, and plus this has to be cost-effective. But it brings up permanent construction and semi-permanent construction. And as we move away from travel trailers and into these alternative forms of housing, we're moving from temporary housing or interim housing into semi-permanent and permanent potential housing.

And what is permanent housing? Many people around the United States live in mobile homes, millions of people live in mobile homes. That's their permanent homes. So we provide those, there was interim housing solution. Is it interim housing solution or is it permanent housing solution? And what drives that? I think we found online or I did some research looking up, what the heck does semi-permanent mean because I know what temporary means, I know what permanent means. What's this? I think it said that it's five to 25 years is the design life of that.

But in any case, as we move forward, as we explore these things and as we develop units that have a longer shelf-life, we're going to have to figure out what that's going to mean

for us when we're actually providing assistance and determining what assistances to provide? And it's going to create some issues for us down the line. And it's going to create some expectations in the disaster population who may want, "I want one of these units that's going to last a lot longer than this unit that you're potentially providing me." Anyway, it's going to provoke some interesting dialogue within the disaster emergency management community down the line, almost certainly.

Todd Richardson: And we're certainly going to track how families -- we surveyed the families before they moved into these units. We survey them a year after they're in the units and we survey them two years later wherever they are, whether in these units or elsewhere, so we can actually see the progression and their experience with these units and what other housing they move on to.

Male Voice: All of these that you have shown tonight are designed and built from scratch. How much has FEMA explored other alternatives that already exist, such as the housing that's deployed for military overseas, anything like that?

David Garratt: What a great question. FEMA stood up in mid 2006, an entity that we called the Joint Housing Solutions Group. We appointed an individual by the name of Jack Schuback, a long-time FEMA individual assistant, subject matter expert, out of region three in Philadelphia, former Federal Coordinating Officer, just one of our real pros, one of our most knowledgeable individuals in the housing arena, to be the director of the Joint Housing Solutions Group. And the charter in charge for that Joint Housing Solutions Group was go out nationally and identify all the forms of alternative housing that exist or potentially exist out there, and by potentially exist, I mean, you a manufacturer have an idea, it's on paper, here's what your proposal is and explain it to us. Let us evaluate that proposal and see if it's something that merits potential field testing.

So the Joint Housing Solutions Group was set up in 2006, they basically spent some time getting their act together. They developed something called the Housing Assessment Tool. That housing assessment tool was online, was placed online and it's -- that was the vehicle by which manufacturers and vendors across the United States and beyond fill out this housing assessment tool and then identify all the components and characteristics of their particular alternative housing proposal. That is evaluated by the Joint Housing Solutions Group and if it meets a certain threshold in terms of, you passed certain gates, then they will make an

appointment to go out and visit the manufacturer and vendor and evaluate a prototype, if they have one, or talk to them about that unit and their proposal about it if they don't have one.

And then, what they've been doing, or after the first year was, at the end of last year, they did a first-year report. It was actually a series of reports and the binders all together were probably about that thick but it was an evaluation of the 40 to 60 some units that they'd looked at, and it rated them all and identified those that had the most promise. And the Joint Housing Solutions Group is going to continue to exist and it's going to continue to go out and solicit information from manufacturers and vendors and continue to evaluate them.

In the meantime, what FEMA is going to be doing this year is rolling out a competition for alternative forms of housing. We'll be doing that for the very first time. We'll be looking for vendors to compete for that and part of the statement of work or the proposal is the result of a lot of the lessons that we've learned from the Joint Housing Solutions Group as they've gone out and looked at proposals and said, "What are we looking for in this? What is it that makes it a potentially great alternative housing solution?" And that has gone into what we've developed to go out for those proposals and then that's something that we plan to do on a regular basis. Every few months, send that out again, look at more proposals and, basically, over time, build up an inventory of vendor alternative housing solutions that we can field test in disaster situations. Field tested, it works out, we evaluate it, then we may add that to our toolbox for the future. But anyway, short answer is yes.

Randall Kinder: And even a little further on that, the Joint Housing Solutions Group works collectively with the Alternative Housing Pilot Program. Matter of fact, in some cases, very close because their cubicles are right next to each other, so we know what's happening within each program. They know what's going with ours and we know what's going on with theirs, and what makes that unique is because we get, periodically, phone calls from a manufacturer or someone with a creative idea of an alternative housing project that's not one of these projects, and then we in return give that to Joint Housing Solutions Group for them to follow up and have the assessment tool done on the project and on their particular unit. So they're working together and knowing what's going on, we have someone that's coordinating in our group and their group collectively so it keeps everyone abreast at what's happening.

