

From: Andrew Janca <andrew.janca.2@outlook.com>
Sent: August 31, 2022 10:17 PM
To: Andrew Janca
Cc: Andrew Janca; andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov
Subject: 2/2 – The pandemic, Maria’s deaths, and future risks. Context and justification for lawful disclosure
Attachments: Detail (full).pdf; Substantiation of assertions and 5 USC 2302 justification 20220627.pdf; Supporting files and context 20220901.zip; SNRA FAQ 20190319.pdf; SNRA follow-up letter to committee staff 20201016.pdf; SNRA FOIA appeal 2017-FEFO-00165 20171101.pdf; NTHIRA FOIA 2020-FEFO-00401 less redacted 20200218.pdf; Attachment list 20220901.pdf

Big picture: [Substantiation...pdf](#) page 12.

Summary: FEMA claims the unclassified science attached to email 1/2 as an authority when we want to tell someone what to do, but then shields it as draft, preliminary, or superseded when someone wants to hold us accountable. Our censorship of this unclassified risk information caused additional loss of life in 2017 and 2020. But we are still doing these things today. --Detail, [Detail \(full\).pdf](#).

Notes

Please contact DHS or FEMA directly for their perspective. It’s fine: I am an open-with-my-management whistleblower, and have been since 2013 (the DHS issues go back to the 2011 first edition of this risk assessment). I have never experienced any retaliation or negative differential treatment of any kind from DHS, FEMA, or my management in all this time. This is one thing that usually goes wrong in whistleblower situations that DHS and FEMA have done a consistently outstanding job of doing everything right in this one, and they deserve credit for that.

That includes the past two months, since I first sent this documentation and context to most of you in June. So why is it still a problem...?

It’s complicated to explain, especially for me ([Detail \(full\).pdf](#) page 4 item 1, either first attached or in the zipfile [*Supporting files and context.zip / Other*]). The best analogy I can come up with is when a substance is decriminalized, but kept illegal. It certainly *seems* to be free, but since it is only tolerated rather than legalized it is still largely locked out of the formal economy and its rules.

DHS and FEMA have not authorized this information’s release. They are refraining from enforcing their prohibition on doing so because the law protects my disclosing it in the way that I’m doing, but if you made a FOIA request for it it would still be withheld. Although these are not the hard obstacles to active dissemination that the explicit prohibitions used to pose (*Supporting files and context / Other / [Restrictions.pdf](#)*), they are enough to keep the problem from resolving itself under its own power in the absence of those active efforts. So I’m continuing to push this long-but-no-longer-buried information out to more people who might find it useful, like you, until it’s gotten enough visibility to disseminate itself without further help from me.

I am not speaking for my Department or Component, any past or present DHS organization, or any past or present colleagues. I will forward these letters to my chain of command, DHS, and DHS/FEMA next: I’ll let you know when that’s done, probably some time tomorrow (9/01/2022).

Everything is unclassified, and non-security sensitive.

The unredacted information that these letters, attachments, and links communicate is explicitly within the scope of 5 U.S.C. § 2302, and communicated solely for its lawful purposes.

Thank you,

Andrew Janca
andrew.janca.2@outlook.com (this address)

From: Andrew Janca
Sent: August 31, 2022 10:14 PM
To: andrew.janca.2@outlook.com
Cc: andrew.janca.2@outlook.com; andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov
Subject: FW: 2/2 – The pandemic, Maria’s deaths, and future risks. Context and justification for lawful disclosure
Attachments: Attachment list 20220901.pdf

Hello – I’m re-sending this to make it more generic, so I can forward it to other recipients. I’m adding more outlets to this email too. The attachments dated June 27 are still current: nothing has changed since, I’m just a slow writer.

Thank you,

Andrew Janca
andrew.janca.2@outlook.com (this address)

