
The United States Conference of Mayors Homeland Security Monitoring Center

FIRST MAYORS' REPORT TO THE NATION: Tracking Federal Homeland Security Funds Sent to the 50 State Governments

**A 168-City/50-State Survey
September 2003**



The United States Conference of Mayors

**James A. Garner, Mayor of Hempstead
President**

**Donald L. Plusquellic, Mayor of Akron
Vice President**

**Beverly O'Neill, Mayor of Long Beach
Chair, Advisory Board**

**Tom Cochran
Executive Director**

This report was prepared for The U.S. Conference of Mayors by City Policy Associates, Washington, D.C. Additional copies of the report are available from The U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1620 Eye Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20006, (202) 293-7330, or at www.usmayors.org.

FOREWORD

One month after the September 11, 2001 attacks on the nation, The United States Conference of Mayors brought more than 200 mayors, police and fire chiefs, emergency managers and public health officials to Washington to examine the new and challenging security issues confronting the vast majority of Americans who live in cities, to examine the extraordinary costs already incurred by the cities in the weeks following the attacks, and to examine the even greater costs projected by the cities as they prepared to take on their new homeland security responsibilities. Led by then-Conference President Marc Morial of New Orleans, this summit meeting of local leaders drafted a sweeping “National Action Plan for Safety and Security in America’s Cities” which included an appeal to the Congress and the administration for a new homeland security block grant that would provide federal funds directly to cities to meet needs such as police and fire overtime, additional training for personnel, communications and rescue equipment, and security measures to protect airports, ports, utilities, public transit, and other public infrastructure.

The next year-and-a-half saw unrelenting efforts by the nation’s mayors to obtain direct federal funding for cities to help meet the costs of the higher level of security that was demanded following the attacks – costs which had to be covered with local revenues – and to ensure that this funding would be distributed to their cities in an equitable and timely fashion – that is, to ensure that the funding would get to local first responders and others needing it without being either diluted or delayed.

The FY 2003 federal appropriations bill finally enacted by the Congress in March 2003 – 18 months after the terrorist attacks – and the supplemental appropriation enacted the following month provided some long-overdue funding for several state and local homeland security programs. While these bills did not include the direct federal funding of local homeland security initiatives that had been consistently sought by the Conference of Mayors, the April supplemental appropriation did include significant funding for first responders, a timetable to be followed by the Department of Homeland Security in distributing the federal funds to the states, and a timetable to be followed by the states in distributing these funds to localities.

This past June, at our annual meeting in Denver, Hempstead Mayor James Garner assumed the Presidency of the Conference of Mayors. After reviewing the homeland security policy adopted by the Democratic and Republican mayors assembled, Mayor Garner determined that, because the new homeland security funding may be the most important federal funding provided to cities this year and in years ahead, the federal plan for the distribution of the funds, which works through the states, must be closely monitored to determine whether it is being followed, whether it is performing adequately, and whether improvements can be made. Mayor Garner and our other mayors believe that too much is at stake for America’s homeland security system to be permitted to perform below its fullest capacity.

A recommendation to create a Homeland Security Monitoring Center within the Conference of Mayors emerged from a meeting of the Conference’s Homeland Security Task Force, chaired by Baltimore Mayor Martin O’Malley, during the Denver meeting. As Executive Director, I was charged with creating the new Center and with launching its first activity – the monitoring of the billions of federal dollars going from Washington to the 50 State Houses, and the monitoring of their distribution by the states to our first responders. This first activity – the survey reported in this document – was developed by a Conference leadership team that included Mayor O’Malley; Elizabeth (NJ) Mayor J. Christian Bollwage, chair of our Criminal and Social Justice Committee; Gary (IN) Mayor Scott King, chair of our Mayors and Police Chiefs Task Force; Louisville Metro Mayor Jerry Abramson, a Past President of the Conference; and Sugar Land (TX) Mayor David Wallace, co-chair of the Homeland Security Task Force.

Mayors' continuing concerns about state administration of federal homeland security funding are grounded in many cities' past experience with their states in other areas of public service delivery. Indeed, the survey described in this document – the first-ever 50-state assessment of the flow of federal homeland security funds to our cities – found that, based on recent years' experience in working with their states, officials in just one in four cities expect to be substantially involved in their states' homeland security planning processes. The survey findings which follow call attention to one of the mayors' most serious concerns – that is, because the federal homeland security funds are being distributed through the states, cities will not be receiving the specific resources they know they need to meet their greatly-increased security responsibilities.

You will see other concerns reflected in officials' responses to several survey questions. Again and again, mayors and other officials report that they are not given adequate opportunities to influence their states in regard to how these funds can be used, either in individual cities or in broader urban areas. City leaders who have become knowledgeable about the latest homeland security technology and equipment are frustrated when the funds they finally receive cannot be spent on what they know is most needed.


City leaders are also frustrated because the federal homeland security funding they hoped would flow through a streamlined distribution system designed to meet first responders' needs is, in reality, being pumped through a much more traditional system in which state decision-makers tend to view counties, rather than cities, as the focal points of emergency and disaster response.

Our survey results show that under the largest first responder funding program, just one in 10 cities had actually received money by August 1. They show, unfortunately, that mayors' concerns have been well-founded, and that the long-sought federal funding for our cities' first responders has been both diluted and delayed.

The ultimate goal of any survey conducted by the Conference of Mayors is to assemble information that can be used to improve the program or process being examined. That is certainly the case with this survey. Mayors have been working very closely with the Department of Homeland Security and Secretary Tom Ridge, and with key members of Congress, on the homeland security issues that they consider most important. How best to get local first responders the resources they need tops our list of priorities, and we believe this survey points to improvements that need to be made to the current process.

In the United States of America, the responsibility for the protection of citizens has long resided at the city level. This is a part of our cultural heritage that gathered strength from the founder of the modern American police movement, Theodore Roosevelt, when he was Police Commissioner of New York City. When it spread to the South and the West, it was the sheriff who was charged with protecting local people from harm.

Today we stand with our first responders – the fire, police, emergency managers and public health officials, men and women – who risk their lives day and night. Unlike mayors in other industrialized nations, the USA mayor stands alone as a citizen elected to protect his or her people in times of danger – danger such as we are all experiencing in the international and domestic war against terrorism. The nation's mayors stand ready to work with the White House and the Congress to ensure that our first responders receive the financial and moral support needed to take on the tremendous challenges ahead. It is in the purest spirit of patriotism that we offer this report and pledge our total support for a new, reformed homeland security system that will, in the end, maintain true hometown security where the vast majority of Americans live and work.



Tom Cochran
Executive Director

September 17, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	5
Survey Findings	9
I. Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure Funding	9
II. State Domestic Preparedness Funding	14
III. Urban Area Security Initiative	19
IV. Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Hospital Preparedness	22
V. Airport Law Enforcement Reimbursement	25
VI. Port Security Grant Program	25
VII. Mass Transit Security Grant Program	26
VIII. Emergency Management Performance Grants	26
IX. Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program	28
X. Community Emergency Response Teams	29
XI. City Involvement in State Planning Processes	29
Survey Cities	33

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

One month after the September 11, 2001 attacks on the nation, The U.S. Conference of Mayors brought together more than 200 mayors, police and fire chiefs, emergency managers and public health officials in a summit meeting to draft a sweeping “National Action Plan for Safety and Security in America’s Cities.” This Plan included a call for a block grant to provide federal funds directly to cities to help them meet the extraordinary costs of heightened security following the attacks – costs they were covering exclusively with local revenues. From that time until March 2003, when the federal appropriations bill enacted by Congress and the supplemental appropriation enacted the following month provided funding for several state and local homeland security programs, the mayors were engaged in unrelenting efforts to secure a mechanism that would get funding directly to local first responders without it being either diluted or delayed. The bills enacted did not include the direct funding sought but did provide significant funding for first responders and timetables to be followed by the Department of Homeland Security and the states in their distribution of the funds.

Because of the importance to cities of the federal homeland security funding, The U.S. Conference of Mayors, meeting mid-June in Denver, announced that it would be monitoring the federal plan for the distribution of these funds – a plan which relies largely on the states to distribute the funds to localities. Conference leaders determined that the foundation for the monitoring initiative would be a survey of the nation’s principal cities on 1) the Fiscal Year 2003 federal funding they are receiving or expect to receive through the states, 2) the adequacy of their involvement in the process used by their state to distribute this funding, and 3) the extent to which their top local security priorities are being addressed through this process.

Mayors’ concerns about state administration of federal homeland security funding are grounded in many cities’ past experience with their states in other areas of public service delivery. A particular concern was that states would not be providing the specific resources – including technology and equipment – that mayors know are most needed in their individual cities to meet their greatly increased security responsibilities. Another concern was that the federal homeland security funds would be distributed through a system in which state decision-makers traditionally view counties, rather than cities, as the focal points of emergency and disaster response.

The 10 homeland security funding programs covered in the survey were those for which applications had been solicited from states and a few other entities by the federal government through late July – the time at which the survey was circulated among the cities. The survey requested information that described the situation in the cities as of August 1. Responses to the survey were obtained from 168 cities located in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the Northern Mariana Islands. Cities as small as University Heights (OH), population 14,146, and as large as New York City are included. Responses were submitted by mayors, police chiefs, fire chiefs, emergency management officials, and analysts familiar with homeland security programs and funding.

Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure Funding -- \$1.5 Billion

- As of August 1, 90 percent of the survey cities had not received this first responder/ critical infrastructure funding through their states.
- 37 percent of the cities had been notified that funds would be received, but 53 percent had neither received funds nor been notified that they would.
- Officials in two-thirds of the cities (66 percent) reported that other jurisdictions in their area had received first responder/critical infrastructure funding that could contribute to their cities’ security

efforts. The largest group of these officials (85 percent) said this funding was going to their county; 77 percent said it was going to one or more area cities.

- In 58 percent of the cities, officials said they had not been given an adequate opportunity to influence their states in regard to how these funds would be used in their cities; in 57 percent of the cities, officials said they had not been given an opportunity to influence the use of the funds in their areas.
- Officials in 30 percent of the cities said the allowable uses of the funds will not address their top security priorities.

State Domestic Preparedness Funding -- \$556 Million

- As of August 1, 80 percent of the survey cities had not received this domestic preparedness funding through their states.
- About half (51 percent) of the cities had been notified that funds would be received (and a few of these cities have indicated that they have since received their funding), but 29 percent had neither received funds nor been notified that they would.
- Officials in nearly three-fourths of the cities (74 percent) reported that other jurisdictions in their area had received domestic preparedness funding that could contribute to their cities' security efforts. The largest group of these officials (89 percent) said this funding was going to their county; 79 percent said it was going to one or more area cities; 75 percent said it was going to one or more area counties.
- In more than half (52 percent) of the cities, officials said they had not been given an adequate opportunity to influence their states in regard to how these funds would be used in their cities; in just under half of the cities (49 percent), officials said they had not been given an opportunity to influence the use of the funds in their areas.
- Officials in 40 percent of the cities said the allowable uses of the funds will not address their top security priorities.

Urban Area Security Initiative for High Threat Areas -- \$600 Million

- Officials in more than one-third of the survey cities (36 percent) which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, the 30 urban areas receiving funding through this Initiative said they have not been involved in the state planning process for the use of the funds.
- Among those involved in the planning process, 38 percent did not believe they had a satisfactory opportunity to influence how the funds will be used.
- One-third of the cities (34 percent) do not believe that other local governments in their area will be able to use the funds they receive to address their top security priorities.
- In 40 percent of the cities, officials do not expect to receive funds through the Initiative.
- 44 percent of the cities indicate that their state is exercising its option to keep a portion of this program's funds to complement state assets that assist urban areas.
- Officials in one-fifth of the cities said they have gotten an indication that their city or area would receive less funding under other homeland security programs because they are receiving funds under the Urban Area Security Initiative.

Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Hospital Preparedness -- \$1.37 Billion

- Officials in nearly half the survey cities (48 percent) do not believe their city government or health department had an adequate opportunity to participate in their state’s planning process for public health and hospital preparedness activities to be funded through this program.
- The same number of officials do not believe their state’s plan adequately reflects their priorities for use of these funds.
- In 83 percent of the cities, officials anticipate that the health department serving their residents will be funded through this program; officials in 82 percent of the cities expect that one or more of their hospitals will receive funding.

Airport Law Enforcement Reimbursement

- Among the survey cities which provide law enforcement assistance to an airport, 37 percent of the airport operators have not been reimbursed for additional law enforcement costs associated with security at airport checkpoints.
- For those airports which have been reimbursed, 40 percent of the cities report that the airport operator has not provided this reimbursement to the city government.

Port Security Grant Program -- \$245 Million

- Officials in just over half the survey cities (52 percent) having a port that is receiving funding through this program said they were responsible for providing security or other services to that port.
- Of these cities, 58 percent said they were not receiving funding through the program.

Mass Transit Security Grant Program -- \$65 Million

- Officials in well over half of the survey cities (54 percent) being served by one of the 20 “highest risk” transit systems funded through this program said they were responsible for providing security or other services to that system.
- Among these cities, 69 percent said they were not receiving funding through this program.
- Officials in 44 percent of the cities said their state was exercising its option to keep a portion of the program funds to complement state assets at transit sites.

Emergency Management Performance Grants -- \$165 Million

- As of August 1, nearly two-thirds of the survey cities (65 percent) have neither received emergency management funds from their states nor been notified that they will receive them.
- Officials in 55 percent of the cities reported that other jurisdictions in their area have not received funding through this program that will contribute to their cities’ security efforts.
- Officials in two-thirds of the cities (67 percent) do not feel they were given an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used in either their cities or their areas.

Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program -- \$248,375 per State

- As of August 1, 82 percent of the survey cities have neither received pre-disaster mitigation funds from their states nor been notified that they will receive them.
- Officials in 62 percent of the cities reported that other jurisdictions in their area have not received funding through this program that will contribute to their cities' security efforts.
- Officials in 69 percent of the cities do not feel they were given an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used in either their cities or their areas.

Community Emergency Response Teams -- \$19 Million

- As of August 1, emergency managers and citizens in half of the survey cities were participating in a CERT Program, receiving 20 hours of training in disaster preparedness, basic disaster operations, fire safety, and light search and rescue.

City Involvement in State Planning Processes

- Officials in 34 percent of the survey cities said their states had not involved them in the development of the statewide preparedness needs assessments required by the former federal Office for State and Local Domestic Preparedness Support in 2000.
- Officials in 42 percent of the cities said they were not involved in the development of the statewide domestic preparedness strategies, also required by that agency.
- 37 percent of the cities do not believe their local interests were fairly represented in their states' development of the required needs assessments.
- 38 percent of the cities do not believe their local interests were fairly represented in their states' preparedness strategies.
- In 44 percent of the cities, officials said their states had not requested an updated local needs assessment, as required in the July 1, 2003 guidance from the new Office for Domestic Preparedness.
- Just under half of the cities (49 percent) said their states had not invited them to become involved in development of an updated homeland security strategy, as required in the new ODP guidance.
- Based on recent years' experience in working with their states, about one-third of the survey cities (34 percent) expect minimal involvement, and seven percent expect no involvement at all, in their states' homeland security planning processes. Another 34 percent anticipate some involvement, and 24 percent expect substantial involvement.

INTRODUCTION

The leaders of The U.S. Conference of Mayors, in this year's June annual meeting in Denver, launched a Homeland Security Monitoring Center that will assess whether the federal homeland security funding programs created in the wake of the September 11, 2001 attacks on the nation are providing the nation's cities – the front lines in the domestic war on terrorism – with the resources needed to meet their local homeland security responsibilities. Because the federal system for the distribution of the funds largely relies on the states to deliver the federal program funds to cities, the mayors want to assess how the system is performing and whether, and how, it can be improved.

The foundation for the monitoring effort, it was determined, would be a survey of the nation's principal cities – generally those with populations of 30,000 or more – on 1) the FY 2003 funding they are receiving or expect to receive through the federal homeland security programs, 2) the adequacy of their involvement in the process used by their state to distribute the funding, and 3) the extent to which their top security priorities are being addressed through this process. In addition to documenting the extent to which federal homeland security funding is actually reaching the nation's cities, the survey would provide a baseline of information on how the funding, when it was delivered, could be used by the cities; on whether other area jurisdictions were receiving funds that could contribute to cities' security efforts; and on the criteria being used by the states in their decisions to allocate funds to local governments.

The 10 separate funding programs covered in the survey were those for which applications had been solicited by the federal government through late July – the time at which the survey was circulated among the cities. Survey respondents were asked to provide information on any of the 10 programs that directly affected their cities, and to describe the situation in their cities as of August 1. The programs covered in the survey were:

- ***Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure Funding*** – \$1.5 billion – Separate state allocations for First Responder Preparedness (\$1.3 billion of the total) and Critical Infrastructure Preparedness (\$200 million of the total) were announced April 30. Eighty percent of the First Responder Preparedness funds must be provided to local communities. These funds may be used for equipment, exercises, training, and planning and administration. Fifty percent of the Critical Infrastructure Protection funds must be provided to local communities. These funds may be used for public safety agency overtime costs, contract security personnel costs and state-ordered National Guard deployments to augment security at critical infrastructure during the period of hostilities with Iraq and future periods of heightened threat. State applications were to be submitted to the Department of Homeland Security by May 30 and DHS was required to act on the applications within 15 days. States were required to sub-allocate funds to local governments within 45 days after their application was approved by DHS.
- ***State Domestic Preparedness Funding*** – \$556 million – Individual state allocations for equipment, exercises, training and planning were announced March 7. State applications for this funding were to be submitted to the Department of Homeland Security by April 22. States were required to pass through to local governments 80 percent of the equipment funds awarded to them; this pass-through had to be completed within 45 days of the award to the states.
- ***Urban Area Security Initiative*** – \$100 million in funding (Part 1) for the New York City, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Seattle, Houston, and National Capital Region “high threat” areas was announced by DHS on April 8. An additional \$500 million in funding (Part 2) was

announced on May 14 and the number of “high threat” urban areas receiving these funds was increased to 30. The funds go to the states and at least 80 percent must be passed through to the local areas. Funds not passed through are intended “to complement state assets that will provide direct assistance to the urban area.”

