

The United States Conference of Mayors  
Homeland Security Monitoring Center

Second Mayors' Report to the Nation:

# TRACKING FEDERAL HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDS SENT TO THE 50 STATE GOVERNMENTS

A 215-City/50-State Survey



THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Sponsored by





## **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

The U.S. Conference of Mayors is the official nonpartisan organization of cities with populations of 30,000 or more. There are 1,139 such cities in the country today, each represented in the Conference by its chief elected official, the Mayor.



### **Special Thanks to our sponsor, SentryPoints**

SentryPoints sets a new standard in public safety management technology with the nation's first fully integrated response management system, including Threat and Vulnerability Assessment and Prioritization. SentryPoints' Response Management/Monitoring System includes agency-specific systems for Law Enforcement, EMS, Fire/Rescue, and Municipal Services. Taken together, these RM/MS elements provide an affordable, distributed and expandable system for municipalities to achieve near real-time position reporting and event tracking within each agency and among several agencies. More information about SentryPoints can be found on-line at [sentrypointslc.net](http://sentrypointslc.net).

This report was prepared for The U.S. Conference of Mayors by City Policy Associates in Washington, D.C. This report can be found on The U.S. Conference of Mayors website at [usmayors.org](http://usmayors.org).

## FOREWORD

On September 17 last year, in concurrent press conferences in New York City and Los Angeles, The U.S. Conference of Mayors released its *First Mayors' Report to the Nation: Tracking Federal Homeland Security Funds Sent to the 50 State Governments*. The report included information on the flow of federal homeland security funding to cities ranging in size from 14,000 to eight million located in all 50 states. It showed that, as of August 1 – the time by which the states were to pass federal funds through to localities under the largest local preparedness programs – few cities had actually received funding, and large percentages had neither received funds nor been notified that they would. It showed that, from the perspective of city officials, the system created to deliver the homeland security funds through the states to local first responders in a timely fashion was not accomplishing that goal.

The September survey report was the first product of the Conference's Homeland Security Monitoring Center which was established in June following the organization's 2003 Annual Meeting in Denver. The Center's mission is to closely monitor the federal plan for the distribution of the homeland security funds through the states to determine whether that plan is being followed, whether it is performing adequately, and whether improvements can be made. In that Denver meeting, the President of the Conference of Mayors, Hempstead (NY) Mayor James Garner, made it clear that too much is at stake for America's homeland security system to be permitted to perform below its fullest capacity.

The recommendation to create the Center was made by the Conference's Homeland Security Task Force, which is co-chaired by Baltimore Mayor Martin O'Malley and Sugar Land (TX) Mayor David Wallace. The survey itself was developed by a leadership team comprised of Mayors O'Malley and Wallace; Elizabeth (NJ) Mayor J. Christian Bollwage, who chairs our Criminal and Social Justice Committee; Gary (IN) Mayor Scott King, who chairs our Mayors and Police Chiefs Task Force; and Louisville Metro Mayor Jerry Abramson, a Past President of the organization.

Because the September survey showed that many of the mayors' worst fears about the homeland security funding system were being realized, and because so many of the city officials surveyed were citing problems, the leadership team determined that a follow-up survey should be conducted in time for results to be released in January during the Conference's 2004 Winter Meeting in Washington.

The follow-up survey that was developed and sent to the nation's mayors in early December asked for basically the same information on the same set of 10 federal programs covered in the first survey. It finds that, five months later, while some additional cities have received FY 2003 funding through some of the programs, most have not. For example, by the end of 2003, more than three out of four survey cities had not received funding through the Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure program. While that's an improvement over the 90 percent of cities not funded in August, it continues to fall far short of meeting this nation's goal of homeland security for our cities. As another example, nearly two-thirds of the survey cities had not received FY 2003 State Domestic Preparedness funding by the end of the year – an improvement over the 80 percent not funded in August, but still far short of an acceptable level.

Unfortunately, the survey also found that, for some programs, we have actually lost ground since August: Larger percentages of eligible cities do not expect to be helped through the Urban Area Security Initiative and are dissatisfied with their involvement in their state's planning process; larger percentages report that their airport operators have not been reimbursed for the additional law enforcement costs associated with airport security; larger percentages contributing to port security say they are not being

funded through the Post Security Grant Program; and larger percentages report they are not receiving funds for their “highest risk” transit systems through the Mass Transit Security Grant Program.

