THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

FALK AUDITORIUM

SECURING GLOBAL CITIES

BEST PRACTICES, INNOVATION, AND THE PATH AHEAD

Washington, D.C.

Thursday, March 16, 2017

PARTICIPANTS:

Moderator:

AMY LIU
Vice President and Director, Metropolitan Policy Program
The Brookings Institution

Featured Speakers:

GENERAL RAYMOND ODIERNO (U.S. Army, Ret.)
Former Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army
JPMorgan Chase Senior Advisor

MICHAEL O'HANLON
Senior Fellow and Director of Research, Foreign Policy
The Brookings Institution

THE HONORABLE MITCHELL J. LANDRIEU
Mayor
City of New Orleans

HIS EXCELLENCY JUAN CARLOS PINZÓN
Ambassador of Colombia to the United States

FRAN TOWNSEND
Executive Vice President, Worldwide Government, Legal, and Business Affairs
MacAndrews & Forbes Incorporated

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. LIU: Good afternoon. I want to welcome all of you and those on the webcast to Brookings and to a, you know, typical, quiet day here in Washington. I'm really looking forward to the conversation today. We are going to have an important discussion about safety, security, and economic competitiveness in cities. So it's a very timely topic, an evergreen topic. And we have a very distinguished set of guests with us today to help us explore this important work.

Today Brookings is releasing a new report. I forgot to bring a copy of it. If you want to hold it up, I believe there are copies available back at the front desk. Is Mike holding it? There you have it. There it is. It is called "Securing Global Cities: Best Practices, Innovations, and the Path Ahead." It is co-authored by General Odierno and my Brookings colleague Mike O'Hanlon.

This report is part of the Global Cities Initiative, which is a project of Brookings and JPMorgan Chase. You know, we launched the Global Cities Initiative more than five years ago to essentially help cities and metropolitan areas grow their economies through global trade and competitiveness. And with cities as the hubs of the global economy and as hubs of a number of global connections, goods and services, talent, ideas, transportation, and so investment, we thought it was time to better leverage all these global connections towards better growth and opportunities for the firms and the families in many of these global cities.

You know, our research out of this project showed all the promise and opportunities that could come from greater global integration. And indeed you see cities like New York, Paris, Berlin, and Orlando, Florida, benefit from global trade and global business, global visitors. Yet, as we know, in the last couple years, these cities have also been at the forefront of some global threats, which is the topic of today.

Increasingly, cities are dealing with terrorist attacks, pandemics, natural disasters that also, like economic flows, transcend national borders. So thanks to the work of General Odierno and Mike O'Hanlon, we now have a paper that captures the lessons that come from how federal, state, local, public-private sector actors can work together to grapple the intersection of now increased globalization and security in our globe's and world's cities.

So there are six findings from this report and we're going to explore these themes on this

panel today. One is refining community policing, which is a fundamental building block to safety in many of these communities. How to break down stovepipes between agencies and level of governments, how to establish strategies against organized crime, how to exploit new opportunities from technology, how to promote social cohesion, and preparing for black swan events, the unexpected events across the globe.

And so to start this conversation I'm going to turn to my colleague on my left. And one of the things I'm going to say first is we do have a strong caliber of leaders to participate in this conversation today. And you all have their names, but I just want to remind who they are.

We have a man who gave us more than 39 years of military service, including in Iraq, who is now a senior advisor at JPMorgan Chase. We have an expert in defense strategies and national security and, honestly, one of the easiest people at Brookings to work with.

We have an ambassador and former defense minister, who brought about some of the most important changes and dramatic reforms nationally and locally. We have a private sector executive and a public servant in Homeland Security and counterterrorism. And we have a two-term mayor of one of my favorite cities, who is passionate about criminal justice reform and how to just turn around a city from a major natural disaster.

So to launch this conversation I'm going to turn to General Odierno. And I'm just going to ask him, you know, why launch a project on securing global cities? And why cities in particular?

GENERAL ODIERNO: Well, a couple things. First, when I first came to JPMorgan about 16, 17 months ago, when they briefed me on the Global Cities project, obviously incredibly interesting and the economic development and the way forward. I had just completed the last two years, in the Army, we did this study on megacities. And we came to the conclusion that by 2040 or '50, somewhere between 65 and 70 percent of the world's population is going to live in cities. And we realized this is going to change the dynamic of security, not only from a foreign security perspective in the military, but also internally to our own cities. So we really realized that we had to take a look at this.

The thing is I learned in my experiences over the years that in order to have economic growth, you must have security. They go hand-in-hand. It's like the chicken and the egg. I can't tell you which one comes first, but they have to be hand-in-hand as you move forward. If you don't have economic growth, you could have trouble with security. If you don't have security, you could have trouble

with economic growth. So you have to consider those two things.

So I thought it was important for us to launch and go visit many cities in the United States and around the world to see what their challenges are today and what are some of the best practices for us to think about, and Amy mentioned many of those. So that was kind of thing that drove us to do this.

And as we got into this, we realized, you know, there's a lot of common problems, but there's also a very uniqueness about each city and the issues we have to deal with. And so what we found is, I believe, because of globalization, the movement of information, the movement of goods, how it's changed over the last 10 years specifically is going to change how we view security in the future. So it must now incorporate security, not only what we do internationally with our military, but how does that connect back down through our federal, state, and local entities?

And I believe the point of the spear within our own country is our mayors. And how are they going to have to deal with these many problems they now have to deal with? Because of the speed of the way things happen today, because of the speed of information, because of the speed of the way things flow, you have to decentralize, in my opinion, responsibility and decisionmaking. So we have to start to think about how do we do this now as a nation? And I think part of that became clear as we walked through this study that we did.

MS. LIU: So in this journey, can you tell me maybe one of the most surprising findings for you?

GENERAL ODIERNO: Well, a couple things. First, I think, for me it was cities are different, but there's a lot of commonalities. And I think it really has to do with the amount of problems a city faces on a daily basis, whether it be from transnational crime, whether it be from organized crime, whether it be from terrorism, whether it be from natural disasters, whether it be from social unrest or social cohesion issues, they're similar, but they're different because of the environment that you're operating in, the environment that your city has. And so for me it was amazing to me the amount of problems that you have.

And now add to that what I consider to be asymmetric threats, such as cyber and other capabilities, that are now threatening our cities and our organizations of financial institutions, our infrastructure. All of these things really all come together at the city level. And so we have to start

thinking about how do we go to assist them in dealing with these plethora of problems that I think are only going to increase over the next several years.

So, for me, that's the biggest surprise that I found in the study that we did.

MS. LIU: That's really helpful. Mike, I would love for you to build on this point, which is that for a guy who spent, you know, most of your years focusing on defense and security policy, the first finding out of this report is community policing. It's this point about the mayors. Tell me why. Why that?

MR. O'HANLON: Thank you, Amy. And also, I want to just say quickly I know General Odierno and I are just so grateful to all the people here joining us today on the panel, all the people at Brookings and JPMorgan Chase who worked with us on this study. And it's really been a privilege.

And not only that, all the people around the country and the world who have shared their best practices with us because we are -- he actually did a lot of things, I just studied them from Brookings over my life. But we're both in sort of the defense sphere and we were trying to learn as much as tell anybody what to do. We were trying to collect best practices and a lot of the best practices that have been created actually by other people on this panel, as you well know. And so I look forward to hearing their thoughts, as well.

But let me just start with maybe a counterintuitive example, Detroit. And we had an amazing day in Detroit. I know you've worked with Detroit. There are some amazing things happening in a city that still remains very challenged with crime, but that has begun to create an inner city that is a lot safer, partly because of the work of Quicken Loans and other private corporate entities that have gotten together and essentially developed public-private partnership concepts that General Odierno has emphasized, as well. Where, for example, there are a lot more surveillance cameras and a lot more patrol officers. And most of them, or at least many of them, in this area are private employees, so they can't go out and do official arrests and they really can only use their weapons in self-defense, but they make a big difference in the community.