- **Public Health Emergency Preparedness/Hospital Preparedness** – \$1.37 billion – Separate state allocations for Public Health Emergency Preparedness (\$870 million of the total) and Hospital Preparedness (\$498 million of the total) were announced by the Department of Health and Human Services on March 20. To obtain these funds, states submitted plans outlining their planned activities in each area and could receive up to 20 percent of the funds prior to plan approval in order to 1) support smallpox vaccination activities for health workers and emergency responders; 2) support activities already approved in their 2002 state plan; 3) enhance or intensify critical activities already approved in their 2002 plan; and 4) accelerate timelines for critical activities.
- **Airport Law Enforcement Reimbursement** – The Transportation Security Administration executed memoranda of understanding with airport operators which provide for the reimbursement of local law enforcement costs incurred in providing security at airport checkpoints.
- **Port Security Grants** – \$245 million – DHS announced the first round of port security grants (\$75 million for 13 ports) on May 14; the second round of grants (\$170 million for more than 100 ports and private companies) was announced on June 12. Grants go directly to state and local government agencies, port authorities, and companies. Funds are for security planning and improvements to dockside and perimeter security including critical infrastructure security, security enhancements, training, exercises, equipment, planning, and information sharing, and may be applied to operations during Orange Alerts between January and April of this year.
- **Mass Transit Security Grants** – \$65 million – Grants through the states to the 20 “highest risk” transit systems were announced by DHS on May 14. States were permitted to use 20 percent of the funds to complement state assets at the system sites. Funds are for installation of physical barricades; area monitoring systems; integrated communications systems; and prevention planning, training and exercises. Funds also may be applied to operations conducted during Orange Alerts between January and April of this year. Transit systems were required to conduct assessments and produce preparedness plans on which to base their resource allocations.
- **Emergency Management Performance Grants** – \$165 million – Availability of these hazards preparedness and emergency management funds was announced by DHS on April 16. The funds may be used for all hazards planning, training, exercises and facilities. States were given the flexibility to allocate funds on the basis of risk vulnerabilities and to address the most urgent state and local disaster mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery needs.
- **Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program** – \$248,375 per state – Availability of these pre-disaster mitigation funds for eligible state, local and tribal hazard mitigation planning was announced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency on March 30. State applications were to be submitted to FEMA regional offices by April 30.
- **Community Emergency Response Teams** – \$19 million – Allocations to the states for the training of emergency managers and citizens to be better prepared to respond to emergency situations in their communities were announced on May 29. CERT team members, who provide a volunteer pool to perform special projects that improve a community’s preparedness, must

complete 20 hours of training on topics such as disaster preparedness, basic disaster operations, fire safety, and light search and rescue.

Survey Respondents

Survey responses were received from 168 cities representing every state in the nation, Puerto Rico and the Northern Mariana Islands. Information was submitted by cities as small as 14,146 (University Heights, OH) and 18,464 (Natchez, MS) and by the nation's largest population centers – New York City (8.0 million), Los Angeles (3.7 million), Chicago (2.9 million), Houston (1.95 million), Dallas (1.19 million), and San Antonio (1.14 million). Cities with populations up to 100,000 comprised the largest group of respondents (84); cities in the 100,000-200,000 population range comprised the next largest group (44). Twenty-two respondents were in the 200,000-500,000 range, and 12 were between 500,000 and one million. States with the largest number of respondents were California (22 cities), Texas (15 cities), Ohio (13 cities), and Illinois (12 cities). A list of the survey cities follows the survey findings chapter of this document.

SURVEY FINDINGS

I. Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure Funding

Of the total \$1.5 billion available through this program, \$1.3 billion support First Responder Preparedness and \$200 million support Critical Infrastructure Preparedness, and states received separate allocations for these two program categories on April 30. States were required to submit their applications by May 30, and DHS indicates that all did so.

DHS was required to act on state applications within 15 days – June 15 at the latest – and states were required to sub-allocate 80 percent of the of first responder funds and 50 percent of critical infrastructure funds to local governments within 45 days – August 1 at the latest, assuming earlier deadlines were met. About one in four survey cities (24 percent) reported that this 45-day deadline for obligating funds to local jurisdictions had not been met.

Funds Received – Survey city officials were asked whether their governments had received funds from their state under this program, or whether they had been notified that they would receive funds, by August 1.

- 90 percent reported that they had not received these funds from their states – 37 percent have been notified that funds will be received, but 53 percent had neither received funds nor been notified that they would.
- 10 percent reported that they had received funds.
- The cities, as a group, have received or been notified that they will receive a total of \$76,715,907.

Use of Funds – Asked how the funds they have received or expect to receive through this program would be used,

- 88 percent of survey city officials said equipment purchase;
- 41 percent said exercises;
- 47 percent said training;
- 34 percent said planning.

Security Priorities – Thirty percent of the cities indicated these uses of funds will not address their top security priorities. Many of the comments they offered also refer to the inadequacy of the funding available. Among them:

Long Beach, CA: Costs of maintaining security at our port and airport are extremely high. These grants do not cover those costs.

New Britain, CT: We need money to pay personnel to take required training.

New Orleans, LA: The needs are greater than the funding.

Lowell, MA: Our highest priorities are funding for permanent full-time positions to plan and prepare for large scale incidents and organize applications for federal requirements and grants.

Kansas City, MO: It will address some (needs) but not all.

Omaha, NE: Not even close. The priority needs for first responder and medical/public health agencies far exceed this funding – e.g., equipment, training, increased responsibilities.

Nashville, TN: \$20 million were identified as needed to meet Nashville's homeland security needs. This funding addressed some of Nashville's needs.

Austin, TX: We need security personnel and reimbursement for overtime costs associated with homeland security.

Other Views – Among the comments by the cities which indicated that the funds will be used to address their top security priorities:

Los Angeles, CA: We used this funding for overtime costs. These funds put a small dent in the actual costs the City incurred during Orange Alert time frames.

San Francisco, CA: Funds include badly-needed \$3.3 million in reimbursement for security during the initial days of the war. An additional \$1.8 million provide protective equipment and training for first responders.

San Jose, CA: San Jose received \$550,000 for police mobile radios and \$252,000 for reimbursement for Orange Alert overtime costs during the Iraqi War.

Tampa, FL: We are included in the State's plan for equipment purchases, training and exercises. Equipment will be supplied to counties first, training will be provided to everyone equally, and we will participate in exercises developed by the County.

Baltimore, MD: Funds will be directed to, but will not fulfill, our top priorities.

Newark, NJ: All funds earmarked for local preparedness will be used to meet the goals of our comprehensive homeland security strategy.

Henderson, NV: This time the amount of money allocated allowed the State to fund all of the requests they deemed eligible. We didn't receive them in order, but we got all of our requests.

Las Vegas, NV: Specialized equipment for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and Las Vegas Bomb Squad will be acquired to enhance the City's preparedness and response capabilities. However, the State of Nevada has elected to retain and administer all funds associated with training, exercises and allowable overtime compensation related to training.

Oklahoma City, OK: These funds will enhance the City's overall response capabilities and ability to train with greater interoperability. Needed equipment will also be provided to first responders.

Stillwater, OK: There are numerous soft targets at Oklahoma State University and in the City in general. These funds will help with addressing the community security priorities.

Newport, RI: These funds were awarded based on a competitive bid process that allowed communities to ask for support in the areas where they saw a need.

Portsmouth, VA: The funds will address priority equipment needs of the fire, EMS and police departments. Additionally, physical security of our City Hall building will be addressed.

Waukesha, WI: These funds will assist in county-wide hazardous materials coverage.

Other Jurisdictions – Asked if any other jurisdictions in their area had received funding that could contribute to their cities’ homeland security efforts, officials in two-thirds of the survey cities (66 percent) said this had occurred. Of these,

- 85 percent said this funding is going to the county in which their city is located;
- 77 percent said it is going to another city or other cities;
- 70 percent said it is going to another county or other counties;
- 69 percent said it is going to a regional agency or organization;
- 55 percent said it is going to other agencies or organizations, including state agencies, universities, ports and the American Red Cross.

Allocation Criteria – Asked what criteria their states used to allocate these funds to local governments,

- 31 percent of the survey cities said population density;
- 20 percent said presence of critical infrastructure;
- 17 percent said existence of potential threat;
- 16 percent identified other criteria used by the states, including base plus population, the number of first responders, a competitive state grant process, and resource availability and regional locations throughout the state;
- 37 percent did not know what criteria their state used to allocate the funds.

Among the city officials’ comments on the state allocation criteria and process:

San Francisco, CA: First responder funds were distributed using the base plus census population formula. Critical Infrastructure Program funds were distributed on the basis of actual expenditures.

Louisville Metro, KY: KY EMA decided to distribute 70 percent of the money equally to all counties, and 30 percent based on population. Critical infrastructure or potential threat were not a factor.

Omaha, NE: We were not involved with the State in the process. When the amount of the 2003 grant was announced, we were shocked. As a result, we initiated a conference call between State officials and the Mayor of Omaha, the Chair of the County Board, County CAO, County EMA director, and several other City of Omaha public safety officials. We expressed our deep concern that the allocation process was not fair and that in the future we wanted representation in whatever process the State used to make the determination. They rejected our request for representation, but the allocation amount was considerably enhanced for the forthcoming supplemental money. Had we not raised a little hell and demonstrated that we were informed, unified, and watching, we would have received less. The absolute, essential keys to this issue are mandatory city/county cooperation, vigilantly watching the state, and knowing the rules and laws. Also, be prepared to battle with the feds regarding the approval of line item requests. Have ready strong justification for the requests. The feds and the states will try to keep as much as the money as they can.