Mayors were asked to respond to this second survey by late December, at about the time that the nation’s terrorism threat level was elevated to Orange, or High, meaning that cities would be increasing their vigilance and spending even more than usual on homeland security activities. This reminder of the need to be prepared to move immediately to higher security levels may have been one of the reasons that 28 percent more cities wanted to participate in this follow-up survey on homeland security funding.

Again, too much is at stake for our nation’s homeland security system to be allowed to perform below its fullest capacity. The early evidence, unfortunately, is that this is happening, and that the homeland security funding needed in our cities is being diluted and delayed.

Today the nation’s mayors stand with our first responders **B** the fire, police, emergency managers and public health officials, men and women **B** who risk their lives day and night. We stand ready to work with the White House and the Congress to fix what we believe to be a flawed delivery system of federal homeland security funds. Mayors, from the beginning, have held the position that federal homeland security funds should be sent directly to cities 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

January 22, 2004

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Foreword</b>	
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Survey Findings</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>FY 2003 Funding</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>State Domestic Preparedness</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Urban Area Security Initiative</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Hospital Preparedness</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Airport Law Enforcement Reimbursement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Port Security Grant Program</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Mass Transit Security Grant Program</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Emergency Management Performance Grants</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Community Emergency Response Teams</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>City Involvement in State Planning Processes</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>FY 2004 Funding</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>State and Local First Responder Programs</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Urban Area Security Initiative</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Metro Rail Transit Grants</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Comparative Survey Findings – FY 2003 Funding     Survey Cities</b>	

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Nearly a year-and-a-half after the September 11 attacks on the nation, the Congress enacted appropriations bills that funded several state and local homeland security programs. These bills did not provide for the direct federal funding of cities that mayors had aggressively sought; instead, they created a federal system for the distribution of homeland security funds that generally operates through the states. The bills did, however, include a timetable to be followed by the new Department of Homeland Security and by the states in distributing the homeland security funds to localities.

In June 2003, during the annual meeting of The U.S. Conference of Mayors in Denver, the organization's leadership declared that, because of the importance to the nation of the homeland security system, the federal plan for the distribution of funds must be closely monitored to determine whether it is being followed, whether it is performing adequately, and whether improvements can be made. In that meeting, the mayors called for the creation of a Homeland Security Monitoring Center within the Conference.

### **FIRST SURVEY**

The first activity of the new Center was a survey of the nation's principal cities in all 50 states and Puerto Rico on 1) the FY 2003 funding they were receiving or expecting 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. 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 in the field. These programs provided funding for: Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure; State Domestic Preparedness; Urban Area Security Initiative; Public Health and Hospital Preparedness; Airport Law Enforcement Reimbursement; Port Security Grants; Mass Transit Security Grants; Emergency Management Performance Grants; Pre-Disaster Mitigation; and Community Emergency Response Teams.

The Conference of Mayors published the results of its 168-city assessment of the flow of federal homeland security funding on September 17. The survey report described delays in the funding of cities and inadequate involvement of local officials in the development of state plans for the distribution and use of the funds. Under the \$1.5 billion Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure funding program, for example, 90 percent of the cities had not received any funding, and officials in 58 percent of the cities said they had not been given an adequate opportunity to influence their states' policies on how program funds could be used. Under another important initiative – the \$556 million State Domestic Preparedness funding program – 80 percent of the cities had not received any funding. Three out of four said that other jurisdictions in their area had received funding under this program, with the largest group – 89 percent – saying this funding had gone to their county government.

### **FOLLOW-UP SURVEY**

In the view of the leadership of the Conference of Mayors, the results of the first survey confirmed many of the mayors' worst fears about the federal homeland security funding system. Because problems were cited by such large percentages of officials surveyed, the Conference's leaders determined that a follow-up survey would be necessary to gauge whether experience over an additional five months would show improvement in the performance of the funding system. The follow-up survey, sent to the mayors on December 4, sought basically the same information on the same 10 federal programs covered

in the first survey. For the follow-up survey, mayors were asked for information on the programs as of December 15 – effectively the end of 2003. While the first survey covered the flow of FY 2003 federal funds, the follow-up survey asked for information on the flow of FY 2003 funding for all programs, and for information on FY 2004 funding which had been announced prior to the time the survey was conducted.

## **SURVEY FINDINGS**

Survey responses were received from 215 cities representing every state in the nation and Puerto Rico. Information was submitted by cities as small as Lincolnwood (IL), population 12,359, and as large as New York City. The average population of survey cities is 223,342.