And the idea of public-private partnerships has spread to the point where now there is this sort of green-light concept where if you're a private business owner, you can buy your own surveillance camera, but then plug it into police databases and they can then surveil what's going on around your establishment. So, again, it's a public-private partnership.

It's not realistic for Detroit to come up with all those resources on its own immediately, but by working together with the private sector this was really one of the more innovative places in terms of a city that's still struggling, that still has huge challenges. And I think here, also, because I think we'll hear from our other panelists about New York and Medellín and New Orleans and other places that these folks know much better than I do, and there are a lot of good examples and lessons we learned there, as well, in all those places. But I think I would mention Detroit.

And let me just mention one other thing about Europe and European cities. We went to Paris and London. And I know we were both very struck by a lot of lessons we learned there. JPMorgan Chase colleagues convened some amazing roundtables. We heard from all different kinds of actors, public and private sector, in those cities.

And the first thing I would say just to set the context is that London and Paris are safe cities. Western Europe is, in many ways, the safest part of the planet, maybe certain parts of East Asia. However, we all know they are under extreme, acute threat right now from a number of concerns, including their social cohesion with many of their immigrant populations and the threat of terrorism. And so both these countries and many others are working their tails off to try to figure out to protect themselves.

But there are interesting differences between Paris and London, also. London, in some ways, and the UK in some ways, has it easier because they have a very simplified structure. They only have about 50 major police departments. They can work with their London Special Police and MI5 and MI6 in a very tightly knit, simplified organizational framework. And they also have some advantages in that even though they've obviously suffered serious attacks, they have criminal networks and terrorist networks that are, to some extent separate from different diasporas, if you will.

Whereas in Paris, in some parts of continental Europe, those groups converge and they're from similar parts of the world. They may know each other, which means terrorist groups can use criminal networks to move money, to move people, to move weapons. And so Paris, frankly, you know, probably is living even more on eggshells. Obviously, everyone is nervous about what comes next in the counterterrorism struggle as we make progress inside of Syria and Iraq, and maybe some of the fighters who had gone there return home. And I don't want to say anybody's well enough protected, but these

were some of the interesting differences that we saw in just three cities to take a couple of examples.

MS. LIU: I was going to say, and Mike was really modest. During the course of this project you all traveled to 12 cities across 4 continents, correct, in 12 months for this project because there are lots of stories.

I thought let me do one follow-up, and I think this is going to be theme that's going to permeate this conversation, which is one of the things that struck me about the Paris example or the French example is the need for -- there was a breakdown in coordination and a breakdown in resources that has to be addressed. Talk more about that because I think that's going to be something that's really imperative across all these communities.

MR. O'HANLON: Well, I'm going to be quick because what they really need to do is study what Fran Townsend and Bruce Riedel and few other people did, so I can just mention some names. What we did in the United States, we made a lot of mistakes in the United States over the years, but after 9-11 we did a number of things right, including creating the National Counterterrorism Center. And the one-stop shopping for sharing intelligence and for a place that ultimately is accountable for integrating databases and for watching this threat. And I think that's what France probably needs.

I'm just going to put one idea on the table. For the most part, we were a little reluctant and a little shy about fiving strong recommendations to anybody, so don't blame General Odierno for this. But if one thing sort of emerged for me looking at the example of France, they are working as hard as anybody and they have just as dedicated people as anybody from what limited experience I have. But they also have a bit of a mishmash bureaucratically, which is in some ways akin to how we looked before 9-11. And I think they need to take some of the steps that we've taken they perhaps haven't yet.

MS. LIU: So since you mentioned Fran, I'm going to go ahead and turn to her right now. And as you see in her bio, Fran was the advisor on homeland security and counterterrorism for President Bush, but has been working on this for many years.

Talk about then what you've learned about the proper way to organize these counterterrorism efforts at the federal, state, and local level, and across agencies. That's huge.

MS. TOWNSEND: So thank you, Amy. Let me start by thanking my friend Jamie Dimon and JPMorgan for supporting this initiative and Brookings. It's a pleasure to be back on a stage with

General Odierno, who I worked with when I was in public service.

You know, my career came full circle because I actually started working as a local D.A. in Brooklyn, New York, and so my perspective was of a local person as I rose through the ranks and found myself advising President Bush. And that's important because when we got to the National Counterterrorism Center, one of the biggest -- Mayor Landrieu will appreciate this -- one of the biggest struggles was as we set it up and got it running, our local partners wanted a representative in the National Counterterrorism Center because, by the way, most crime doesn't happen in the capital. Right? It happens in our local communities. And so rightly, our local communities wanted a representative in the National Counterterrorism Center and you would have thought I had suggested heresy because it became a fight.

Three-letter agencies said why do they need to be here? No, we'll send them what they need. Which is quite, I'm embarrassed to say, a typical, paternalistic sort of view of the relationship between the Feds and their local partners. We broke past that. There is a local representative in the National Counterterrorism Center because what you begin to appreciate, pre-9-11 there wasn't this natural and sort of fulsome transparency and sharing of information, the notion that classified information stays at the federal level and you trickle out what you believe your local partners need. And the answer is, if you're sitting in Washington or in a headquarters building, hard for you to really understand or anticipate what those local needs are.

And by the way, it needs to be what we learned painfully a two-way sharing of information because if you're only relying on information collected at a national level, that is set by national requirements in the intelligence and national security community, the answer is you're missing your greatest number of potential collectors. That is, your local policeman walking a beat on a corner in the community, who is most likely to have first contact. Think of the 9-11 hijackers in their communities.

If you're not getting their collection, if you're not sharing with them what the requirements are, and providing them with an easy mechanism to put information into a system, you're not collecting all the necessary dots. I sort of hate the analogy of connecting the dots, but your local community partners are the ones with greatest access and the greatest ability to connect dots. And then you're in a position to help make sense out of that information, and that's what the purpose really was of the National

Counterterrorism Center.

I should mention there's a number of other ways we do this with our state and local partners. The FBI has joint terrorism task forces. Post 9-11 we funded regional information-sharing risk centers, so that the states could compile their own information and also disseminate it to local partners.

We've accomplished much, but, I will tell you, one of the last things I did during the Bush administration, the president issued a national information sharing strategy. It sounds kind of odd, right, but the answer was without presidential leadership, involvement, and absolute insistence that it happened, it won't. Yes, technology can enable it, but people and culture still impedes it. And so if you really are -- you want meaningful information sharing in both directions with your local partners, it requires presidential leadership and commitment, and it has to be worked every single day was what I learned.

MS. LIU: Yeah. You know, I want to build on the local piece for a minute of the two-way street that you were just talking about. Right before this event we were talking about a report that was released yesterday. I don't know if you saw, but it was a bipartisan report about how the federal government should best tackle homegrown terrorism. And one of the findings was that what we need to do is embrace community-based solutions to really defeat radicalization, radicalization that we saw in San Bernardino, that we saw in Boston, saw in Orlando. And that the best remedies are often outside of the criminal justice system.

And so the critique was that in a lot of administrations these were considered like soft investments and not that necessary. But if we were going to really take that intelligence that you are gathering and really begin to build relationships or work in these communities, that there's all these community supports are really important.

What's your reaction to that finding or recommendation? And what does that look like to have the federal government partner with communities around these community-based solutions?

MS. TOWNSEND: So, you know, when I left the federal government in 2008, I made up my mind, having tried over the course of almost 25 years, the federal government is just not going to be very good at this, even in a post 9-11 world with the attention and resources. And so I came to the conclusion -- I started with former Senator Joe Lieberman and Ambassador Mark Wallace a nonprofit called the Counter Extremism Project. And the whole idea was for this nonprofit to work the grant system

with the federal government, to get that to community-based organizations in places like Detroit and New Orleans and around the country, where they could work most effectively in their communities on what really comes down to a cohesion issue, which the report identifies.

The government can't do this and the federal government in particular can't do it. And so we raised private money and we got grant money from the government and said you need to let go of it and let people who actually live in these communities and are closest to the issues address them most effectively.

We have an online campaign. We have a social media campaign. But the whole idea is to your point, Andrea, is what you need is local communities empowered and resourced to do it and they're unlikely to be able to fight that battle for federal dollars on their own without a nonprofit in between them trying to bridge that gap.