Female Voice: Thank you. I'm interested in these new communities that are being created with these funds and I'd like to observe that most private developments are not covered

by Federal Civil Rights regulations and presumably these new communities are covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, the Architectural Barriers Act, because CDBG funds are being used and probably a whole host of other Federal Civil regulations. Is HUD or FEMA in the contract with -- you mentioned a social science firm that was looking at the sociology of these units, are they focusing in any way on how this community integration, which is going to be, I think, optimal in terms of race, religion, color, disability, et cetera? How these communities are responding to that mixture of people?

Randall Kinder: First, each one of the grantees are required to have five percent of the unit UFAS compliant and Americans with Disabilities Act, everything intact, just like what you mentioned. Next, each one of the grantees are required through the selection process to work with HUD to ensure that the selection criteria meets the Fair Housing Act. Because it is federally-funded money, we want to ensure that all of this is done and that each one is -- I think Todd mentioned in Louisiana certain limitations on some of the areas, Lake Charles or whatever population is going into those. The same thing with the development in Alabama. They had some upfront some things that they wanted to say, "Okay, we want to do this," and we had to run it through and say we need to discuss this with HUD and ensure that what you're doing can be done.

Todd Richardson: In addition actually, most of the sites have been looking very carefully to make sure that not only do they meet the five percent requirement for UFAS or the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards, but most of the sites are building far more than that requirement because they recognize a lot of the families that are currently without housing have a fairly high rate of disability so more units are being built that way.

But certainly, we're working hard to make sure that we keep track of who's being served and we'll be reporting on what the diversity of the sites are and any challenges associated with that. Certainly, creating new communities, there's -- anytime you build new housing, especially housing for low-income folks, you've experienced not-in-my-backyard types of reactions, we're certainly encountering that here with these projects and so we are looking at that and trying to understand that and figure out what can we learn by how the projects proceed.

Randall Kinder: And the unique thing about the development in Alabama, the part-time mayor lives across the street from where the development is so he's 100 percent behind this,

bringing all types of walks of life into this community. There's a big Vietnamese community there that they're coming into there so it's -- like I said, the mayor lives right across the street from where the development is.

Todd Richardson: We call it PIIMB, put it in my backyard.

Randall Kinder: Yes.

Dana Bres: Randy didn't mention it, on the Alabama project but there's also walking distance to two new schools so it really has the potential to truly become a community very quickly. A lot of folks living there, access to facilities, safe, and it'll just -- that one's one where I think we're all ready excited about.

Female Voice: I believe you said in the Texas project that the houses were being given to the recipients and there would ownership at the beginning, I'm wondering how that works and also if any of them are being given subsidies or breaks when there's ownership involved, whether there's some mechanism in place to maintain the affordability of them or split profits or whatever in the end when they're sold.

Todd Richardson: Actually, the sites are all very different about how they're trying to approach home ownership. So in Texas it's one extreme, essentially -- these are very low-income homeowners. Their homes were destroyed in rural areas and the state has identified them as being -- they're not going to get any other house back and the state has made the decision, this is our solution for the housing problem for these households, is we're going to provide them with this house at no charge.

In Louisiana where they're building some as home ownership, they're establishing what is the market value of this home after it's built. These are stick-built permanent homes. And then, based on the income of the buyer, they'll put a silent second on the property that will be forgiven over time to avoid slipping but also to give the homeowners an affordable housing to purchase.

In other sites, they're doing rental housing and for example, in Mississippi, to make it affordable for some folks who are in commercial parks, to be able to afford to live in that commercial parks and afford the lot fees, the units are being provided to the housing authority. And then the housing authority is renting the units out to the households, and the household also gets a housing choice voucher. And so the housing authority can pay the lot rent and then

the household pays 30 percent of their income and the voucher covers the difference in cost in the lot rent and the utilities et cetera.

Female Voice: So just to clarify on her question, so then as emergency housing after a storm or Katrina or whatever, it's not equivalent to a mobile home or a unit that's given to them to live in or a hotel room, or this is the next step?

Randall Kinder: This is the step towards solving their permanent housing need. These houses will be placed in East Texas, like Todd said, these are property owners that lost their house due to the storm and have not been able to re-build back for whatever reason and they qualify still under the FEMA housing assistance and they're going to this program and then the house will be gifted to them to solve their permanent housing need. Even under the gifting program, there will be a time-limit requirement that the people have to maintain to keep the house. And as you asked about maintenance, in most of the programs, there's a maintenance included, even in the home ownership part, to where the state or the grantee or if it's the housing authority, whomever will assist in the maintenance on these homes for a period of time.