Opportunity to Influence Use of Funds – Asked whether officials in their city had been given an adequate opportunity to influence how these funds would be used, either in their cities or their areas,

- 58 percent of the respondents said officials were not given an adequate opportunity to influence use of the funds in their city; a smaller group (42 percent) felt they were given an adequate opportunity to do this;
- 57 percent felt they were not given an adequate opportunity to influence use of the funds in their area; 43 percent felt they were given an adequate opportunity to do this.

Among the comments from officials who did not feel they were given an adequate opportunity to influence how funds will be used in their city or area:

Fairbanks, AK: We were not given the opportunity to provide any input.

North Little Rock, AR: There was a one-day meeting; all five jurisdictions in the County have definite logistical differences.

Long Beach, CA: Very little time was available for proper planning and input.

Los Angeles, CA: The time period was very short and it didn't allow for an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used.

Norwalk, CA: Local officials were not involved in establishing the funding priorities for the operational areas.

San Francisco, CA: The State continues to ignore risk in the distribution of funds.

Thousand Oaks, CA: The process is rushed and flawed with no real plan of attack for addressing regional needs with direct input from the cities.

Cedar Rapids, IA: The State is only willing to work with county EMA's. We are trying to persuade them to work more closely with us.

Chicago, IL: Chicago has been informed that since it is receiving its own direct funding from the federal government, it will not be receiving any funds from the State from this grant.

Peoria, IL: Again, the State task force is making the decisions and they are voted on by a large group of people. Funds are not distributed as cash to the local entities but as equipment and training chosen by the State.

New Orleans, LA: No input was requested by the State.

Taylor, MI: We never met with the State.

Rochester, MN: There was minimal participation in state-level planning.

Las Vegas, NV: The region's list of identified needs was re-prioritized by the State's committee without the region's consent.

Linden, NJ: We were never consulted.

Niagara Falls, NY: There was county level distribution only.

Cleveland, OH: All funds are being determined by a County committee on which the City has 25 percent representation. Higher representation is needed.

Edmond, OK: On area planning: We essentially have no active role in planning outside the City.

Pittsburgh, PA: The Mayor's Office was not involved in the distribution of funds. The State decided how the money will be spent.

Cidra, PR: Our City was not asked to participate at any level.

Providence, RI: We were never asked. It was done based on the State's three-year strategy that was put together prior to 9/11.

Knoxville, TN: Funding is distributed by a committee of County appointees, with little or no City input. On area planning: Training and exercise money was a fixed percent regardless of previous training and/or exercises.

Austin, TX: We did not have much input on categories of eligible expenses.

Houston, TX: Our jurisdiction has not been notified about these funds, nor invited to participate in the planning for their expenditure.

Charleston, WV: We were not even told by the State that funds were available.

Other Views – Among the comments from officials who felt they had been given an adequate opportunity to influence how funds would be used in their city:

Florence, AL: State agencies conducted surveys.

Huntsville, AL: Officials serve on statewide committees.

Dayton, OH: Official notification was sent June 2003 with a deadline to allocate funds by November 2003. There is a total of six months provided in order to plan, prepare and decide by committee whom will receive them.

Lakewood, OH: The process is underway and communities will be surveyed by a County committee.

Oklahoma City, OK: We anticipate that the City will have influence over how these funds are expended.

Nashville, TN: Nashville was given full latitude in choosing categories and budget items.

Portsmouth, VA: The Emergency Coordinator (Fire Chief) in conjunction with the Police Chief will determine use of funds.

Tacoma, WA: The Fire Chief and Police Chief hold positions on the regional council and will be able to influence funding decisions.

Cheyenne, WY: There were meetings and input opportunities.

II. State Domestic Preparedness Funding

State allocations for this \$566 million program were announced March 7 and state applications were due at the Department of Homeland Security April 22. Each state received specific allocations for equipment, exercises, training, and planning.

The guidance issued for this program required states to pass through to local governments 80 percent of the equipment funds within 45 days of receiving their grant award. One-fourth of the survey cities reported that this 45-day deadline for obligating funds to local jurisdictions had not been met.

Funds Received – City officials were asked whether their government had received funds from their state through this program, or whether they had been notified that they would receive funds.

- 80 percent had not received funds – 51 percent had been notified that funds would be received, but 29 percent had neither received funds nor been notified that they would. (New York City and a few other cities have reported that, since August 1, they have moved from the notification category to the funds received category.)
- Twenty percent reported that, as of August 1, they had received funds.
- The cities, as a group, have received or expect to receive a total of \$64,311,310.

Use of Funds – Asked how the funds they have received or expect to receive through this program will be used,

- 95 percent of survey city officials said equipment purchase;
- 45 percent said exercises;
- 41 percent said training;
- 32 percent said planning.

Security Priorities – Forty percent of the cities indicate these uses of funds will not address their top security priorities. Among the ir comments:

Little Rock, AR: We are only authorized for equipment. We could use access to the other categories and, of course, more equipment.

Scottsdale, AZ: This allocation only addresses some of our opportunities to deal with some infrastructure security issues, conduct exercises, or deliver advanced WMD training.

Colton, CA: To date, DHS grants have been narrowly focused. Specifically, exact equipment lists inhibit innovation. More money is allocated towards exercises than training, although thorough training needs to occur prior to exercising. Very short time frames have not allowed adequate time for research and needs assessment!

Long Beach, CA: Personnel costs continue to be the most significant issue. These grants, although very gladly received and very well used, still will not address our most critical needs.

Modesto, CA: Priorities were established earlier and as funds become available the priorities are addressed in order, considering any special criteria for the use of the funds. One example is staffing.

Staffing may be a higher priority, but we purchase equipment instead because personnel costs are not funded in the grant.

Bridgeport, CT: Equipment allocation is very good, but without proper or allocated training, planning guidance/assistance and monies for realistic exercises, equipment may as well be non-existent.

Miami Beach, FL: The funds that have been received are designated for Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). The Miami Beach Police Department purchased PPEs for all sworn and critical civilian personnel prior to funds being available.

Athens, GA: These funds are for equipment. We still need training, exercises and planning. This grant does not address security issues such as critical facilities support.

Carmel, IN: Carmel's \$29,000 was included in \$140,000 for all of Hamilton County. The monies will be used county-wide, not specifically for Carmel's needs.

Michigan City, IN: We did not receive funds. We received bio-chemical suits which were not complete and cannot be used unless operations level hazmat training takes place. With overtime issues, the grant requires local jurisdictions to spend more money to receive the suits than the suits are actually worth.

Louisville Metro, KY: This will not address the need for PPE for law enforcement or other public safety personnel and does not address our need for interoperable communications or combined communications centers or systems.

Lowell, MA: We need fixed structure funding, which was not available through this grant. We also need funds for permanent full-time personnel, which also weren't included in this grant.

Henderson, NV: Our State Homeland Security Committee does not consider our priorities when evaluating grant applications. They individually rank items and we end up not receiving our items in the order we prioritize. It's a bad system.

New York City: NYC first responder agencies have identified \$900 million in homeland security needs in the areas of equipment, training, and exercises. The City's top priorities exceed current federal funding levels.

Providence, RI: Our top priority is establishing an emergency preparedness structure within the City that includes a permanent Emergency Operations Center as well as communications equipment to accomplish our goals. None of this money is earmarked for those priorities.

Austin, TX: Our top security priority is still security personnel who are not funded by any of these programs.

Dallas, TX: The amount available is insufficient to impact our priority: communications.

Laredo, TX: The border is a high risk area for communicable diseases and was not appropriately supported with this funding because of international trade, commerce and daily activities and other health threats related to biological, chemical or radiological exposure. Our request was for \$5 million for supplies, training, vehicles, medical emergency equipment and medications, first response, security and protection.

Everett, WA: The City's top security priorities are focused around the securing, monitoring and hardening of our critical infrastructure. This equipment has helped, but we need to fund engineering studies, security manning, and specific projects.

Other Views – Among the comments from the cities which indicated that the funds will be used to address their top security priorities:

Huntsville, AL: These funds will further enhance the City's ability to respond to and deter WMD and terrorist activities.

Augusta, GA: It will help a great deal, but there are many needs yet to be addressed.

Boise, ID: Personal protective equipment for first responders is our greatest need.

Arlington Heights, IL: Any financial assistance is always appreciated.

Boston, MA: Personal protective equipment needs will be addressed.

Baltimore, MD: The funds will be used for top City priorities, but are not sufficient to fully meet them. In addition, although some of these funds are set aside by the federal government for training and exercises, we have not yet received clear guidance from the State on how they will be allocated and released.

Dearborn, MI: The funds will be used to provide needed equipment to first responders – police, fire service, EMS – to better prepare them for response to critical incidents.

Detroit, MI: It will assist in properly equipping first responders.

Billings, MT: It will enhance our ability to respond to WMD and hazmat events.

Oklahoma City, OK: These funds have provided for a bomb robot, SCBA's and protective clothing. The majority of security issues have proven to be explosion-related. The bomb robot will limit exposure to these issues and the protective clothing will provide for personnel safety.

Pittsburgh, PA: The funds are being distributed through our Regional Counter Terrorism Task Force. Therefore, some of the City's concerns will be addressed and some will not be due to the regional approach.

Beaumont, TX: The bulk of the award will be used to purchase communications equipment in an effort to have interoperability. This will enable various disciplines to communicate more effectively with each other, thus helping address security priorities.

Sugar Land, TX: These funds are being forwarded through the Texas Engineering Extension Service and Houston Area Council of Governments. Interoperability and hazmat are two eligible areas, or two top priorities, based on State needs assessment process. Our top two local priorities match those of the State as a whole, but many other security needs are not being funded with federal assistance now.