MS. LIU: Yep. And another argument for public-private partnerships, right, around these solutions. That's great.

And can I just one other thing is technology. We've talked a little bit about this and clearly cybersecurity is one issue, but, in general, technology is now being used as a tool for both the bad guys, but also for the good guys. And I guess what I want to understand is where are we in leveraging technology in this fight, particularly given the coordination we need between federal, state, and local?

MS. TOWNSEND: Yeah. So from my perspective in the counterterrorism fight, it was a blessing and curse. The blessing was if they use technology we could exploit it and we could understand their plans, their intentions, their members, and that was an exploitation and targeting tool. The problem is the speed that General Odierno, right, mentioned earlier. And getting in that loop fast enough to be able to action it was a real challenge.

In terms of the information sharing, we have leveraged technology, but there's much more that needs to be done. Look, the goal is that you ought to be able to leverage that technology all the way down to the patrol officer in his car. You've got to make this easy. He's got to be able to file a single report, not multiple times. He can't to hit multiple buttons. And there's got to be immediate feedback at the local department level. It can't just go into this black hole because then there's no incentive to bother sharing it, right? And so there's got to be real-time transparency. The technology's

there.

Again, this is an investment issue in terms of state, local, and federal investment in these sort of technologies. And then there's the cultural thing. The federal government has to view itself by and large here as a service provider and customer as opposed to kind of traditional relationship which is kind of the more dominant of the two partners.

GENERAL ODIERNO: Can I?

MS. LIU: Yes, please.

GENERAL ODIERNO: Just two points to this. So, in my opinion, the challenge we have in the future is we have too much information. So in other words, the amount of information you have now available is just incredibly -- I mean, the number of terabytes, megabytes, whatever you want to call it today, so it's how you sort the information. And that's going to become the challenge in the future is not only sharing the information, but how do you sort the information so, as Fran just said, you get it at the right time to make the right decision.

So for me, that -- and some people say, well, maybe we can use artificial intelligence or maybe there's other ways. You sort through this by big data computing. But we have to start thinking about how you do this so you get it to the patrolman.

In the Army, we tried to figure out how do we get it to soldier? And we've struggled with that. When he's out somewhere in the middle of nowhere, how do you get that information? It's the same problem we face in the cities. So we've got to figure out how we do that.

The second point, I think there's a whole other area here, especially when you get into the cyber realm because, frankly, we have not recognized yet -- we haven't had a discussion yet on laws and what we're allowed to do and what we're not allowed to do. We've had discussions, but we have to continue to have those because we have to decide how much do we want to limit ourselves and how much do we want to provide capability for us to use these technologies in order to help our law enforcement officials.

And I'm not falling on either side of this issue because it's very debatable in terms of privacy/how much information they have. But we have to deal with this because the world is changing in front of us and we at least have to have discussion, the legal discussion, about what we can and can't do

when it surrounds this area of information.

MS. LIU: So I'm going to turn to Ambassador Pinzón now. And one of the key pillars of the report is the importance of dealing with organized crime. And, you know, the ambassador, prior to his current post, was also defense minister for Colombia and was really at the -- spearheaded what has become one of the most important breakup of a drug cartel anywhere in the world, which played out particularly in what's called the "Medellín Miracle."

So I thought maybe you could tell this group the story about what you did at the national level working with local communities to really address the organized crime head-on.

MR. PINZÓN: Well, thank you so much. It's a great honor to be here. What a group of people, you know, I'm surrounded by today, so thank you for the opportunity. You're so kind.

And thank you for looking at Colombia as a case that can bring some lessons. We don't have solutions for everybody. We are still moving forward. We have advanced a lot, but there are many challenges ahead that we will need to tackle and certainly we're willing to learn from a report like this that is really looking for worldwide lessons learned.

In the case of Colombia, let me just clarify something that I believe is important. I was minister of defense, but we might be the last ministry of defense in the world that has internally or as part of the services the National Police. So that creates two interesting figures. One that we have a National Police and, second, that it is located inside the Ministry of Defense. The reason for that probably was the fact that for many years still we had threats that were combined between insurgency terrorism funded by a different type of crime and that, of course, needed and required that level of cohesion and somehow coordination.

One thing that I can tell you that as much as we were able to evade defeat, the (inaudible) organizations, and somehow we paved the way for peace negotiated process, more and more citizens in the country started to face the idea that securities involved their lives. And I think this is very important. Sometimes we strategize for a geopolitical vision, with a national vision, but we forget that security is an input for life quality for citizens. You know, citizens care about what happens to their lives.

It would be a gang that maybe is connected to a cartel and that cartel has a worldwide issue, but, at the end, what happens at that level? Or even if you're facing a terrorist threat or something

like, it's life of citizens what matters and that kind of approach. So you can create that sense of community and effort.

Some comments I will make now. First, I share very much the ideas that are coming out of the report. I'm very impressed with that. And I guess there's one that is, you know, included in a way, which is leadership. I can assure you in those cities that I was able to find real mayors that were willing to lead, the combination of all the efforts is not only policing, is not only justice, it's economic development, it's doing several things at the same time. And you cannot just do one or two, you have to try everything.

In the cities we were having those kind of leaders, the progress in security was very substantial and those cities, of course, are very famous: Medellín and Cali. Medellín and Cali, I'm speaking especially for the time I was there, we were able to reduce homicide numbers in Medellín by 60 percent and Cali by 50 percent, and it's still moving downwards.

Our capital city, Bogota, did have some issue on leadership on security. Last year, we had a new mayor and that mayor crafted a team dedicated to security and they are now implementing the same set of policies that we saw for the other cities. Consequence. Right now, Bogota has started to reduce, finally, all its crime rates in a very effective way.

All of the things that I believe are important, of course, having enough police is important. It is not a minor issue. You know, people require that, especially where a crisis or, you know, criminal activity is visible. Technology, of course, integrating that knowledge and those capabilities is very important.

There is an issue that becomes a challenge I guess for Colombia, but for other parts of the world: how to manage this on the justice and on the, you know, penitentiary system; how to handle this in an effective way. That's a challenge we have to the future.

Just to summarize, in Colombia, we have a lot of progress. You know, we have right now the lowest security indicators for the country in almost four decades. That's really the consequence of sacrifice of our police and military, efforts of the whole society to work forward, specific leadership in certain cities that have produced an effect.

But certainly, right now, the police asking the natural question of what comes next? And that what comes next, as I said before, is their own lives, the life of the citizens, what to do next with

them; how to secure them; how to provide them security so they can prosper.

You know, a head of a family, a mother that goes to work and is a working class mother, she's very worried about their kids staying at home and thinking that a gang might be around or that there might be a molester around. And what will happen when she gets at night if she's going to get assaulted or not? Those are the kind of questions that we're now facing.

The good news, we don't have any more discussion of natural security challenge, on, you know, how the country's failing to terrorist organizations or to those kind of threats, but it's now these kind of questions. And I find this report interesting because there are lessons from Colombia that we have used already and that we will need to pursue, but there are other ideas that should be now implemented to this next phase.

MS. LIU: I'm sure Mayor Landrieu's just chomping at the bit to come in here, but I'm going to ask you one question before I turn to the mayor because everyone's talking about you right now. (Laughter) But I want to come back to this issue of leadership.

And I actually want to ask Fran and others to comment on this because all of you have said, you know, at some level all of this work and the success of our efforts centers around local capacity and local communities. And yet, we all know not every mayor is the same, that not every community has that leader as you experienced, ambassador. So what do you do?

Because what we don't kneed at a national level is to have unevenness of security, holes, right? This is a national priority to have our homeland be safe. And if there's gaps, how do we fill that?

So talk about it from your Colombia experience and then I'd like to hear from others. And mayor, if you want to jump in, you can speak, too. (Laughter)

MR. PINZÓN: Well, in the case of Colombia's insecurities, it's a very important issue. I think having this national capacity of trying to be present in all the country is very important. So when we had a good leader, there's a partnership and you can work and, you know, you unify forces, you unify budgets, and suddenly, you can enhance whatever your objectives are. But in those places where you simply don't have either the capacity or the political will and leadership to do it, having a national option to intervene, to, you know, have a straightforward activity in protection of the citizens, which is to us our

main objective, makes sense and matters, and that's how we did it.