### **Cities' FY 2003 Funding Experience at End of 2003**

#### ***Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure -- \$1.5 Billion***

- Officials in 76 percent of the survey cities had not received this first responder/critical infrastructure funding through their states.
- Thirty-one percent of the cities had been notified that funds would be received, but 45 percent had neither received funds nor been notified that they would.
- Officials in 59 percent of the cities reported that other jurisdictions in their area had received first responder/critical infrastructure funding that would contribute to their cities' security efforts. The largest group of these officials (79 percent) said this funding was going to their county; 56 percent said it was going to one or more area cities.
- In 59 percent of the cities, officials said they had not been given an adequate opportunity to influence their states in regard to how these funds could be used in their cities.
- Officials in 37 percent of the cities said the allowable uses of the funds will not address their top security priorities.

#### ***State Domestic Preparedness -- \$556 Million***

- Officials in 64 percent of the survey cities had not received this domestic preparedness funding through their states.
- Forty-one percent of the cities had been notified that funds would be received, but 23 percent had neither received funds nor been notified that they would.
- Officials in just over three-fourths of the cities (76 percent) reported that other jurisdictions in their area had received domestic preparedness funding that would contribute to their cities' security efforts. The largest group of these officials (80 percent) said this funding was going to their county; 52 percent said it was going to one or more area cities.
- In 49 percent of the cities, officials said they had not been given an adequate opportunity to influence their states in regard to how these funds could be used in their cities.
- 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 -- \$600 Million***

- In 41 percent of the cities which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, the 30 urban areas receiving funding through the UASI, officials do not expect to share in the UASI funds.
- Officials in 46 percent of the cities said they have not been involved in the state planning process for the use of the UASI funds.

- Among those involved in the planning process, 23 percent do not believe they had a satisfactory opportunity to influence how the funds will be used.
- Thirty-seven percent of the cities do not believe that local governments in their area will be able to use the funds they receive to address their top security priorities.
- Sixty-three percent of the cities say that their state is exercising its option to keep a portion of the UASI funds to complement state assets that assist urban areas.
- Officials in 15 percent of the cities say they have gotten an indication that their city or area would receive less funding under other homeland security programs because they are receiving UASI funds.

***Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Hospital Preparedness -- \$1.4 Billion***

- In 81 percent of the survey cities, officials anticipate that the health department serving their residents will be funded through this program; officials in three-fourths of the cities expect that one or more of their hospitals will receive funding.
- Officials in 41 percent of the cities 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.
- Officials in 40 percent of the cities do not believe their state’s plan adequately reflects their priorities for the use of these funds.

***Airport Law Enforcement Reimbursement***

- In survey cities which provide law enforcement assistance to an airport, 46 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, 35 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 half of the survey cities having a port that is receiving funding through this program say they were responsible for providing security or other services to that port.
- Of these cities, 64 percent say they are not receiving funding through the program.

***Mass Transit Security Grant Program -- \$65 Million***

- Officials in over half of the survey cities (51 percent) being served by one of the 20 “highest risk” transit systems funded through this program say they are responsible for providing security or other services to that system.
- Among these cities, more than three out of four (76 percent) say they are not receiving funding through this program.
- Officials in half of the cities say their state is exercising its option to keep a portion of the program funds to complement state assets at transit sites.

***Emergency Management Performance Grants -- \$165 Million***

- Fifty-nine percent of the survey cities have neither received emergency management funds from their states nor been notified that they would receive them.



- Officials in 53 percent of the cities report that other jurisdictions in their area have not received funding through this program that would contribute to their cities' security efforts.
- Officials in 55 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.

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

- More than three out of four of the survey cities (76 percent) have neither received pre-disaster mitigation funds from their states nor been notified that they would receive them.
- Officials in 64 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 60 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***

- Citizen volunteers in 52 percent of the survey cities were participating in a CERT Program, receiving 20 hours of training on disaster preparedness, basic disaster operations, fire safety and light search and rescue.

***City Involvement in State Planning Processes***

- Officials in 22 percent of the survey cities said they had not been asked to submit a needs assessment to their state.
- In 37 percent of the cities, officials said they have not been involved in, or been contacted by the state to become involved in, the development of the state homeland security strategy. Among these cities, 26 percent do not expect to be involved.
- Among the officials in the 63 percent of the cities which have been involved in, or have been contacted to be involved in, the development of their state's homeland security strategy, 24 percent anticipate minimal involvement in the state planning process, 38 percent expect some involvement, and 38 percent anticipate substantial involvement.