Portsmouth, VA: Funds will address priority equipment needs of the fire, EMS and police departments.

Seattle, WA: State funding will be used for personal protective equipment and detection equipment. We will fund other priorities, like additional assessments, with other federal and local funding sources.

Allocation Criteria – Asked what criteria their states used to allocate these funds to local governments,

- 44 percent of the survey cities said population density;
- 26 percent said presence of critical infrastructure;
- 26 percent said existence of potential threat;
- 28 percent identified other criteria, including base plus population, the number of first responders, and a competitive state grant process;
- Resource availability and regional locations throughout the state;
- 34 percent did not know what criteria their state used to allocate the funds.

Other criteria for the state allocation of funds which were identified by cities were:

- base plus population;
- the number of first responders;
- a competitive state grant process; and
- resource availability and regional locations throughout the state.

Among the city officials' comments on their state allocation criteria:

Fort Collins, CO: Criteria used to distribute grant funds were based on alphabetical order of County's name. This was done due to staged release of funds by the federal government to the State. Larimer County is in the second wave of grants.

Baltimore, MD: Although the State developed a formula that nominally took into account factors such as actual likelihood of an attack, population density, etc., we were not convinced that the formula adequately or accurately assessed these factors. Also, the mechanics of the State's final formula remained cryptic.

Fargo, ND: The four largest cities received nearly identical amounts even though the largest city is nearly three times larger than the fourth largest city.

University Heights, OH: Cuyahoga County received the funding and they chose how to disperse it. The result was that each police department is receiving nine suits.

Everett, WA: Allocation has been fractured at many levels with the State making broad allocations first to counties and now to Homeland Security Regions. This has resulted in a process that has not considered threat/infrastructure/population.

Other Jurisdictions – Asked if any other jurisdictions in their area had received funding that would contribute to their cities' homeland security efforts, officials in nearly three-fourths of the survey cities (74 percent) said this had occurred. Of these,

- 89 percent said this funding is going to the county in which their city is located;
- 79 percent said it is going to another city or other cities;
- 75 percent said it is going to another county or other counties;
- 70 percent said it is going to a regional agency or organization;
- 59 percent said it is going to other agencies or organizations, state agencies, hospitals, universities, the American Red Cross and statewide associations.

Opportunity to Influence Use of Funds – Asked whether officials in their cities had been given an adequate opportunity to influence their states in regard to how these funds would be used, either in their cities or their areas.

- More than half (52 percent) felt they were not given an adequate opportunity to influence use of the funds in their cities.
- Nearly half (49 percent) felt they were not given an adequate opportunity to influence use of the funds in their areas.

Among the comments from officials who felt they had not been given an adequate opportunity to influence how funds will be used in their city or their area:

Port St. Lucie, FL: Determinations are made at the state and regional levels.

Peoria, IL: Even though as a region our area has been very proactive in planning and training for domestic preparedness, and is ahead of much of the State, we are not consulted when the State chooses equipment or how they are going to distribute equipment or training in our area. The choices are not always compatible.

Hempstead, NY: We were told that the Nassau County Police Department would get the funding to equip a countywide response and that the Village would get, if anything, equipment that was left over.

Euclid, OH: To the best of my knowledge, the only benefit the police department received was eight level A first responder suits. Eight!

Stillwater, OK: The State had a plan and it was too late to influence it.

Houston, TX: The organizational structure at our COG establishes 14 votes – one for each county judge in the area, and one for the Houston Mayor. Despite our arguments that the majority of the threats/vulnerabilities are within the City – warranting a greater allocation of funds – we are out-voted by the adjacent (largely rural) counties that want to insure that their areas receive some of the funds as well.

Sugar Land, TX: In coming days and weeks we will know more about our ability to influence extent to which the county will take the lead in better coordinating hazmat capabilities in particular. It currently appears that efforts to limit redundant equipment purchases and establish a countywide team are stalled.

Seattle, WA: State funding is provided to nine regional homeland security districts. Decision-making at the regional level is NOT made with much input from Seattle. Seattle is discussing this situation with the State.

Other Views – Among the comments from officials who felt they had been given an adequate opportunity to influence how funds will be used in their city or their area:

Huntsville, AL: Officials serve on statewide committees.

Campbell, CA: There was participation in the countywide working group.

Fort Collins, CO: Fort Collins has been involved in a regional planning effort with surrounding municipalities and the County to identify those areas where funds could be best utilized. We feel confident that we have had adequate input for use of funds.

Wilmington, DE: We participate in regular strategy meetings.

Baltimore, MD: The City and counties in our region were able to agree on a plan for using our regionally allocated funding.

Hamilton, OH: The City has a seat on the Butler County Counter-Terrorism and Homeland Security Advisory Committee.

Pittsburgh, PA: Because some of the money has been given to the region, the City has been able to have input into how the money will be spent.

Austin, TX: We had substantial input to a Council of Governments which made recommendations on local and regional funding allocations.

Beaumont, TX: Each jurisdiction was allowed one representative who sat on the committee created by the COG. The objective was to determine how funds would be allocated throughout the region.

Burlington, VT: We have members on the grant screening committee.

III. Urban Area Security Initiative

On April 8 DHS announced \$100 million in funding (Part 1) for the New York City, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Seattle and Houston areas and the National Capital Region. On May 14 the agency announced an additional \$500 million in funding (Part 2) and increased the number of urban areas receiving funds to 30. Added were Buffalo, Dallas, San Diego, Sacramento, Long Beach, Boston, Denver, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Kansas City (MO), Miami, Tampa, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Newark (NJ), Phoenix, Baltimore, Honolulu, Portland (OR), New Orleans, and Memphis. State applications were due July 8.

In this program, funds go to the states and at least 80 percent must be passed through to local areas. States may keep up to 20 percent of the funds to complement state assets that will provide direct assistance to the urban area. Funds can be used for planning, equipment acquisition, training, exercises, management and administration, and operations.

The survey sought information from cities which are in, or are a mutual aid partner with, the urban areas receiving funding through this Initiative.

- Officials in more than one-third of these cities (36 percent) said they have not been involved in the state planning process for the use of these funds.
- Among those which have been involved in the planning process, 38 percent did not believe they had a satisfactory opportunity to influence how the funds will be used.

Use of Funds to Address Priorities – One-third of the cities (34 percent) report that local governments in their area will not be able to use the funds they receive to address their top security priorities. Among comments from the survey cities on their ability to use the funds to address their top security priorities:

Long Beach, CA: These funds will address critical needs.

Los Angeles, CA: We have implemented a very robust working group which includes many local governments in our area.

San Francisco, CA: San Francisco has formed an Urban Area Working Group consisting of five Bay Area counties and the State has agreed to make its 20 percent share of UASI - Part 2 funding available for regional projects identified by this group.

Chicago, IL: UASI - Part 2 funding must be shared with our core county (Cook) and is being granted to the State of Illinois, who in turn must sub-grant 80 percent to the core city (Chicago) and county. The City of Chicago would have preferred to be directly granted the funding to meet security needs, as was done for UASI - Part 1 grant funding.

Baltimore, MD: Funds will be used for equipment, overtime reimbursement, and other top priorities.

Kansas City, MO: It will allow us to address some, but not all, of our security concerns.

Newark, NJ: Six counties in New Jersey have been designated to receive these funds. The City of Newark has been designated a core city.

Cleveland, OH: Although the press releases indicated the funds were going to the cities, requiring County concurrence virtually guaranteed that funds would go to the County. Within that County process we have been represented, although the process reduces the direct access of the City to the funding.

Hillsboro, OR: Our City will be represented on the Urban Area Working Group, which will determine how and where funding will be applied within our urban area.

Pittsburgh, PA: The State of Pennsylvania decided to distribute the funds to our regional entity. The City has not yet agreed to the plan.

Dallas, TX: Funding is to be shared among five counties and the core city. The funding is insufficient.

Houston, TX: From round one, yes, because the City of Houston has complete control of the funding. It is not yet clear if round two funds will address our highest priorities, as four agencies (the City and three counties) each have veto power on the allocation of funds.

Everett, WA: Our City was not involved in the allocations of Urban Area Funds for the greater Seattle area. Our County was included in these allocations, and we represent the largest urban area in our County.

Tacoma, WA: The regional council will make the decisions.

Funds to be Received -- Asked whether they expected that their city will receive funds through this program,

- officials in 40 percent of the cities said they did not;
- those expecting funding anticipate receiving a total of \$167,500,000.

Use of Funds – Cities expecting funding under this program were asked how that funding would be used.

- Most of the cities (88 percent) will use it for equipment, for training, and for planning;
- 85 percent will use it for exercises;
- 77 percent will use it for management and administration;
- 46 percent will use it for operations.

Forty-four percent of the cities indicate that their state is exercising its option to keep a portion of this program's funds to complement state assets that assist urban areas.

Loss of Other Funds – The cities involved in the Urban Area Security Initiative were asked whether they had gotten any indication that this involvement would result in their city or area receiving less funding under other homeland security programs. Officials in one-fifth of the cities said they had. Among their comments:

Los Angeles, CA: The reaction from Los Angeles County is not favorable. Therefore, we may see a reduction in funds awarded to the City in the FY04 State Homeland Security Grant programs.

Honolulu, HI: SHSGP II was decreased. The County's share was originally 55 percent. After UASI II was announced, the County share was decreased to 40 percent.