From: Andrew Janca
Sent: June 27, 2022 8:09 AM
To: tfrank@eenews.net; investigations@npr.org; editors@sciam.com; tips@rollingstone.com; tips@nationalreview.com; wsjcontact@wsj.com; tips@latimes.com; covidtips@kff.org; historiasph@grfmedia.com; redaccion@elvocero.com
Cc: andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov; lockbox@washpost.com; national@washpost.com; news@unionleader.com; tips@nytimes.com; tips@reason.com; info@thebulwark.com; chris@amgreatness.com; scoop@motherjones.com; contactus@foxnews.com; coverage-desk@voanews.com; info@truthout.org; mikelud@protonmail.com; editorial@newsmax.com
Subject: 2/2 – The pandemic, Maria’s deaths, and future risks. Context and justification for lawful disclosure
Attachments: Detail (brief).pdf; Substantiation of assertions and 5 USC 2302 justification 20220627.pdf; Supporting files and context 20220627.zip; SNRA FAQ 20190319.pdf; SNRA follow-up letter to committee staff 20201016.pdf; SNRA FOIA appeal 2017-FEFO-00165 20171101.pdf; NTHIRA FOIA 2020-FEFO-00401 less redacted 20200218.pdf; Attachment list 20220627.pdf

Please note that in the following (as is the case in every one of these letters and attachments, but this seems like an especially important place to repeat it) that **I am NOT speaking for my Department or Component, any past or present DHS organization, or any past or present colleagues.**

FEMA claims the unclassified science attached to email 1/2 as an authority when we want to tell someone what to do, but then shields it as draft, preliminary, or superseded when someone wants to hold us accountable. Our censorship of this unclassified risk information caused additional loss of life in 2017 and 2020. But we are still doing these things today.

FEMA’s censorship of its own master risk assessment complicates everything that the agency does. The thing that makes a taboo – censorship of something for no reason at all, other than avoiding the embarrassment of admitting to something so irrational [the censorship] that ending it would require – so destructive is that it puts a huge set of tools and activities that are essential for the organization’s mission off limits, for reasons that are also off limits (“that’s what leadership decided”). It puts the functions that they perform off limits as well, because they can’t be replaced without acknowledging the hole that their censorship left. So the hole remains.

These things happen in every organization, in some measure. But the real-world consequences are very different when the organization is the Nation's emergency management agency.

I am NOT speaking for my Department or Component, any past or present DHS organization, or any past or present colleagues. I will forward these letters to my chain of command, DHS, and DHS/FEMA once I've sent them to all of you and the committees. I'll write additional outlets later this week.

Everything is unclassified, and non-security sensitive.

The unredacted information that these letters, attachments, and links communicate is explicitly within the scope of 5 U.S.C. § 2302, and communicated solely for its lawful purposes.

Thank you,

Andrew Janca
andrew.janca.2@outlook.com (this address)

From: Andrew Janca

Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 8:02 AM

To: 'tfrank@eenews.net' <tfrank@eenews.net>; 'investigations@npr.org' <investigations@npr.org>; 'editors@sciam.com' <editors@sciam.com>; 'tips@rollingstone.com' <tips@rollingstone.com>; 'tips@nationalreview.com' <tips@nationalreview.com>; 'wsjcontact@wsj.com' <wsjcontact@wsj.com>; 'tips@latimes.com' <tips@latimes.com>; 'covidtips@kff.org' <covidtips@kff.org>; 'historiasph@gfrmedia.com' <historiasph@gfrmedia.com>; 'redaccion@elvocero.com' <redaccion@elvocero.com>

Cc: 'andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov' <andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov>; 'lockbox@washpost.com' <lockbox@washpost.com>; 'national@washpost.com' <national@washpost.com>; 'news@unionleader.com' <news@unionleader.com>; 'tips@nytimes.com' <tips@nytimes.com>; 'tips@reason.com' <tips@reason.com>; 'info@thebulwark.com' <info@thebulwark.com>; 'chris@amgreatness.com' <chris@amgreatness.com>; 'scoop@motherjones.com' <scoop@motherjones.com>; 'contactus@foxnews.com' <contactus@foxnews.com>; 'coverage-desk@voanews.com' <coverage-desk@voanews.com>; 'info@truthout.org' <info@truthout.org>; 'mikelud@protonmail.com' <mikelud@protonmail.com>; 'editorial@newsmax.com' <editorial@newsmax.com>; andrew.janca.2@outlook.com

Subject: 1/2 – Documentation. Pandemics, pp. 173-86. Power loss deaths, 197-98. Heat, 509-14. Fire, 231-36, 563-80. Tornadoes, 217-30. Border surge, 543-62. Terror & political violence (domestic, foreign, left, right), 307-78. Climate change, 472-88.

Attachments: Strategic National Risk Assessment (SNRA) 2015 - Consolidated unclassified documentation.pdf; Full unclassified documentation (original pdfs).zip; Attachment list 20220627.pdf

The first attached is a one-volume consolidated version/binder of the unclassified documentation of record. The latter (the original May/June 2015 pdfs with the draft labels still on them) is in the zipfile. Page numbers below refer to the first attached.