MS. TOWNSEND: So, I mean, I hesitate to jump in here before the mayor, but let me say this. What you realize -- and for me, the realization really came post Katrina, frankly. We worked with the Conference of Mayors and the National Governors Association. Every leader comes to those positions, by the way, from president on down -- this is not just a local issue -- with a different experience. And so if a mayor or a local sheriff or someone comes in that doesn't have the same background, doesn't understand kind of the emergency EMAC, right, the ability to share resources locally among governors and mayors to call on those resources, there has to be some sort of baseline of that.

And so, quite frankly, the Conference of Mayors, the National Governors Association would bring through newly elected officials for a series of meetings so that they understood kind of resources available to them. Because, quite frankly, while we're talking and, you know, my background is security, the mayors are dealing with police unions and teachers' unions and getting the garbage picked up and they've got a lot of things to do.

MS. LIU: Yeah. So I'm going to tee you up because I know you can share.

MR. LANDRIEU: Yeah, god forbid we elect someone for an important office that didn't have any experience.

MS. LIU: Well, first of all, Mayor Landrieu is the incoming chairman of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, so you can comment about the ability to bring all the mayors together around these topics. But since I had all these national security experts and terrorism experts now talk about cities, I actually want you as mayor talking about terrorism. And, you know, it's a flip. Isn't that interesting?

So tell me why you're at this panel? Why are you thinking about this?

MR. LANDRIEU: I have no idea why they invited me. (Laughter) Anyway, I'm thrilled to be you, with the general, who I have great admiration for, and for Fran. And I'm thrilled to meet the ambassador because I followed the work that they've done in Medellín. Michael, thank you for all of your thoughts.

I might frame this just a little bit in a different way. I wouldn't say why am I here thinking about terrorism? I would say why am I here thinking about security?

MS. LIU: Yeah.

MR. LANDRIEU: Because security is a broader definition, and it's not just resilience and economic security. If we just stayed in the public safety realm and thought about what do we have to do to make people feel secure, that will take us, in my opinion, in a better direction.

And it's very interesting that I'm sitting here because General Odierno earned his stripes a bunch of different ways, but he helped keep us safe by doing work in Iraq and Afghanistan. And I think that the generals in asymmetrical wars would come back and say to us we can't just win this with guns. If you want to secure America by securing the places overseas where we were, essentially you had to get into some form of reformation of the institutions that were over there. And we actually built with federal money through the Department of Defense sewer systems, schools, and police departments in other countries. It's fair? General, that's right, isn't it?

And one of the reasons we did that was because we thought that that was going to protect the homeland. That was kind of the whole point.

In Medellín, Colombia, for example, and they've done tremendous work and leadership was really important, but the United States of America also spent $3 billion hiring 50,000 police officers that were part of the national force that helps to secure the cities in that area to give them some breathing room to help move into the areas that they thought. And so the notion of spending money to support local police departments is not a notion that is kind of, you know, in the sky for us.

It only gets to be a difficult conversation when you bring it back to the homeland and say the federal government should support local police officers on the ground. That's when it gets to be in kind of a typical political fight about, well, one's federal, one's state, and one's local. And what governs local, governs best, and that's not really for us.

As a mayor I would say that that thinking is upside down based on the realities that we see today. And the general and this report support this notion. Here's the fact, that in the not too distant future, I think the number's 85 percent of people in the world, certainly in America, will be living in cities. And cities are getting bigger, not smaller. In other words, when you get into these issues of megacities and you think about China and Brazil and even in the United States of America, you have big cities that have lots of people in them. And if that's where all of the people are, then what essentially happens --

and you all know this to be true because you watch it on TV; you may not process it this way -- that cities are the point of impact.

You know, the state's kind of a point of impact, but the governor's 20,000 feet up. Cities are where things actually occur. So just let's think through a couple of real-life situations.

San Bernardino, that happened in a city. If you think about what happened in Boston, that happened in a city. If you think about what happened in New York, that happened in a city. In Orlando, that happened in a city.

And let me tell you who the first one there was. The first one there was the local PD. The second one there was local EMS. The third ones that were on the scene that they brought all the patients to was the local trauma center. And that's also true whether it's a terrorist attack. It's also true whether it's a Katrina-type event. It's also true every day when there's a public safety event. And so to the general's point, local law enforcement has, in fact, because of reality, become the tip of the spear in the fight against terrorism, natural and manmade disasters, and then against public safety.

So then if you ask the next question, well, how are they doing with that, the question is not just one of leadership, which is always important. If you don't have good leaders, you can just forget it because then money and strategy and execution doesn't matter because you can't get an idea to the ground quickly. But the issue of resources becomes really something very interesting to talk about. I call it operation full circle.

I guess the reason why the United States thought that it was important for us to invest in making sure that Medellín was safe along with their local leaders is because the drug cartels were pushing drugs in and around that eventually came, at least from my perspective, through the I-10 corridor and that in some form or faction it was going to get to the United States and then it was going to be dramatic. But what they didn't do was come back around to the domestic side and say, oh, by the way, we really want to make sure that all of the PDs around the I-10, all of the DEA, ATF, U.S. attorneys, FBI had everything that they needed.

As a matter of fact, if you actually don't try to answer the questions now, but just take it this is true, if you line up the number of deaths that we've had in all of these different spheres, how many soldiers have been killed in the battlefield since 2000, how many police officers have killed citizens, how

many citizens have killed police officers, and then you look at, well, how many American citizens have killed American citizens, right, and just basic public safety issues, and then you put that right next to where the funding increases have gone, it's an X.

In other words, the money that was spent on antiterrorism, national defense, all of the things that we've spent -- and, by the way, I think we ought to spend every penny and more -- it's going up like this. And the funding that we've given for local law enforcement and our federal law enforcement agents that were involved in the things that people are most at risk of, has gone down exponentially this way. And I think that there needs to be a rebalancing because the real dangers, putting aside what people mostly fear, the real actual dangers are not consistent with the funding and the organizational models that we have.

Now, the resources are critically important, but I want to go back to what Fran said because I was a state representative for 16 years. I was responsible for putting budgets together, as well, and the budgets were really designed to kind of bring people together, not separate them, not say what's good for half of the country or the state and vice versa. So you have to have budgets that do that. But as lieutenant governor, which I served as for six years, I actually sat at the homeland security table. So for Katrina, Rita, Ike, Gustav, national recession, BP oil spill, we were there.

And I think it's been true, and I think that you guys will confirm this, that when there's a major event, the thing that helps security the most is clear command and control; clear coordination horizontally and vertically between the federal, state, and local officials, and the ability to speak to each other and see the same things; interoperability. And where those three things do not exist, when there's an emergency of some sort, whatever the genesis is, you're going to have a catastrophic response.

Now, post 9-11, when Governor Kuehn and Congressman Hamilton did their report, they said the response was pretty good, but there were some issues, and they listed those three things. Not surprisingly, shortly thereafter, four years after, when Katrina hit, those things really did not exist very well. And then I'm not sure we really learned the lesson from Isaac, although we're getting a lot better.

And on the security front, the fusion centers that Homeland Security thinks -- they're not really talking to each other as much as they should now. So as the mayor of the city of New Orleans, what I'm saying to the country is this is what I'm seeing on the ground, and this is what looks like it works

and this is what looks like it doesn't. And I would say there are no more lines on security between what's local, state, and federal.

I don't think anybody in here would argue after Orlando that that wasn't a national crisis. And if it is a national crisis, then it becomes a federal responsibility, not solely, but the federal government's got to show up when it's supposed to, the state does, the local governments do. It's got to be rightly ordered, rightly centered. And you have to have the right number of boots on the ground. And I don't think that anybody would disagree with me that if you don't have enough police officers on the ground who are well hired, well trained, and are thinking, as the ambassador said, into the notion of community policing, where the community trusts you and thinks that you're there to help them rather than to hurt them, you're going to really kind of just take away your ability to respond to whatever might come your way.