Chicago, IL: Chicago is not receiving funding from either of the State's two Homeland Security Grant allocations, which total \$68 million.

New Orleans, LA: We have never been given any word about distribution of State 2003 Supplemental Funding.

Baltimore, MD: The State has assured the City that this will not occur; we have no means at this time to assess whether this promise has been kept.

Pittsburgh, PA: The City of Pittsburgh has not received ANY funding.

Other Views – Among the comments by officials in the cities which have gotten no indication that they will receive less funding under other homeland security programs:

Tampa, FL: We were advised by the State that our receipt of this USAI grant would have no effect on the distribution of regional domestic security task force funding.

Seattle, WA: We are watching carefully to see if the State keeps any portion of the UASI – Part 2 grant and to see if we will receive less money under other programs because it received UASI Part 1 and (part of) UASI Part 2 funding.

IV. Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Hospital Preparedness

On March 20 the Department of Health and Human Services announced separate state allocations for public health preparedness and hospital preparedness under this \$1.37 billion program. To receive the funds, the states must submit a plan to HHS outlining the public health and hospital preparedness activities it plans to undertake. States may receive up to 20 percent of their funds before their plans are approved in order to: a) support smallpox vaccination activities for health workers and emergency responders; b) support activities already approved in their 2002 state plan; c) enhance or intensify critical activities already approved in last year's state plan; and d) accelerate timelines for critical activities.

Funds to be Received – Most survey city officials anticipate that the health department or one or more hospitals which serve their residents will receive funding through this program.

- Those in 83 percent of the cities anticipate that the health department will be funded.
- Those in 82 percent anticipate that one or more hospitals will receive funding.

Opportunity to Influence Use of Funds – In response to the question of whether their city government or the health department which serves their city had an adequate opportunity to participate in the state planning process for the use of these funds,

- nearly half of the city officials (48 percent) indicated that their city government or health department did not have an adequate opportunity to participate in the planning process for use of the funds;
- the same number indicated that their state's plan did not adequately reflect their priorities for use of the funds.

Comments on State Planning Process – Among the comments from officials who felt their city did not have an adequate opportunity to participate in the state planning process for the use of these funds:

Omaha, NE: For whatever reason, the State has elected to use state personnel only. With the greater Omaha metro area having a population over 700,000, we do not agree with them.

Buffalo, NY: Erie County and New York State Health provide this.

Newport, RI: The State plan for response to health emergencies has been developed by the RI Department of Health. Funding has been distributed to our local hospital but not to our municipal agencies.

Houston, TX: Planning has not involved local governments. In some cases, the State has dictated how the funds will be used. On some specific topics, they will incorporate components from local plans. However, local governments are not provided copies of the State plan. With regard to the

laboratory components of the program, our State has dictated the specific equipment that our local government can purchase. In some cases, specifically software, they are mandating use of an antiquated package that is less sophisticated than that currently in use in our City. We objected, and they have responded by amending our grant to remove the computers we were previously funded to purchase.

Virginia Beach, VA: Comments were requested via e-mail on an already developed plan done largely at the central office level. Health districts were asked to provide input regarding roles and job descriptions of staff to be assigned to the district. There was no input to the overall plan from the ground up with an opportunity to incorporate local priorities.

Tacoma, WA: There was not much local input into the process. The State Health Department did the work.

Other Views on Planning Process – Among the comments from officials who felt their city had an adequate opportunity to participate in the state planning process for the use of these funds:

Kansas City, MO: The KCMO Health Department is actively involved in bio-terrorism planning and preparedness activities.

Trenton, NJ: The City Health Department is serving as the lead agency in Mercer County for this initiative.

Las Vegas, NV: The City's Fire/Rescue Department and the regional Clark County Health District regularly participate on the State of Nevada's public health planning projects.

Fargo, ND: Local jurisdictions did not participate in the State strategies but were given leeway in the creation of regional implementation plans.

Oklahoma City, OK: Our City/County Health is under contract with the Oklahoma State Health Department, which initiates and approves plans.

Hillsboro, OR: Our County health department and local hospitals are represented on the committees determining how funding will be used.

Nashville, TN: Metro Health and local hospitals coordinated with their State and regional counterparts through a committee.

Austin, TX: The Austin Emergency Management director, Health Department director, and a local hospital emergency manager all participate on State bio-terrorism advisory councils.

Waco, TX: We assisted in drafting the State plan, and received local, direct funding.

Provo, TX: State Health received a grant allotment that was passed to the local health departments and districts. Utah County Health submitted a written proposal, and used the grant to hire three staff members – a planner, epidemiologist, and risk communicator (Public Information Officer). They will reapply for the grant money each year of the five-year grant period. They have also obtained the equipment necessary to perform the job of planning and preparing. They have been active in coordinating efforts with City and County planners and responders. To date, Provo City has participated in two table top exercises with this group, and has noticed improved reporting and coordination of health trends in our County.

Comments on State Plan – Among the comments from officials who felt their state’s plan does not adequately reflect their city’s priorities:

Modesto, CA: The State only allows the funds to be applied to certain large ticket items. There is very little flexibility and local situations are not addressed in this program.

Louisville Metro, KY: The decision was made at the state level to spread the funds out over the health districts, and it appears that too much funding is going to areas that don't need it as much as the urban areas where the need is greatest.

Burnsville, MN: The health system is creating a separate bureaucracy and is not working within the emergency management program.

Newport, RI: The plan does not address the limited local resources available for planning and responding to these types of emergencies.

Knoxville TN: Funding and plans do not match MMRS plans.

Sugar Land, TX: The focus is at the county level.

Virginia Beach, VA: The planning was largely driven by the State plan for emergency response to a WMD/bio-terrorism scenario. All localities were given the same resources (divided equally) despite the size, population, and other locality specifics.

Other Views on State Plan – Among the comments from officials who felt their state’s plan adequately reflects their city’s priorities:

Huntsville, AL: Funding is adequate for current priorities.

San Francisco, CA: Overall, the identified focus areas that the CDC selected in the Bio-terrorism Preparedness Grant were appropriate and well chosen. We believe it has provided us with an appropriate organizational framework for our bio-terrorism preparedness program.

Wilmington, DE: The City has been identified and included in all public health department planning. The City thinks the State department plan is very aggressive and well planned.

Fort Wayne, IN: Indiana's State Health Department does a good job of coordinating its actions with local health departments.

Fargo, ND: The State brought together the necessary players in the planning process.

Trenton, NJ: As a lead agency, the City Health Department is able to influence the priorities for the use of the funds.

Las Vegas, NV: The State of Nevada Health Division has distributed funds equitably to the southern Nevada region.

Dayton, OH: The Combined Health District states their identified needs and technical assistance have been addressed with full collaboration; the City, State, and County plans agree with one another.

Oklahoma City, OK: According to City/County Health and the Oklahoma State Health Department, the local plan and State plan are consistent.

Provo, UT: This planning team in Utah County Health is doing a very thorough job and has included others in the planning effort.

V. Airport Law Enforcement Reimbursement

The Transportation Security Administration has executed Memoranda of Understanding with airport operators which provide for the reimbursement of local law enforcement costs incurred in providing security at airport checkpoints.

Among survey cities which provide law enforcement assistance to an airport,

- 37 percent report that their airport operator has not been reimbursed this year for additional law enforcement costs incurred in complying with the Memorandum of Understanding.
- Of the cities that have been reimbursed, 40 percent report that the airport operator has not provided this reimbursement to the city government.

The following comments were offered by two cities which have not been reimbursed by their airport for their law enforcement services:

San Jose, CA: Since 9/11 San Jose has expended over \$12 million in security measures at the San Jose Mineta International Airport. These measures have been mandated by the TSA. No funding has been reimbursed by the federal government.

Omaha, NE: Our main airport did participate with the TSA, but the program was ended by the feds. Many local security personnel that had augmented airport security were let go.

VI. Port Security Grant Program

The Port Security Grant Program, at \$245 million, funds security planning and projects to improve dockside and perimeter security. Funds may be used for operational activities conducted during Orange Alerts from January to April of this year, critical infrastructure security, security enhancements, training, exercises, equipment, planning, and information sharing. The grants go directly to state and local government agencies, including port authorities, and private companies. DHS has announced two rounds of port security grants B \$75 million in grants for 13 ports on May 14 and \$170 million for more than 100 ports and companies on June 12.

Officials in cities having a port (either in or adjacent to them) and receiving funding through this program were asked whether they were responsible for providing security or other services to that port.

- Just over half the cities (52 percent) said they had such responsibilities.
- Of these, 58 percent said they were not receiving funding through the program.

VII. Mass Transit Security Grant Program

This program is funded at \$65 million. On May 14 DHS announced grants through the states to the nation's 20 highest risk transit systems. States may use 20 percent of these funds to complement state assets at those system sites. Funds may be used for installation of physical barricades; area monitoring systems; integrated communications systems; prevention planning, training and exercises; and operational activities conducted during Orange Alerts from January to April of this year. Each transit system is required to conduct an assessment and preparedness plan on which to base resource allocations.

Officials in cities being served by a transit system funded through this program were asked whether they were responsible for providing security or other services to that system.

- Well over half of the cities (54 percent) said they have such responsibilities.
- Of these, 69 percent said they were not receiving funding through this Mass Transit Security program.

Forty-four percent of the cities reported that their state was exercising its option to keep a portion of the transit security funds to complement state assets at transit sites.