***Cities' FY 2004 Funding Experience at End of 2003***

***State and Local First Responder Programs -- \$2.2 Billion***

- Sixty percent of the survey cities had not been notified that they would receive this first responder/critical infrastructure funding through their states.
- Officials in 46 percent of the cities report that other jurisdictions in their area would receive first responder/critical infrastructure funding that could contribute to security efforts in their cities. The largest group of these officials (76 percent) reports that this funding is going to their county; 61 percent say it is going to one or more area cities.
- In 43 percent of the cities, officials do not expect to be given an adequate opportunity to influence how these funds could be used in their city.
- Officials in 41 percent of the cities say the allowable uses of the funds will not address their top security priorities.

### ***Urban Area Security Initiative -- \$675 Million***

- In one-third of the survey cities which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, the 50 urban areas receiving funding through the UASI, officials do not expect to share in the UASI funds.
- Officials in 44 percent of the cities say they have not been involved in the state planning process for the use of the funds.
- Among those involved in the planning process, 18 percent do not believe they are getting a satisfactory opportunity to influence how the funds will be used.
- Twenty-eight percent of the cities do not believe that local governments in their area will be able to use the funds they receive to address their top security priorities.
- Nearly three-fourths (74 percent) of the cities say their state is exercising its option to keep a portion of the UASI funds to complement state assets that assist urban areas.
- Officials in 12 percent of the cities say they have gotten an indication that their city or area would receive less funding under other homeland security programs because they are receiving UASI funds.

### ***Metro Rail Transit Grants -- \$50 Million***

- Officials in 56 percent of the survey cities being served by one of the 30 transit systems funded through this program say they are responsible for providing security or other services to that system.
- Among these cities, 71 percent say they are not receiving funding through this program.
- Officials in 58 percent of the cities say their state is exercising its option to keep a portion of the program funds to complement state assets at transit sites.



## **INTRODUCTION**

Shortly after the September 11 attacks on the nation, The U.S. Conference of Mayors brought to Washington more than 200 mayors, police and fire chiefs, emergency managers, and public health officials. This group drafted the organization's "National Action Plan for Safety and Security in America's Cities," which called for a federal block grant that would provide homeland security funding directly to cities – not through the states – to help meet local needs for police and fire overtime, personnel training, communications and rescue equipment, and security measures to protect airports, ports, utilities, public transit, and other critical infrastructure.

Nearly a year-and-a-half later the Congress enacted appropriations bills that funded several state and local homeland security programs. These bills did not provide for the direct federal funding of cities that mayors had aggressively sought; instead, they created a federal system for the distribution of homeland security funds that generally operates through the states. The bills did, however, include a timetable to be followed by the new Department of Homeland Security and by the states in distributing the homeland security funds to localities.

Many mayors had been concerned about the state handling of their homeland security funding based on past experience in working with their states on other public service programs. Based on this experience, many feared that funds needed in cities – on the front lines of homeland security – would be diluted and delayed. Many feared that they would not have a voice in deciding how the funds could be used in their cities, or whether the funds would enable them to address their greatest security needs.

An overriding concern of mayors was that, in the new post-9/11 world, the nation's need for a streamlined system to get homeland security funds to first responders in cities was actually being addressed by a much more traditional system which is inclined to view counties, not cities, as the keys to emergency preparedness and response.

### **HOMELAND SECURITY MONITORING CENTER**

In June 2003, during the annual meeting of The U.S. Conference of Mayors in Denver, the organization's leadership declared that, because of the importance to the nation of the homeland security system, the federal plan for the distribution of funds must be closely monitored to determine whether it is being followed, whether it is performing adequately, and whether improvements can be made. In that meeting, the mayors called for the creation of a Homeland Security Monitoring Center within the Conference.

It was determined that the first activity of the new Center 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 were receiving or expecting 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. The survey of cities in all 50 states and Puerto Rico would also provide 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 first survey were those for which applications had been solicited by the federal government through late July – the time at which the survey was in the field. These programs provided funding for:

- Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure
- State Domestic Preparedness
- Urban Area Security Initiative
- Public Health and Hospital Preparedness
- Airport Law Enforcement Reimbursement
- Port Security Grants
- Mass Transit Security Grants
- Emergency Management Performance Grants
- Pre-Disaster Mitigation
- Community Emergency Response Teams

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.