And I'll end with this. What's coming our way is a lot all at the same time and it's coming fast. The pitches are harder, the pitches are faster, they're very different, and we have to be ready to respond to all of that stuff. And I'm not so sure the nation is having the kind of discussion that we need to have right now.

So, for example, the budget that the president released today is kind of an either/or budget. Choose between more defense spending or domestic spending. I guess Congress is going to talk about that, but from our perspective that kind of either/or, as opposed to both/and, from a security perspective is not something that makes me feel comfortable about our ability and capacity to have the resources to actually protect the citizens from the things that, number one, they're afraid of, whether they should be or not, and what their actual threats are. And I think we have to have a more robust kind of thoughtful conversation about that going forward.

MR. PINZÓN: I will have to intervene a little bit because I have to make some comments. First, I agree very much on some of your final questions, but I'm doing here in front of all these people an invitation to go to Colombia.

MR. LANDRIEU: I would love to go.

MR. PINZÓN: You've got to get a little bit of information, a little bit more specific. And let me share with you some ideas because I believe it's important.

The reason why all these efforts of support of the United States has happened in Colombia. It's not just because the drugs comes to the United States. It's because consumption happens and money and weapons come back there. So this is a system that needs to be, you know, caught in different places. And this is an important clarification.

And second, the money that we have kept has been only 5 percent of the total budget. So it's Colombian taxpayers, by the way, through the use of a wealth tax and other taxes, that really funded all these efforts to recover security. The use came in a very effective way to enable our institutions. So instead of paying for police, you know, actually we have increased more than 200,000 people in 10 years all our manpower to protect our cities and our citizens. But, in essence, what the U.S. did very well was to help us with technology, intelligence, and those assets that create a difference.

I believe it's important just to mention that because the case is a very interesting one and I think it can be replied, but just with the promise of getting you Medellín.

MR. LANDRIEU: First of all, let me respond to the ambassador. First of all, 100 percent of what he said I know is true, and I agree with him. I'm really making the point on the domestic side in the United States. When mayors go and they say -- and the federal government says we don't fund crime-fighting activities in cities in America, I say, well, we actually do it across the world. And it's important that we do it across the world and we should continue, even if we play a very small part, but you also should do the same thing on the homeland in a way that makes sense, that provides us resources.

And by the way, on the Medellín -- and I will accept your invitation to come, thank you.

MR. PINZÓN: You're coming. You're coming. You're coming. (Laughter)

MR. LANDRIEU: One of the things that they talked about after they talked about security and police was social cohesion and how you rebuild neighborhoods and how you make sure neighborhoods feel safe. Critically important in the American cities, as well, and there's lessons to be learned from there.

MS. LIU: So we're going to come back and talk about the budget and talk about the resources, but I want to come back to one other issue before we do that with the mayor, which is Fran said, you know, the federal government's just not really good at community-based solutions and that's

really the province of local leaders, the nonprofits and others. And when we talk about community-based solutions it's something that you just, mayor, do inherently really well in New Orleans, which is also part of the report's findings.

We need to emphasize prevention, preventing that person or preventing the risk, creating economic security, and social cohesion on the prevention side. But on the other end, right, reentry, whether it's from a Homeland Security detention center or from one of our own prisons, is that how we reenter citizens into our community in a way that's successful is also important.

And those two issues seem to be very local. Tell me what you think about that and what you've done.

MR. LANDRIEU: First of all, I think Fran is right. What she intended to communicate was people in the federal government that live in Washington are not good at thinking about what happens on the ground in, for example, New Orleans; Albuquerque, New Mexico; or Boone, Iowa; and from up here. But here is the fact, and the federal government's really good at this. The people that work for the federal government actually live in our cities, too. (Laughter) No, and in a very meaningful way. Members of the U.S. Marshals, the DEA, the ATF, the FBI, they're federal, but they live in the city, so they're local. And they really know, in partnership with the local police department, others ways how to do this.

What they don't have, and this is just a fact, when September 11th hit we were, as we should have been, in a really difficult space. That was an attack on the United States of America. We created the Department of Homeland Security out of whole cloth very quickly. We hired 60,000 TSA agents really quickly. And that department has now plussed-up pretty substantially since then for the purpose of protecting the homeland.

Well, the consequence, the money that went there had to come from someplace else because that's what governments do in budgets. And in certain instances, the FBI, for example, started to kind of take counterterrorism as their number one priority and public safety and public corruption kind of fell down. And when that happened, the resources in all of those different departments that funneled down to the ground for those federal employees, who partnered with us on things like community policing, has gotten less rather than more.

And, you know, when you think about what that actually means in real time, it mean that you have fewer people with boots on the grounds that have to do things like respond to violent crime, and in some of our cities we have robust violent crime. And then, at the same time, building community trust back.

And so I would just say the things that have worked in New Orleans -- so we're somewhat of a miracle, too, since Katrina, I mean, it really is one of the great success stories of the country. What has worked every day, whether it's education, healthcare, or public safety, the model that has worked is a really great partnership between the federal, state, and local authorities with vertical and horizontal integration, and a partnership with the private sector through faith-based communities, not-for-profits, so that on the ground people know each other, they can see each other, they can hear each other. And there's something that the ambassador talked about called social cohesion, where everybody's on the same fight, fighting the bad guys.

Let me tell what you doesn't work. Racial profiling doesn't work. Separating communities by race doesn't work. Separating communities by religion and ethnicity doesn't work. Or this notion of something's federal and something's local, and we're kind of different, you handle your business, I'll handle by business. That doesn't work.

The other part of it is the thing that's helped the city stand back up and we think that we have a lot to learn from other places because we have a long way to go. But that's what's working in the city.

MS. LIU: Great. So be prepared to ask questions. I'm going to be turning over to you in just a moment.

So the last question is about the news of the day, which is the president released his budget today. And for the purpose of this conversation, you know, the winners were defense and Homeland Security with about $120 billion worth of cuts across the other domestic agencies, including labor, housing, and economic development. So I want to ask each one of you, how do you rate that budget against the themes and findings of this report?

Who wants to go first? (Laughter)

MR. PINZÓN: Let me start, being the foreigner. (Laughter) So you can then, you know -

- because this is a local debate and I will just mention some realities.

One, budgets everywhere are a big challenge because it's about prioritizing. And how to prioritize is always a big, complex problem because there are never enough resources. So that's one observation.

The second one, coming from the security world that I was in, I think it's always good to enhance your capabilities. But as we describe and I think the mayor did very well, security, and General Odierno expressed that very well, is a lot more things, you know, a lot of combined and integrated efforts.

Now, from a country like Colombia that has been partnering with the United States, not only now being a recipient of aid, but for many years now promoting stability and security in Central America, the Caribbean, and training others -- 60 countries -- in different times of the year on security first, I believe that, you know, it's important that the investment that the mayor described that help us to pave the way to peace can be sustained in the efforts that we're trying now to make peace permanent and sustainable. If we can do that, that's going to be a geopolitical success for the United States, for Colombia, and for democracies, you know, in a way that we can continue to be this model of democracy, you know, progress, reduction of poverty, and moving forward.

So I think that's a comment just to, you know, highlight a bit on what is from my angle on budget.

MS. LIU: I think Mike?

MR. O'HANLON: I'll defer to my esteemed co-author.

GENERAL ODIERNO: So I want to go back to sort of what the mayor said. We can't make this an either/or argument. So having just not too long ago stopped being the head of the Army, I will tell you for the amount of things that the military's being asked to do they're underfunded. They can't sustain what they're doing. And so I think this is a recognition that if they get -- you ask them to do the things they're doing, they need some sort of increase in spending.

That said, the problem we have is we need to maybe look at our budget differently. In other words, what I believe we need to start thinking about and what I'm trying to emphasize in this report and the op-ed we wrote the other day is when we think about security, we need to think about it as, first, we have to worry about our foreign security, our military, the things they do. They've got to be funded

properly. They've got have the best equipment. We have to have enough people.