VIII. Emergency Management Performance Grants

On April 16 DHS announced FY 2003 state allocations for all hazards preparedness activities and emergency management under this \$165 million program. States have the flexibility to allocate funds according to risk vulnerabilities and to address the most urgent state and local needs in disaster mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery. Thirty-eight percent of the survey cities did not feel that their state sub-allocated these funds in a timely fashion.

As of August 1,

- Nearly two-thirds of the survey cities (65 percent) have neither received funds nor been notified that they will receive funds from their state under this program. The balance reported that they have received or expect to receive funds; for this group, funds received or expected total \$2,675,728.
- Well over half (55 percent) of the survey city officials report that other jurisdictions in their area have not received funding under this program that will contribute to their city's homeland security efforts.

Opportunity to Influence Use of Funds – Officials in two-thirds of the cities (67 percent) feel they were not given an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used in their city or area. Among their comments:

Fairbanks, AK: We were not given the opportunity to provide any input.

Little Rock, AR: There was no City participation in the decision-making process.

Cedar Rapids, IA: The State is only willing to work with county EMA's. We are trying to persuade them to work more closely with us.

Minneapolis, MN: The City of Minneapolis is not included in the EMPG program. It goes to the County.

Billings, MT: This grant was awarded entirely to Yellowstone County. The City does not expect to realize any benefit.

Omaha, NE: No one in Omaha/Douglas County government has been informed of the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program.

Buffalo, NY: The County controls the funding.

Mount Vernon, NY: Officials have not been given adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used in the City or specified areas because of the time constraints placed on meeting the deadline for being eligible.

Pittsburgh, PA: The Office of the Mayor has not been given an opportunity to influence how the money was spent.

Knoxville, TN: There is no consideration of use based on previous expenditures or training.

Houston, TX: Our jurisdiction has not been notified about these funds, nor invited to participate in the planning for their expenditure.

Mesquite, TX: The City has applied for EMPG funding but has been turned down due to a lack of available funds. The application for this program begins in September 2003. Due to the increase in available funds, the City will submit an application again this year.

Other Views – Among the comments from officials who felt their city had an adequate opportunity to influence how funds will be used in their city or area:

San Francisco, CA: San Francisco has flexibility in submitting an annual work plan. However, funding is determined not by the work plan but by the standard base plus census population formula.

Wilmington, DE: We participate in a bi-monthly EM meeting with State and local EM directors.

Athens, GA: GEMA held several meetings around the State to receive input on use of funds and how to distribute funds.

Louisville Metro, KY: There were extensive meetings held between FEMA Area 6, KyEM, and our local mitigation team to plan the grant request. We were told that it would be approved, but it has never been awarded.

Las Vegas, NV: The State of Nevada invites the City to submit an annual grant application for the EMPG funds. The FY2003-2004 allocations are still pending.

Hamilton, OH: The City and County have been working together with the Butler County EMA staff on disaster preparedness and recovery. The City is also represented by our own police and fire officials on fire, EMS and hazmat committees.

IX. Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program

On March 3 the Federal Emergency Management Agency announced the availability of mitigation planning grant funds for FY 2003. Each state is receiving \$248,375 for eligible state, local and tribal hazard mitigation planning; FEMA contributes up to 75 percent of the cost of approved activities, up to each state's maximum. State applications were due at the FEMA Regional Office by April 30. Forty-four percent of the survey cities do not believe that their state sub-allocated the funding in a timely fashion.

As of August 1,

- Most of the survey cities (82 percent) have neither received funds nor been notified that they will receive funds from their state under this program. The balance reported that they have received or expect to receive funds; for this group, funds received or expected total \$534,000.
- 62 percent of the survey city officials reported that other jurisdictions in their area have not received funding that will contribute to their city's homeland security efforts.

Opportunity to Influence Use of Funds – Officials in 69 percent of the cities do not feel they were given an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used in either their cities or their areas. Among their comments:

Fairbanks, AK: We were not given the opportunity to provide any input.

Bridgeport, CT: Monies were provided to all regional planning agencies and in some instances the local emergency service officials are doing most or all of the planning and receiving no funding allocation.

Honolulu, HI: The State Hazard Mitigation Officer takes the "recommendation" of the State Hazard Mitigation Forum, but does NOT involve County emergency management agencies in the selection process.

Cedar Rapids, IA: The State is only willing to work with county EMA's. We are trying to persuade them to work more closely with us.

Louisville Metro, KY: We believe that the State used this money at the state level.

Lowell, MA: We were told by the Northern Middlesex Council of Governments that they received a mitigation grant to help communities develop a mitigation plan.

Minneapolis, MN: The State picked jurisdictions arbitrarily – the County instead.

Fargo, ND: The State made decision without local input.

Waco, TX: Most funds will go through the local Council of Governments to hire a consultant to develop the mitigation plan.

Everett, WA: The grant was handed down in a very prescriptive and unilateral process.

Other Views – Among the comments from officials who felt their city had an adequate opportunity to influence how funds will be used in their city or area:

Fort Collins, CO: Fort Collins is working with Loveland, Greeley and Larimer County and received a grant in the amount of approximately \$38,000 for the development of a regional Hazard Mitigation Plan. The Colorado Office of Emergency Management was the administrator of this grant. Adequate training, support, and input opportunities were readily available.

Athens, GA: Several meetings were conducted by GEMA to receive input on how to distribute these funds.

Hamilton, OH: We were notified of the program by Butler County EMA staff and, in turn, notified certain City directors of this opportunity.

Caguas, PR: We were asked to submit a proposal to receive funds for a mitigation plan. The proposal was submitted and is in the process of approval and allocation of funds.

Provo, UT: By having the AOG involve the members of the County and cities in the region, we have all had input in the mitigation planning.

X. Community Emergency Response Teams

On May 29 DHS announced allocations to the states to train emergency managers and citizens for Community Emergency Response Teams under this \$19 million program. The goal is for CERT members to be better prepared to respond to emergency situations in their communities, and each CERT member must complete 20 hours of training on topics such as disaster preparedness, basic disaster operations, fire safety, and light search and rescue. As of August 1, citizens in half of the survey cities were participants in the CERT Program.

XI. City Involvement in State Planning Processes

The Recent Past

Guidance issued in 2000 by the former federal Office for State and Local Domestic Preparedness Support within the Justice Department required states to develop a statewide needs assessment and a three-year statewide domestic preparedness strategy in order to receive equipment, training and other resources. The survey asked city officials whether their state had involved them in the development of this assessment and strategy and whether they believed local interests – their own and others – had been fairly represented by the state in this development effort. In regard to development of the needs assessment,

- 34 percent of the survey cities reported that they had not been involved by their states in the development of the statewide assessment, and five percent did not know whether their city had been involved.
- 37 percent of the cities do not believe that local interests had been fairly represented in their states' development of needs assessments, and 11 percent don't know whether interests had been represented.

In regard to development of the domestic preparedness strategy,

- 42 percent of the survey cities were not involved in the development of their states' domestic preparedness strategies, and 10 percent did not know whether their city had been involved;
- 38 percent of the cities do not believe that local interests had been fairly represented by their state in the development of its domestic preparedness strategy, and 17 percent don't know whether interests had been represented.

The Present

On July 1, 2003 the new Office for Domestic Preparedness, now within the Department of Homeland Security, provided new guidance to states and local jurisdictions for use in updating local needs assessments and state homeland security strategies. Local jurisdictions are to submit their assessments to their state; states are to incorporate these assessments in their strategies and must submit them to ODP by December 31, 2003.

- Asked whether, as of August 1, they had been asked to submit a needs assessment to their state, 44 percent of the survey cities said they had not. Of these, 36 percent anticipate they will be asked, 18 percent anticipate they won't, and 46 percent don't know.
- Asked whether, as of August 1, they had been involved in, or contacted by their state to become involved in, the development of its homeland security strategy, just under half the cities (49 percent) said they had not. Of these, 16 percent anticipate they will be asked, 35 percent anticipate they won't, and 49 percent don't know.

The Future

The Department of Homeland Security clearly expects states to involve local governments in the development of their homeland security strategies. City officials were asked, based on recent years' experience in working with their states, what level of local involvement in the state planning process they were anticipating.

- About one-third of the survey cities (34 percent) expect to have minimal involvement in the development of their homeland security strategy, and seven percent expect no involvement at all.
- Another one-third of the cities (34 percent) anticipate some involvement in this process.
- About one-fourth of the cities (24 percent) expect substantial local involvement in the process.

Several cities expressed satisfaction with their involvement in the development of the state domestic preparedness strategy:

Huntington Beach, CA: We participate in developing the local strategy for our operating area which, in turn, goes up to the appropriate agencies at the State level.

Boise, ID: The needs of my City have been taken into consideration by the State ODP representative.

Northbrook, IL: The Illinois Terrorism Task Force is an inclusive group substantially representing multiple public and private disciplines and city, county and special purpose districts. Various subcommittees work the issues and collectively share priorities, standardization and funding revenues.

Baton Rouge, LA: The State Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness has in past years sought input from local jurisdictions in planning for the use of funds and planning initiatives. We expect that will continue.

Saint Louis, MO: The State of Missouri is working hand in hand with us to make sure we are ready to respond. They are also working on making us aware of any and all grants.

Newark, NJ: In the past we have had some involvement in the State's planning process. Currently, however, we have substantial involvement in New Jersey's development of its homeland security initiative.