Everything is 100% unclassified.

Some relevant parts (note that not everything below is bad):

- **Pandemics.** Relative risk, p. 27 (figure 2a). Detail, pp. 173-186, 593-596.
- **Electric grid** related risks. The SNRA's power loss mortality model ([https://5usc2302.github.io/risk/5 U.S.C. 2302 justification/Sent in July/Sent July 4/SNRA follow-up letter 20201016.pdf](https://5usc2302.github.io/risk/5%20U.S.C.%202302%20justification/Sent%20in%20July/Sent%20July%204/SNRA%20follow-up%20letter%2020201016.pdf) pp. 1-2) is primarily documented in the space weather chapter, pp. 197-198, 201, 204-205. The low estimate (which the SNRA uses for its own numbers) is 1.8 deaths/million people-days. The high estimate which accurately predicted Maria's deaths is 11.25 deaths/million people-days.
 - **Space weather**, pp. 27 (figure 2b), 197-215.
 - **Physical attack on the electric grid**, pp. 365-377.
 - **Electric grid failure (natural/accidental)**, pp. 503-508.

- **Cyber-attacks** on the electric grid, pp. 642-645.
- **Climate change**, pp. F-21 - F-23 [front insert], 472-488, 559-560.
 - The final (2016) versions of the maps on pp. 485-488 are in www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1400/RR1453/RAND_RR1453.pdf.
- **Drought**, pp. 147-154.
- **Heat waves**, pp. 509-514.
 - The missing low/best/high frequencies in the data table on page 514 are 0.14 / 0.29 / 3 events/year respectively [1]. For annualized risk comparisons, the average (1,500 deaths / year) of the 1,000-2,000 deaths/year range on page 511 is a suitable best estimate. [2]
- **Hurricanes**, pp. 27 (figure 2b), 187-196.
- **Tornadoes**, pp. 217-230.
- **Wildfires**, pp. 231-236 and 537-538.
 - **Fires and explosions** of generally unintentional origin, pp. 269-278, 527-542, 563-569.
- **Winter storms**, pp. 237-246.
- **Migrant surges / mass migration**, pp. 543-562.
 - DHS defines risk as the potential for an *unwanted* outcome (SNRA terms of reference page 1/1a footnote 4, https://5usc2302.github.io/risk/5_U.S.C._2302_justification/What's_missing.pdf), not a bad outcome. Border surges are unwanted events, but the people in them are good.
- **Energy, food, water, and supply chain** risks to society, pp. 465-468, 479-480, 638-641.
- **Unclassified** conventional and 2015 cyber-terrorism analyses, pp. 58-60, 307-378, 501-649.
 - Details that the SNRA omits in its own tables are in their cited sources (most are in pp. 57-66 of https://www.fbi.gov/file-repository/stats-services-publications-terrorism-2002-2005-terror02_05.pdf).
- **Unclassified** portions of CBRN and 2011 cyber-terrorism analyses, pp. 61-66, 379-408.

[1] Low frequency: $0.14 = 1/7$ years, the longest gap between events in table 7 (p. 513). Best estimate frequency = 0.29/year, 6 events in 21 years (p. 512). High frequency = 3 / year (max # of events in one year [1999]). I made the decision (I was the technical lead for FEMA's 2015 update) to leave the data table on page 514 incomplete in 2015 because I mistakenly believed that the small number of data points indicated an incomplete record, when in fact they accurately reflected the dispersal in time that characterize great heat wave events in this country. So they are the best numbers to use.

[2] Since most fatality risk comes from heat events outside the 100+ fatality threshold for this SNRA hazard, the 1,000 – 2,000 deaths / year number referenced on page 511 is more appropriate for annualized risk comparisons than the 73 deaths / year average of the threshold set (258 average deaths / event times 0.29 events / year). The best-estimate average of that range (1,500/year) matches AP's current estimate, <https://www.foxnews.com/us/americans-threatened-extreme-heat-record-temperatures> (2022/06/21).

I am not speaking for my Department or agency, any past or present DHS organization, or any past or present colleagues. I will forward these letters to my chain of command, DHS, and DHS/FEMA once I've sent them all to you and the committees.