And then we should look at, then how are we then supporting security. It's not separated. It's a continuum of security that we now need, starting there and going all the way down to our cities. And we should look as a whole is how we're funding the continuum of that security.

Because the way it's done now is you have some are funded with labor, some are funded at Homeland Security, some are funded in economic aid, some of -- let's look at it from a security perspective and how are we funding this from a security perspective. And make sure we're focusing on the things we need to secure our cities and what is the federal government doing to enable our cities.

And I think one of the important points the ambassador made was this idea that enabled them. So what are doing from the federal level to enable the cities to do their jobs? And so that's the way to look at this.

And I think we have to look at it differently, and I think that's the point I'm trying to make here is that we now have to start looking at this problem differently than we had before. Plus, I don't know the details. I mean, I know the headlines. You'd have to dig deep into the budget to see really where the cuts are happening, where are they not happening. And, you know, I haven't had a chance to look at it and I probably won't because I'm tired of doing that kind of work. (Laughter) I'll read somebody else's analysis. But I think we have to look at this differently, and that's what I would ask us to do as we review this budget.

MS. LIU: Mike?

MR. O'HANLON: What he said. (Laughter) I'll defer to the mayor.

MR. LANDRIEU: Well, first of all, I think the general's right. I think if you can just think about security as a circle, the whole circle's got to be a secure and there's got to be a continuum from one. If there's a hole in the circle, then there is a way for somebody who wants to hurt you to get in. And I think that for just forever in this country we've always talked about a them versus us or an either/or, not a both/and.

Now, let me say this. Government, its tendency is to grow. And its natural inclination is to become inefficient and for stovepipes to go up, so every day, all day. Not like you're on a diet, but you're changing your lifestyle. There always has to be pressure for government to get more efficient,

more effective, and to target the resources for where the problem is.

So, for example, in the Department of Defense, President Trump has said himself, took off after the cost of the F-35 program. So everybody kind of agrees that even though we want to buy an F-35, maybe there's a better way to do it.

Senator Graham and Senator McCain have all spoken about ways to get into DOD procurement. So you're not weak on defense. If you say, look, there's a better way for the military to spend their money and you could create a lot of savings that way, and it's not inconsistent with what General Odierno said. If we're going to give them more to do, they need more money. That's okay. You can figure that out.

That's a different thing from saying, oh, and as a consequence, now we're going to cut the other half of the circle off so that when you come back home side there's no security. For example, we could get into an argument here, and we don't need to, but I think a lot of people that are strong on defense would say one of the things you should never do is cut the State Department because diplomacy really matters in keeping us secure.

But, you know, incidentally, that's always for some reason an overseas discussion. And it's never about, when you come back full circle, how you create that impenetrable circle of security that goes all the way, ground to the bottom. And Washington's not really used to having that kind of discussion. So I just want to just reiterate it would almost be -- you know, I don't want to put you in a position, General, but if we took the generals, all of the generals, and say, why don't you guys construct a security budget for the country, I think that they would come up with a more robust, richer, more thoughtful continuum of security than maybe the elected officials would in the country. And it's just a very interesting discussion.

All I can tell you as a lieutenant governor, when they asked what I was, I said I was an Indian scout. They said what do you mean? I said I ran out to other places and found out what they did best, tried to see what kind of harm was coming our way, came back home to tell everybody what was going to happen, and tried to get us ready.

I'm just telling you as a mayor, every mayor in the world is going to tell you what I'm telling you, is it's the security threats, that point of impact in cities where people live. And that law

enforcement are the tip of the spear and we do not have the resources or the technology in total to do what it is that we're being asked to do. And if you want us to help secure the country, you have to stop looking at it as a federal, state, and local issue and look at it as a national issue of federal concern that is rightly ordered, where all have responsibility and then we all have opportunity to keep the streets safe.

MS. TOWNSEND: So, I mean, General Odierno called it a continuum. The mayor called it a circle. I'll offer you the third. I think it's a fabric, right? And if you think of what is a fabric, it's a weave. Right? And you pull a string and you weaken, you fundamentally weaken if you pull one string, the integrity of the entire cloth. And so I think we use differently analogies, we're saying the same thing.

Look, in terms of what we've seen in the release today, like General Odierno, I'm out of that business, happily out of that business now, so I don't know the details of it. I would say to folks who don't like what they've heard, this is the budget blueprint. This is not -- in a typical budget year, you would get a budget. You would get a full-baked budget. You're not going to get that till May.

So what you've fundamentally gotten is the outline to a book that's coming. You know what the chapters are, you may or may not like them. The debate is just about starting today, including with Republicans and Democrats with the administration, and that's going to continue.

You know, people talk about the foreign aid budget and the State Department. Just to benchmark that, foreign aid is 1 percent of the discretionary budget. It is a very small fraction. And I will tell you from my work with the Pentagon and my military colleagues, they have viewed that time immemorial as an investment. It is an investment for good will.

The question is can we spend it better? And that's exactly what the mayor is saying. There are lots of those programs, some we can debate whether or not they should be cut as severely, some of them are obsolete. And, you know, it's very easy in Washington to create a program. It is near impossible to kill one. And so I have to say it takes a good deal of courage to say I am about to kill the following dozen programs because they are no longer effective. I'm not saying that's right or wrong, but I'm saying to the mayor's point we need to do that because of budget constraints, so we can spend more wisely where we're going to have more impact.

MR. LANDRIEU: Right, I agree.

MS. LIU: Great. Now it's your turn. Please raise your hand if you have questions and

identify yourself when you ask them.

MR. LANDRIEU: You're the expert on that.

MS. LIU: go ahead. Why don't we take these two gentlemen right here and go back? Why don't you both ask your questions and we'll try to address them at the same?

MR. BRUNNER: So I'm Jordan Brunner. I'm a national security intern here at Brookings. I work at Lawfare, which is a national security law blog. And so I'm wondering, you've talked a lot about, you know, community policing and sort of, you know, public safety and things like that. I'm wondering about climate change because, you know, the military has said this is a threat multiplier. You know, it's going to make a lot of situations worse. I'm wondering how the report sort of addresses that. I haven't read it yet.

And then, also, you know, with the administration now kind of -- General Mattis has said, you know, climate change is a national security threat. Other members of the administration say it's not real. How do you think that that's going to affect things down the line?

GENERAL ODIERNO: Well, if I could just start, if you don't mind. So with climate change, I would just say that's what's driving people into the cities in many case is climate change; lack of water, other things that are driving them into areas around the world. So it's definitely having an impact and we have to think about it as we go to the future. You know, we always worry about the change in the Arctic and other places like that and the effects that could have. So climate change is going to play an important role.

Natural disasters and how we respond to those, they seem to have an effect on that, as well, in terms of Mother Nature and what's going on now. So it's absolutely something that, again, we believe the mayors have to deal with is climate change. It's going to change the dynamics of where we live and how we live and the problem we face.

MS. LIU: Okay, we'll take your question.

MR. ENACHE: Thank you. Urban planner Enache, International Urban Alliance. It's a fascinating report, a fascinating panel. I have a concern with the transfer of best practices and success stories and things like this, and not only related to security, but, you know, other -- you know, Bloomberg Network of Cities, the Rockefeller Foundation, et cetera. The problem I see is that if there are

differences, structural differences between cities.

For example, you explained security in terms of a different set or slightly different set of indicators, then the probability of a successful transfer of best practice drops quite a bit, certainly in my experience. One good example is Paris versus London where they have a clear difference in governance and you can see what happens. Thank you.

MS. LIU: Why don't you --

MR. LANDRIEU: Let me hit on that for a second. First of all, what has occurred to mayors around the world is that we're in the business of getting things done, more so than at any other time. And I was with the mayor of Paris the other day in Chicago with Mayor Emmanuel, we talked about the impact of water on cities. So that talked about climate change, but it also talked about how you develop around water and all of those separate issues.

One of the things that's different today than was different, let's say, 10 years ago is you have Bloomberg, for example, that's creating a platform for mayors from around the country and mayors around the world to meet; Rockefeller, with 100 resilient cities have done that. There's the global meeting of mayors. I think it's going to take place in Montreal in a couple of weeks. So mayors are doing a better job of meeting each other, talking to each other, and beginning to share experiences.