David Garratt: But let's keep in mind that the answer is relative to this particular pilot program and those particular units that are in this pilot program. It's not necessarily translatable to how things will be done in the future. Clearly, once we've completed the evaluation, we're going to have to assess a lot of things. The timeliness of setting these things up. What is the overall cost of these? And if in fact we're going to be providing a unit to somebody that is essentially a permanent unit, stick-built for example, or a unit that can last a very long time, and it's difficult to, perhaps, disassemble and store, how are we going to -- what is the basis by which we are going to make decisions about who gets what in the future. Right now we can roll up a park model that costs \$20,000 maybe into somebody's yard if they've got a big enough yard, we can set that thing up and we can hook it up, and then we can come and pull that away if eight months later, they get their house repaired, we can take that back, we can refurbish it, maybe use it again, or we can sell it.

So from a government standpoint, we've got an opportunity to get some of the investment back in that we've provided them an interim housing solution while they've repaired their home and moved back into it and now we've recouped what cost we can from that. But if we're going to start using permanent or what are essentially permanent homes and

somebody says I'd rather have one of those in my front yard because it's about the same size as that park model but it doesn't disassemble very well, doesn't store very well once that happens, but yet it is more pleasing both to the occupant or potential occupant as well as to the community, we're going to be facing decisions in the future.

So the bottom line is, what Texas is doing and choosing to do under this grant program that they have, and they own these units, is not necessarily how the Federal Government will handle this in the future given that these will not be units that are provided to the state, they're going to be federal units that are provided and then we're going to have to make decisions about how that's going to be managed.

Randall Kinder: Right, and as Dave mentioned, each state has their own system in place, demo [sounds like] plan, the federal government would look at it differently but I think more important is to look at what different aspects of units, implementation in FEMA's toolbox, it allows us to become more of individual assistance versus a cookie-cutter approach, one-size-fits-all and that's one of the unique things about this, is trying to find out what other alternatives are there for that specific disaster, each disaster is different. I think we recognize that after Katrina and Rita, that it takes a lot of different innovative ideas in each situation to meet the needs of the public.

Chase W. Rynd: Okay, folks, we have time for one more question.

Male Voice: More than just a technical tracking piece, whose website is this information going to be on so you can track it into the future?

Randall Kinder: We have developed a website that's just getting started for AHPP and I'm not familiar with -- Naomi [phonetic], do you -- where or what the --?

Naomi: [inaudible] has some basic information [inaudible] website [www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov) and it's backslash AHPP or you can just go to fema.gov website to search on AHPP. You should come it -- right now, all we have is basic fact sheet on each of the projects. But we will be adding more information [inaudible].

David Garratt: Everybody here presumably signed in and gave your e-mail addresses, and I'm assuming everyone these days has an e-mail address. That being the case, I think we can commit to once we've figured out where this is going to be located, whether it's on a HUD site, whether it's on our site, whether it's on fema.gov or all of them, we can send that out to everybody and let you know exactly where you can find all this information.

Male Voice: And then just a follow up, you talked about supply and demand, 4,000 units, that's what is being provided, what's the demand still?

Randall Kinder: The actual demand of the housing in the Gulf Coast I can tell you that -- I break it down to the states, we're meeting the supply of Texas and the demand and the same in Alabama. Louisiana is a different story because of the number of people that are still displaced. So it's hard, I couldn't give you the exact numbers on that.

David Garratt: It's still several tens of thousands of individuals are still in some form of manufactured housing in the Gulf Coast, principally in Louisiana and Mississippi. Or there are still a paucity of organic rental resources in that particular area, or more accurately, affordable rental resources in the area. One of the biggest issues we have found is that we can find a rental resource for somebody but it's going to be expensive and if we subsidize for some period of time, once that subsidy stops, they're not going to be able to afford and they're going to be right back where they were again.

So that's probably the biggest challenge that we face in finding housing for the remaining population and they are the toughest population to find housing for because they are the most socially and economically disadvantaged, that's why they're still in this position. So the last thing we want to do is just put them in something that is a home for them, wipe our hands of them, and then six months down the line, they're in the very same situation they are again. We need to find something that's sustainable and that's a huge concern of both Mississippi and Louisiana.

Chase W. Rynd: Great. Let's have a round of applause for our panel. And thank you to all you for joining us this evening and we look forward to seeing you in the Museum as the series continues. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]