The unredacted information that these letters, attachments, and links communicate is explicitly within the scope of 5 U.S.C. § 2302, and communicated solely for its lawful purposes.

Thank you,

Andrew Janca
andrew.janca.2@outlook.com (this address)

From: Andrew Janca

Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 7:58 AM

To: 'tfrank@eenews.net' <tfrank@eenews.net>; 'investigations@npr.org' <investigations@npr.org>; 'editors@sciam.com' <editors@sciam.com>; 'tips@rollingstone.com' <tips@rollingstone.com>; 'tips@nationalreview.com' <tips@nationalreview.com>; 'wsjcontact@wsj.com' <wsjcontact@wsj.com>; 'tips@latimes.com' <tips@latimes.com>; 'covidtips@kff.org' <covidtips@kff.org>; 'historiasph@grfmedia.com' <historiasph@grfmedia.com>; 'redaccion@elvocero.com' <redaccion@elvocero.com>

Cc: 'andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov' <andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov>; 'lockbox@washpost.com'

<lockbox@washpost.com>; 'national@washpost.com' <national@washpost.com>; 'news@unionleader.com' <news@unionleader.com>; 'tips@nytimes.com' <tips@nytimes.com>; 'tips@reason.com' <tips@reason.com>; 'info@thebulwark.com' <info@thebulwark.com>; 'chris@amgreatness.com' <chris@amgreatness.com>; 'scoop@motherjones.com' <scoop@motherjones.com>; 'contactus@foxnews.com' <contactus@foxnews.com>; 'coverage-desk@voanews.com' <coverage-desk@voanews.com>; 'info@truthout.org' <info@truthout.org>; 'mikelud@protonmail.com' <mikelud@protonmail.com>; 'editorial@newsmax.com' <editorial@newsmax.com>; 'andrew.janca.2@outlook.com' <andrew.janca.2@outlook.com>

Subject: 0/2 - RE: (5 U.S.C. 2302) Pandemics have been the #1 or #2 (after drugs) non-CBRN risk on DHS's list since 2011. The SNS was empty and the Nation was unprepared because we suppressed those risk assessments. We are still doing so.

Attachments: Attachment list 20220627.pdf

Hello – I'm sending the follow-up next. I'm sending the attachment list by itself first, so you'll know if something didn't come through. It may be slow.

I'm writing some of you for the first time. Everything I've sent before is at https://5usc2302.github.io/risk/5_U.S.C._2302_justification/Sent_in_July/index.html.

Truthout covered the SNRA in 2018, [https://truthout.org/articles/key-assessment-of-climate-threats-cyberwar-and-terrorism-goes-missing-under-\[my former boss\]/](https://truthout.org/articles/key-assessment-of-climate-threats-cyberwar-and-terrorism-goes-missing-under-[my former boss]/).

Thank you,

Andrew Janca
andrew.janca.2@outlook.com (this address)

From: Andrew Janca

Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 10:53 PM

To: tfrank@eenews.net; investigations@npr.org; editors@sciam.com; tips@rollingstone.com; tips@nationalreview.com; wsjcontact@wsj.com; tips@latimes.com; covidtips@kff.org

Cc: mediainquiry@hq.dhs.gov; FEMA-News-Desk@fema.dhs.gov; andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov; lockbox@washpost.com; national@washpost.com; news@unionleader.com; tips@nytimes.com; tips@reason.com; info@thebulwark.com; chris@amgreatness.com; scoop@motherjones.com; contactus@foxnews.com; coverage-desk@voanews.com; andrew.janca.2@outlook.com

Subject: Corrected version - RE: (5 U.S.C. 2302) Pandemics have been the #1 or #2 (after drugs) non-CBRN risk on DHS's list since 2011. The SNS was empty and the Nation was unprepared because we suppressed those risk assessments. We are still doing so.

Attachments: Substantiation of assertions in email text - 5 USC 2302 20210704 (corrected).pdf; Corrections indicated 20210720.pdf

Hello – I'm correcting a small error in figure 1. I also removed some parts that don't make sense, so it's shorter. The corrections are indicated in the second attached. I'll write again next week.

I'm cc-ing my organizations' public affairs not to suggest I'm speaking for them – I'm not, of course (I'm assuming it's obvious) – but so you'll know that you don't need to worry about keeping me anonymous from DHS or FEMA. I've been open with my management about my whistleblowing since 2013. These issues as they manifest internally are strongly normative, and norms are established or re-established in the open.