In those conversations, we pick up pretty quickly, for example, the differences between London and Paris because the mayors are there. So Sadiq Khan would say, well, this is the way I do it in London and Mayor Hidalgo would say this is the way I do it in Paris. And then we adapt ourselves to what our structures and systems in government are.

One of the things that we're finding, and I'm really not just trying to be basic here, we're finding out that you pick up the garbage the same way in New Orleans as you do in Paris. As a matter of fact, in some instances, we use the same trucks. (Laughter)

And go to what the general told you before. If you think about all the things the mayors have to do every day, we don't just have to secure the city. We have to make sure the water's running. We have to make sure it's safe. We have to make sure the recreation centers are up. We've got a lot of stuff to do.

And we're beginning to find each other and talk to each other in clearer ways, and then

creating the models for things that work in the cities. So as Mr. Ambassador said, the mayor of Medellín and the mayor of Cali have been to a number of different events. And people are very intrigued by the work that they have done on public safety and are asking the mayors to put together what we call toolkits that we can actually pull off of the shelves.

Now, not every city is in the same place. There are some cities that are not really -- they don't feel like they're under the same kind of security threats. They're working on entrepreneurship. They're working on innovation. They're working on autonomous vehicles. They're working on technology. It's where everything really kind of in the world is happening.

And so for the first time in a long time we're seeing each other better. But I think that what's going to have to happen, and Amy and I talked about this earlier, is all of us are going to have to think about ways for mayors and cities to meet more, to see each other, to connect governors with mayors, CEOs with mayors, and world experts.

It's a little bit more challenging because there are a lot of us. If you're coming just to interact with Washington, D.C., and you want to interact with Congress, you got 535 people, you kind of know how many cabinet secretaries there, if you can penetrate the White House, whoever the president is, you know, that's kind of the complex up here. When you start working with cities, you're dealing with thousands and thousands and thousands of different organizations which may not be on the same page, and it's a little bit more complicated for the people that are trying to engage with us.

MS. LIU: That young man there had his hand up.

MR. GRIFFIN: My name's James Griffin. I have a general question for the panel, but I think that General Odierno and our defense analysts might think it's more interesting. What are some -- from what I've read of ONA reports and from the Modern War Institute, it seems that securing megacities is somewhat problematic. Could you guys say or talk about some of the problems with it, pertaining to it?

GENERAL ODIERNO: Sure. I mean, yeah, the issue with megacities is, first, how do you move around a city where you have millions of people within a one-mile square mile or five city blocks? How you're able to move emergency services, how you're able to police, how you're able to get inside of these areas, that's one of the things.

The second problem is how do you bring economic development and jobs into these

areas where you have a million people packed in very small areas? So these tend to be more overseas right now, but I see this potentially coming back to the United States in the future, as well.

So what the cities -- it puts so many people in a small area, it's complex. If you have a vertical city -- so happens if your city grows and it grows vertically? How are you able to secure vertically your city when you have a problem? Say you have a city that now expands horizontally. There's whole different challenges of how do you secure that and what are the capabilities that you need, the way you move? How do you communicate, how do you coordinate, how do you collaborate across this wide broad area as it grows?

So those are the thing that I worry about. Do we even have the right systems to work inside of these cities where you have so many people? You have to come up with new ways to communicate.

So for me, those are some of the things that we know are going to be challenging. But there are other challenges besides just the hard security issues. It's also providing services, providing infrastructure. See infrastructure will become overwhelmed.

We were talking earlier, how do you pump water up to the high floors, you know? I mean, how do you have enough water in these buildings to get -- you know, there's all kinds of problems that will add to security issues and unrest inside of these communities.

MS. LIU: This gentleman here. Yeah.

MR. GAGLIANO: Lou Gagliano. Clearly, the signal in the United States is that many of the programs that would add to solutions here are not going to be funded at the federal level. So the question becomes, and if you look at the history of where solutions are coming from, they're coming from local collaborations between the private and public sector in everything from case management of people to find employable jobs. So how do we promote that here in the United States more actively?

GENERAL ODIERNO: What I would say is we have some good examples of the private-public partnerships that are going on. And I think that the fact that our private industry is benefiting from what they are getting inside of these cities, it's important they buy back and pay back in order for them to continue to do that. So I think we have to come up with new ways. It shouldn't be just higher taxes. I mean, I think there are others way they can contribute, and we gave some examples.

They can contribute by helping in economic development activities. They can maybe help with educational opportunities. They can help with maybe supplementing security. And I think those are the kind of things we have to think about, and we should hold them responsible.

I've seen a lot of the COs that really grab onto this and I think they want to. I think we have to pushed them, and I'm sure the mayor has a thought on this.

MR. LANDRIEU: I would just say, going back to my original theory about government as a whole. In my city, when I took it over, there really was nothing there because Katrina had destroyed everything. And when we got into the actual mechanism of the government, what the org structure looked like, and, as Fran said earlier, all these things that existed that may have been obsolete.

My observation was that you had to really -- before you asked anybody for any more money, you had to prove to people, number one, that the government was honest, that it was competent, and that you actually took a really hard look, an X-ray of everything in the government and ask yourself whether that was related to what the vision was going forward. And of course, we found that there were really like obsolete things.

For example, one obscure thing was that there was a government regulation that there be a guy who oversaw the boiler systems in the buildings. Well, there were no more boiler systems in some of the buildings, so that was obviously obsolete, but it had never been taken off the books. And so we basically when through the government with a fine-toothed comb. We renegotiated every contract, actually cut my budget by 22 percent.

Now, I want you all to think about that. Nobody in Washington's ever even said that number. You all talk about slowing the growth, 22 percent in 6 months. So I have a hard time listening to people talk about how we need to cut. We cut our arms off and our legs off, but we did it with a scalpel. We didn't do it with a bludgeon because, at some point in time, even in difficult circumstances, you find yourself having to cut things that are essential. But if you cut them the wrong way it can never grow back when the economy grows back. So we cut, we reorganized, we invested the savings in the things that mattered, and then and only then did we say, well, okay what parts do we really need now?

Having said that, we realized at some point in time that the federal government is not going to be there all the time and mayors have really started to think about how they're going to do it

without them. And really the greatest innovations that have taken place in the country right now are taking place in cities.

Now, that is not to say that we don't want our partners to show up. We desperately want them there and we want them rightly ordered in the right place, and we don't want to overburden them and we're better with them. But mayors right now are not waiting.

In our lexicon we either find a way or we make one because we have to. And I'm going to tell you why we have to. It's not theoretical and we don't get to wait till the next election. When we go to the grocery in the morning or when we're standing in the carpool line with our kids or we're getting laundry, you're getting an earful from Ms. Agnes because she's got an issue. (Laughter) And so we're operating in real-time with real people, which is why mayors tend to talk a little bit faster and walk a little bit quicker, you know. (Laughter)

MR. PINZÓN: You have to.

MR. LANDRIEU: No, because you have to. (Laughter)

MR. PINZÓN: Yeah, yeah, you have to.

MS. TOWNSEND: Can I give a couple just quick examples?

MS. LIU: Yeah.

MS. TOWNSEND: So I sound like a paid advertisement for JPMorgan, but in New York City, the New York City Police Department needed an infusion of technology, laptops, and JPMorgan, who has a large presence in New York City, saw it not only in their interest, but in the community's interest to provide those resources to the tune of over a million dollars. I mean, it was substantial. They did it quietly. They did it because it was needed and they were just good partners to the New York City Police Department.

Florida does a tax holiday. So you talk about the public-private partnership where there's no state tax if you're buying hurricane supplies, right. And so there are more hurricane supplies during the tax holiday and more people are prepared to reduce the burden on public service in the event of a hurricane.

And then there was the Wall Street initiative, the third one I'd use, which was post 9-11 the stock exchange reopened quite quickly, but there was no question that the attack was an attack on

our economy. The businesses down there understood that they had to provide physical security. And so in partnership with the city and the police department, funded the Wall Street area initiative for physical security.