Providence, RI: The City and our emergency response director are well represented on the State's homeland security and domestic preparedness subcommittees.

Virginia Beach, VA: Based upon observations, there is a broad-based process for the development of a State strategy. The City has been given opportunities for involvement in this process. The systematic nature of this contact remains unclear, however, in terms of the overall response.

Comments on Counties – Many cities commented on their state's work with counties, rather than cities, in the development of its strategy:

Oxnard, CA: Our representation is through the County terrorism working group. Our City participates, but the County OES is clearly the driving force.

San Jose, CA: The current allocation of voting rights in California's Operational Area Council unfairly deprives the cities of the population-based representation, even though the funds are distributed per capita. For example, the City of San Jose represents 54 percent of the residents that live in the County, but San Jose has no vote on the operational area council.

Tampa, FL: The State of Florida is very well organized into Regional Domestic Security Task Forces. As such, we are very active participants in threat and needs assessment, as well as prevention, mitigation, and response to area incidents. Our only concern is that funding and equipment pass through the State to the counties and then to the cities. We would prefer money and equipment be distributed directly to our City, as our needs, threats and associated demographics are unique. We cannot, however, completely disagree with the chosen method of distribution.

Cedar Rapids, IA: Rather than working with cities, the State prefers to work through counties.

Fort Wayne, IN: Indiana uses its existing emergency management architecture for the implementation of its homeland security strategy. This State architecture only extends to the county level and does not normally consider city-based requirements.

New Iberia, LA: All information/strategies/requests are routed (or not) to the municipality through the Parish (County) Office of Emergency Preparedness (OEP)...This is not an effective system. Not only are municipalities excluded from funding, we are excluded from information. While a Parish entity may appear to be a good contact point, it's not. Parish administration is not responsible for law enforcement or fire protection. They have no day-to-day experience in dealing with related issues. This system has proven to be ineffective in natural disaster situations and is not working any better in the arena of homeland security. It is disturbing that while first-response activities occur at the local level, the local level has been virtually removed from this process.

Fargo, ND: County emergency managers may have some involvement, but no direct City input has been accepted.

Trenton, NJ: The state government of New Jersey has been coordinating its activity at the county level.

Buffalo, NY: New York State deals with counties regularly. It very rarely has direct dealings with cities.

Hempstead, NY: The involvement is usually stopped at the county level. Smaller municipalities are usually told what their share, if any, will be.

Cleveland, OH: Ohio is currently sending all funds to counties. Although represented at the county level, the City itself has little direct input.

Waukesha, WI: The County is the contact point for the State, and the County does not generally contact local governments for input.

Comments on Process – Several cities' comments reflect considerable dissatisfaction with the process overall:

Little Rock, AR: There is no history of involvement by locals in State plans.

Los Angeles, CA: Our staff is communicating with our State OES/OHS on a weekly basis because of technical difficulties with the program. The assessment is very cumbersome and the online system is very unstable. The deadlines are very tight and the training was delivered way too late in the process.

Orland Park, IL: Past experience indicates that there will be little meaningful input.

Peoria, IL: Our City has recently been able to add a voting member on the Illinois Terrorism Task Force. That is one voice in a group of about 35 representatives. There are opportunities to serve on committees, but the involvement is limited. The State strategy has pretty much been decided. Specific locations are not being targeted for funding (to the extent that there is) blanket preparedness for the State to assist locals in responding.

Baltimore, MD: We find that many locals are well ahead of the State in domestic preparedness planning. The City has often had to initiate contact with the State regarding this issue.

Omaha, NE: For whatever reason, the State has elected to use State personnel only. With the greater Omaha metro area having a population over 700,000, we do not agree with this.

Las Vegas, NV: The City of Las Vegas petitioned the State of Nevada for a seat on the State's homeland security committee in February 2002, to no avail. After persistent lobbying, the State is now accepting additional applications for committee appointment. The City of Las Vegas application is pending.

Burlington, VT: There is a group formed at the State level that does not include anyone from our City.

SURVEY CITIES

Florence	AL	36,264	Carpentersville	IL	30,586
Huntsville	AL	158,216	Chicago	IL	2,896,016
Fairbanks	AK	30,224	Hanover Park	IL	38,278
Scottsdale	AZ	202,705	Hoffman Estates	IL	49,495
Little Rock	AR	183,133	Northbrook	IL	33,435
North Little Rock	AR	60,433	Oak Park	IL	52,524
Campbell	CA	38,138	Orland Park	IL	51,077
Cerritos	CA	51,488	Peoria	IL	112,936
Chino Hills	CA	66,787	Rock Island	IL	39,684
Colton	CA	47,662	Villa Park	IL	22,075
Escondido	CA	133,559	Carmel	IN	37,733
Fontana	CA	128,929	Fort Wayne	IN	205,727
Fremont	CA	203,413	Gary	IN	102,746
Huntington			Michigan City	IN	32,900
Beach	CA	189,594	Richmond	IN	39,124
Long Beach	CA	461,522	Cedar Rapids	IA	120,758
Los Angeles	CA	3,694,820	Topeka	KS	122,377
Modesto	CA	188,856	Louisville Metro	KY	694,000
Norwalk	CA	103,298	Baton Rouge	LA	227,818
Oxnard	CA	170,358	New Iberia	LA	32,623
Pomona	CA	149,473	New Orleans	LA	484,674
Salinas	CA	151,060	Portland	ME	64,249
San Francisco	CA	776,733	Baltimore	MD	651,154
San Jose	CA	894,943	Boston	MA	589,141
Santa Barbara	CA	92,325	Brockton	MA	94,304
Sunnyvale	CA	131,760	Lowell	MA	105,167
Thousand Oaks	CA	117,005	Dearborn	MI	97,775
Upland	CA	68,393	Detroit	MI	951,270
West Hollywood	CA	35,716	Kalamazoo	MI	77,145
Fort Collins	CO	118,652	Livonia	MI	100,545
Wheat Ridge	CO	32,913	Taylor	MI	65,868
Bridgeport	CT	139,529	Burnsville	MN	60,220
Naugatuck	CT	30,989	Minneapolis	MN	382,618
New Britain	CT	71,538	Rochester	MN	85,806
Wilmington	DE	72,664	Natchez	MS	18,464
Lauderhill	FL	57,585	Kansas City	MO	441,545
Miami	FL	362,470	St. Louis	MO	348,189
Miami Beach	FL	87,933	Billings	MT	89,847
Pembroke Pines	FL	137,427	Lincoln	NE	225,581
Port St. Lucie	FL	88,769	Omaha	NE	390,007
Tampa	FL	303,447	Henderson	NV	175,381
Athens	GA	101,489	Las Vegas	NV	478,434
Augusta	GA	199,775	Reno	NV	180,480
Honolulu	HI	423,475	Manchester	NH	107,006
Boise	ID	185,787	Elizabeth	NJ	120,568
Arlington Heights	IL	76,031	Linden	NJ	39,394
Bolingbrook	IL	56,321	New Brunswick	NJ	48,573

Newark	NJ	273,546	DeSoto	TX	37,646
Piscataway	NJ	50,482	Euless	TX	46,005
Trenton	NJ	85,403	Grand Prairie	TX	127,427
Willingboro	NJ	33,008	Houston	TX	1,953,631
Alamogordo	NM	35,582	Laredo	TX	176,576
Albany	NY	95,658	McKinney	TX	54,369
Buffalo	NY	292,648	Mesquite	TX	124,523
Hempstead	NY	56,554	San Antonio	TX	1,144,646
Mount Vernon	NY	68,381	Sugar Land	TX	63,328
New Rochelle	NY	72,182	Waco	TX	113,726
New York	NY	8,008,278	Wichita Falls	TX	104,197
Niagara Falls	NY	55,593	Provo	UT	105,166
Rochester	NY	219,773	Burlington	VT	38,889
Winston-Salem	NC	185,776	Portsmouth	VA	100,565
Fargo	ND	90,599	Virginia Beach	VA	425,257
Saipan	MP	60,000	Everett	WA	91,488
Akron	OH	217,074	Redmond	WA	45,256
Cleveland	OH	478,403	Renton	WA	53,840
Columbus	OH	711,470	Seattle	WA	563,374
Dayton	OH	166,179	Spokane	WA	195,629
Euclid	OH	52,717	Tacoma	WA	193,556
Gahanna	OH	32,636	Charleston	WV	53,421
Hamilton	OH	60,690	New Berlin	WI	38,220
Kettering	OH	57,502	Waukesha	WI	64,825
Lakewood	OH	56,646	Cheyenne	WY	53,011
Lima	OH	40,081			
University Heights	OH	14,146			
Warren	OH	46,832			
Westlake	OH	31,719			
Edmond	OK	68,315			
Midwest City	OK	54,088			
Oklahoma City	OK	506,132			
Stillwater	OK	39,065			
Hillsboro	OR	70,186			
Medford	OR	63,154			
Allentown	PA	106,632			
Pittsburgh	PA	334,563			
Caguas	PR	140,502			
Cidra	PR	42,753			
Newport	RI	26,475			
Providence	RI	173,618			
Rock Hill	SC	49,765			
Rapid City	SD	59,607			
Knoxville	TN	173,890			
Memphis	TN	650,100			
Nashville	TN	569,891			
Austin	TX	656,562			
Beaumont	TX	113,866			
Dallas	TX	1,188,580			
Denton	TX	80,537			