DHS, FEMA – I usually find a way to funnel whatever whistleblowing I do into a communication to committee staff so I can use FEMA's Report of Congressional Contact process to notify everyone who needs to know internally. I don't see a way to do that now that wouldn't seem contrived, because I'm not adding anything to what they already saw two weeks ago. I'll still forward this to my management and office lawyer, but please feel free to notify whoever else you think is appropriate.

I am not speaking for my Department or agency, any past or present DHS organization, or any past or present colleagues.

The unredacted information that these letters, attachments, and links communicate is explicitly within the scope of 5 U.S.C. § 2302, and communicated solely for its lawful purposes.

Thank you,

Andrew Janca
andrew.janca.2@outlook.com (this address)

From: andrew.janca.2@outlook.com

Sent: Sunday, July 4, 2021 11:56 PM

To: tfrank@eenews.net <tfrank@eenews.net>; investigations@npr.org <investigations@npr.org>; editors@sciam.com <editors@sciam.com>; tips@rollingstone.com <tips@rollingstone.com>; tips@nationalreview.com <tips@nationalreview.com>; wsjcontact@wsj.com <wsjcontact@wsj.com>; tips@latimes.com <tips@latimes.com>; covidthips@kff.org <covidthips@kff.org>

Cc: andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov <andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov>; lockbox@washpost.com <lockbox@washpost.com>; national@washpost.com <national@washpost.com>; news@unionleader.com <news@unionleader.com>; tips@nytimes.com <tips@nytimes.com>; tips@reason.com <tips@reason.com>; info@thebulwark.com <info@thebulwark.com>; chris@amgreatness.com <chris@amgreatness.com>; scoop@motherjones.com <scoop@motherjones.com>; contactus@foxnews.com <contactus@foxnews.com>; coverage-desk@voanews.com <coverage-desk@voanews.com>; andrew.janca.2@outlook.com

Subject: (5 U.S.C. 2302) Pandemics have been the #1 or #2 (after drugs) non-CBRN risk on DHS's list since 2011. The SNS was empty and the Nation was unprepared because we suppressed those risk assessments. We are still doing so.

Attachments: What's missing.pdf; SNRA letter to committee staff March 2019.pdf; SNRA FAQ 20190319 redacted.pdf; SNRA follow-up letter 20201016.pdf; Substantiation and context.zip; Attachment list 20210704.docx

Summary: The DHS/FEMA Strategic National Risk Assessment (SNRA) is the science-based comparative national risk assessment of natural, accidental, and adversarial hazards that FEMA's National Preparedness System is based on. It has been locked up since 2011. (The SNRA's climate change analysis is the only Government climate study that I know of that has been suppressed by both parties.) While classification and disagreements with DHS HQ had much to do with that before 2015, neither has been an obstacle since. As far as I know, the decisions to suppress the science that FEMA's plans, requirements, and doctrine are based on have been made by DHS/FEMA itself since 2015.

I don't have the moral credibility or communication skills to solve this problem inside the Government. Everything I've tried has failed. That is why I'm writing you now.

The context and documentation for the statements above is attached. Larger files (all of which are already public information) are in <https://bd02.github.io/external>. I will forward this to the committee staff I wrote to before, to my Department and agency, and to the addressees and cc-ed on the forwarded email below tomorrow.

I am not speaking for my Department or agency, any past or present DHS organization, or any past or present colleagues.

The unredacted information that these letters, attachments, and links communicate is explicitly within the scope of 5 U.S.C. § 2302, and communicated solely for its lawful purposes.

Thank you,

Andrew Janca
andrew.janca.2@outlook.com

From: Janca, Andrew <andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2020 07:21

To: --- AUSA ---@usdoj.gov; --- POC GAO-20-297 ---@gao.gov

Cc: OGC <ogc@HQ.DHS.GOV>; FEMA-OCC <FEMA-OCC@fema.dhs.gov>; GAO-OIG Liaison <GAO-OIG.Liaison@HQ.DHS.GOV>; FEMA-GAO-OIG-LIAISON <FEMA-GAO-OIG-LIAISON@fema.dhs.gov>; Media Inquiry <MediaInquiry@HQ.DHS.GOV>; FEMA-News-Desk <FEMA-News-Desk@fema.dhs.gov>; Janca, Andrew <andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov>

Subject: 1/3 - What my agency (DHS/FEMA) is telling each of you is factually inconsistent with what we're telling the other

Hello – Recent statements that my agency has given GAO and the press factually conflict with sworn declarations that my agency has given in court.