So these are just three, but they're all examples of the private sector saying it is in our interest for our local partners to be successful. We don't need to wait for the federal government. We're just going to do it.

MS. LIU: I'm going to take some questions from the back. Let me -- that female, yeah.

MS. MORALES: Hi, everyone. My name is Nicole Morales and I'm an emergency management consultant with Hagerty Consulting. I'm also a native New Orleanian, so I'm quite proud to have our city on display as a national model.

And my question is sort of detail on Ms. Agnes there a bit. We've discussed the role of the public sector and certainly the role of the private sector. But those cities and all of that is so dependent upon the trust and participation and engagement of the Ms. Agneses of the world. So my question for the panel is what guidance, what input, what message would you want Ms. Agnes to know about these issues, who may not understand the homeland security architecture that we've just discussed?

MR. LANDRIEU: She understands whether she feels safe or not. And Ms. Agnes will get the face of the police chief really quick, which happened the other day. So I had a community meeting the other day with 400 people in the neighborhood in Algiers on the West Bank, where people were really concerned because they were a number of different shootings; a Domino's pizza gentleman was killed. And they show up and they know when they feel unsafe.

And it's really interesting to be in meetings because, Fran, you've been at this post Katrina where the public, like this room, doesn't like or trust anybody up here. That's one kind of meeting. You've kind of seen them in the congressional breaks where people are angry and they're frustrated. You saw it four years ago.

And then there's another kind of meeting where everybody's sitting here and we're just having a nice talk with each other because we trust and like each other. And it's really strange because you can be the same human being, me, and be in two of those meetings almost in the same week.

And Ms. Agnes is comfortable when, let's say, she knows who the head of the precinct is in the neighborhood that she lives in and that she can call him when she needs him, whether it's anything.

And the FBI even, when they're helping us -- for example, we have some pretty major events. We just had the NBA All-Star Game. It was a Level 2 event. So the FBI and the DEA and the ATF are all there and we all have a press conference. The DEA says to the public, look, we're on your side. We're your friend. But here's the thing, we can't work without you, so if you see something, say something.

So this should be familiar to you because the message now down on the ground is the way to fight potential terrorist threats that we practiced for, in major events: somebody puts a bag on the parade route, somebody puts something in Jackson Square, somebody puts something in Café du Monde. You've been there before, right? And those things go off at one time. How are we going to react?

We're always telling the public if you see something, say something, but here's the thing. It gets into a bunch of other issues. If they don't trust us and they don't know us, they're not going to call us and they're not going to engage with us. And that cohesion that the general talks about, if it's not there, then the community's at risk.

So back to the initial issue about funding, if we don't fund things and actually create that environment, then we're going to leave a piece of the circle unsecure and then we're going to have challenges not only seeing what's about to happen, but responding to what we know is going to happen.

GENERAL ODIERNO: If I could just add, and the mayor mentioned it, but I want to emphasize it, is it's not just being there when it's easy to be there. People like it when you're there during -- they like it when you're there when they're yelling at you because they know you're going to show up. And that pays dividends over time. So it's about us responding. And I can't tell you how many places I've been where I stood there and I just got lambasted by people for things, but they appreciate it. and when you came back the next time, they appreciated you more because you were willing to sit there and listen to what they had to say. And when you do that, they know you care. So that's first.

And second point I would just make is the idea of these lone wolf attacks. What I tell the public it's now all of our responsibilities to point out changes. Every one of the attacks that have occurred

could have been stopped if certain people had spoken up when they saw changes in personality, changes in how people are acting, changes in behavior. And so the message I tell everyone is -- and they've got to have trust -- is you have to -- it's incumbent on everyone in today's world to report something when it's not quite what they suspect it to be. That's what we need, in my opinion, that's what we need from the people, as well.

MR. PINZÓN: A small comment. An experience we had in Colombia that, you know, was an idea that was put together by my team actually. And they plan a national tour to every city most valid or most affected neighborhood with certain kinds of crime. In some places, most of the places, it was extortion or gangs. And we invited 500 people to a room like this. We asked all the community leaders to talk. We spend four or five hours. When I said "we," it was me, the chief of national police, but the mayor of the city, of course, running his town and his city, and, of course, the presence of the attorney general's office, every agency that had anything to do with a security problem.

So it was very interesting because the community brought issues from your police is not working -- the guy might be corrupt; the guy doesn't care; he's not taking our calls -- to issues like we didn't have lights during the night or we don't have a park in -- security in central park of the neighborhood. And those kind of issues came along and, you know, they allow us, first of all, to listen to the people. And I think that's a strong recommendation I will do.

And again, where we had strong leaders as mayors, they delivered immediately. Where we didn't, at least people saw we listened to them and then we can come back and measure what was going on.

MS. LIU: So I'm just going to say this gentleman has been waiting for a long time to ask his question, so can you make it quick and then we're going to wrap up. Right here.

MR. KRAVITZ: Thank you very much. A fascinating panel. Alexander Kravitz from Insight. You made a comment, Mayor, about the picking up the trash with the same trucks as Paris and, you know, these international meetings. And it made me think of something and it might betray my ignorance here, but is there such a thing as a sort of cities competitiveness report, you know, kind of akin to the, you know, the world competitiveness report, that would sort of rank cities on trash collecting, security, something that could give, you know, sort of a framework to these international meetings that

happen that you mentioned that are coming up?

And if there isn't such a thing, is that something that perhaps the Global Cities Initiative could think of, you know, picking up for later? Thank you.

MR. LANDRIEU: If there were a thing like an international Brookings, they would do that. So, for example, Brookings and other organizations kind of learn how to see what we're doing and count what we're doing on economic development and input. A lot of these organizations are beginning to do that themselves. I don't know if Bloomberg's got a report card on cities, but they would be the most likely or, for example, Rockefeller with 100 Resilient Cities initiatives, they're actually measuring whether or not what we think we're doing is actually consistent with what we're doing.

But my sense is the more that we get in spaces where we're going to see each other, people will measure us. Because mayors are very competitive in a really good way and we want to be better than whoever the mayor of, you know, another city is. And so we would be very interested in something like that.

MS. LIU: Could I just say real quick on this piece, if you look inside the report there's a reference to a Global Cities Index. And last year we actually created that typology of global cities that responds to some of the questions that you mentioned.

And I think this goes back to you point that not every single city is the same. And rather than just rank people on particular indicators, we basically looked at, you know, I forget, over 150 international cities and basically said each of these cities, large and small, play a function in the global economy and they have a distinct function in the global economy. And because of that function, their needs to stay globally competitive and still globally engaged are different. So it allows you to see the peer groups and lessons you can draw because of that. So that's in the report. It's also in the Global Cities Initiative.

GENERAL ODIERNO: Could I --

MS. LIU: Yep.

GENERAL ODIERNO: I should have said this in the beginning. This report or whitepaper is a quick look. It is no way an in-depth study of these cities and the issues they follow. The intent of this was to start and identify issues and some practices so we can begin the discussion because

we think it's so important about what we're doing inside of our cities.

And so I see this as a beginning, frankly. This is supposed to stimulate thought, stimulate discussion, stimulate things that have to be done on the way ahead, and kind of resonate on the importance of securing our cities and the challenges they face in this dynamic world that we're living in.

So I don't want anybody to think that we have -- this was a quick look. We went to so many cities over a year, but really this is to really stimulate thought and to stimulate, hopefully, leaders in our own government to start thinking about these issues. And I think that was the intent.

MS. LIU: That's a great, great summary. And I want to thank our friends at JPMorgan Chase for really supporting Brookings and all of our partners in really not only looking at the powerful role of cities across the global economy and their competitiveness, but also increasingly the linkages with economic security, which we explored today. So thank you, JPMorgan Chase.

The report, which is, again, authored by General Odierno and Michael O'Hanlon is in the back if you don't have it. It represents their independent ideas in this report gathered from all of their travels. I think you should take a look at it.

And please thank this audience and this panel for a great discussion today. We learned a lot. Thank you and have a good afternoon. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2020