I drew my agency's attention to the inconsistencies between the latter, and the information which my agency later communicated to GAO and the press, in February. My agency has not corrected them.

(I'm talking around the subject to some extent because the non-disclosure agreements that that unsuccessful correction attempt left me with limit what I can put in a cover letter with multiple recipients on my end. So I'm trying to say as much as I can without going into the protected content.)

These inconsistencies are public, but currently below the threshold of public awareness. Since I have pointed them out to others outside the Executive Branch (footnotes 10-12, SNRA follow-up letter 20201016.pdf inside the second attachment), I'm obligated to tell you too. I haven't contacted the journalist yet, but I'll work on that next.

The three public inconsistencies that are the easiest to start with are

- <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/6284501/28/1/public-employees-for-environmental-responsibility-v-united-states/> paragraph 8;
- <https://www.gao.gov/assets/710/706612.pdf> pp. 11-12, 28; and
- <https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/stories/1062857757> (if the link doesn't work there's a pdf copy in the second attached).

The connecting context is the DHS/FEMA Strategic National Risk Assessment (SNRA), the "risk basis" of the National Preparedness System and the subject of a briefed-but-pending FOIA litigation (1:18-cv-00158-CKK) that ---AUSA --- inherited in May. I helped FEMA update this risk assessment in 2015, and I signed off on the language that FEMA used to tell the public what it said. The FOIA case duplicates a FOIA request that I made in October 2016.

I have also worked on the National THIRA that is referenced in these parts. It is a very different kind of thing than the SNRA: neither product is capable of filling the role of the other. My agency's use of it to bury something else should not be allowed to discredit the honest work that my colleagues have done on it.

This email is 1 of 3. Attached to this and the next two emails are what I sent committee staff Friday before last (October 16), July 2020, and March 2019, including the unclassified SNRA itself. The last attachment to this email is the one piece from my February correction attempt (a FOIA for what FEMA later told GAO and the journalist) that I can share without restriction. I've redacted the protected content, but the rest will still be helpful for context. Additional context:

- GAO: Relevant context is GAO-11-873 and 16-371 (DHS context), 16-243 (risk comparisons), and prior reports referenced in GAO-20-297. The 'missing' methodology report I mentioned in the SNRA FAQ p. 6 (How does the SNRA relate to DHS' HSNRC?) is the missing documentation discussed in GAO-16-371. Declaration 28-1 in --- AUSA ---'s case discusses another GAO document in paragraph 10.

- DHS/FEMA public affairs [cc-ed]: Relevant context is <https://www.eenews.net/stories/1062824495>, <https://web.archive.org/web/20140502084541/https://www.llis.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/NPS-LLIS.pdf> 3-6, 3-7, 3-12, 3-16, <https://www.fema.gov/pdf/government/training/tcl.pdf> 460-463, SNRA 2011/15 and HSNRC 2013/17 pandemic and comparative analyses, QHSR 2014 Bio Study, and the QHSR 2014 homeland biosecurity national capability targets. The targets were classified in their final version: I believe this is why they disappeared, but I don't actually know.
- USAO: I will forward you the full February 18, 2020 packet (including the unredacted version of the last attachment) separately. The main differences with the Trusted Traveler case (<https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16824447/113/state-of-new-york-v-wolf/> pp. 16-17, <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16824447/124/state-of-new-york-v-wolf/> p. 9) are 1) my agency did not correct the problematic filing when I pointed out its inconsistencies with other information; 2) my agency subsequently made those inconsistencies public (above); and 3) the real-world consequences of my agency's choices in your case.

The information these letters and attachments communicate is explicitly within the scope of 5 U.S.C. § 2302, and communicated solely for its lawful purposes.

I apologize for the awkwardness of this letter.

Andrew Janca, PhD

National Preparedness Directorate, FEMA

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Phone: (202) 786-0937

andrew.janca@fema.dhs.gov

Warning: This communication, along with any attachments, is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and may contain confidential and legally privileged information such as found under 49 CFR 1520 or the Privacy Act of 1974. It should not be communicated to any person, or agency, unless disclosure is in performance of official DHS duties and there exists a valid need to know. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this in error, please reply immediately to the sender and delete this message. Thank you.