## **FINDINGS OF FIRST 50-STATE SURVEY**

The Conference of Mayors published the results of its first assessment of the flow of federal homeland security funding through the states to the nation's cities on September 17. The survey report, released by Conference leaders in concurrent press conferences in New York City and Los Angeles, was based on information provided by 168 cities ranging in size from 14,000 to 8 million.

Among the major findings of the survey for the \$1.5 billion Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure program which requires that states pass through 80 percent of the first responder money and 50 percent of the critical infrastructure money to local governments within 45 days of receiving it from the federal government:

- As of August 1 – the pass-through deadline – 90 percent of the cities had not received any funds under this program from their states. Thirty-seven percent had been told that funds would be received, but 53 percent had neither received funds nor been notified that they would.
- Two-thirds of the cities said that other jurisdictions in their area had received funding that could contribute to their security. The largest group – 85 percent – said this funding had gone to counties.
- 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 30 percent of the cities, officials said the allowable uses of the funds would not address their top security priorities.

Among the findings for the \$556 million State Domestic Preparedness program which requires that states pass through 80 percent of funds for equipment, exercises, training and planning to local governments within 45 days of receiving them from the federal government:

- As of August 1, 80 percent of the survey cities had not received any funds under this program from their states. About half had been notified that funds would be received, but 29 percent had neither received funds nor been notified that they would.
- Three-fourths of the cities said that other jurisdictions in their area had received funding through this program, with the largest group – 89 percent – saying this funding had gone to counties.

Among the findings for the \$600 million Urban Area Security Initiative which is intended to focus federal funding in 30 high threat urban areas, and which requires that states pass through at least 80 percent of the funds to the cities which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, the 30 urban areas:

- Officials in 40 percent of the survey cities said they did not expect to receive funds under this program.
- Well over one-third of the survey cities said they had not been involved in the state planning process for the use of these funds. Of those who had been involved in this process, 38 percent do not believe they had a satisfactory opportunity to influence how the funds will be used.

The survey report contained similar assessments of cities' experience with the other seven programs examined. It also presented scores of comments by officials in the survey cities on their relationships with their state homeland security officials, and on their efforts to obtain the kinds of resources they need to meet their unique local security needs.

## **DESIGN OF SECOND 50-STATE SURVEY**

In the view of the leadership of the Conference of Mayors, the results of the first survey of cities confirmed many of the mayors' worst fears about the federal homeland security funding system – among them, fears that the funding for first responders would not be delivered in a timely fashion, that the funding would not flow through the kind of streamlined system that meets first responder needs, and that local officials were not getting adequate opportunities to influence how federal funds managed by the states could be used in their cities, with the result that the resources provided were frequently not the resources needed.

Because the problems were cited by such large percentages of officials surveyed, the leadership of the Conference determined that a follow-up survey would be necessary to gauge whether additional experience over time would show improvement in the performance of the funding system. Conference leaders believed that a survey of cities' experience through the end of 2003 – a period of approximately five months following the August 1 cut-off date of the first survey – would accomplish this, and that a report covering the follow-up survey results should be released during the organization's 2004 Winter Meeting, January 21-23 in Washington, where more than 250 mayors would be assembled, and where homeland security would be a top agenda issue.

The follow-up survey, sent to the mayors on December 4, sought basically the same information on the same 10 federal programs covered in the first survey. For the follow-up survey, mayors were asked for information on the programs as of December 15 – effectively the end of 2003. While the first survey covered the flow of FY 2003 federal funds, the follow-up survey asked for information on the flow of FY 2003 funds, and for information on FY 2004 funding which had been announced prior to the time the survey was conducted.

## **SURVEY RESPONDENTS**

Survey responses were received from 215 cities representing every state in the nation and Puerto Rico. Information was submitted by cities as small as 12,359 (Lincolnwood, IL) and by the nation's largest population centers – New York City (8 million), Los Angeles (3.7 million), Chicago (2.9 million), Miami-Dade County (2 million), and San Antonio (1.14 million).

Cities with populations up to 100,000 comprise the largest group of respondents (126); cities in the 100,000-200,000 population range comprise the next largest group (50). Twenty respondents are in the 200,000-500,000 range, and 14 are between 500,000 and one million. The populations of all survey cities average 223,342.

States with the largest numbers of respondents are California (30 cities), Texas (16 cities), Illinois (12 cities), Massachusetts (11 cities), and Ohio (10 cities).

The appendices to this report contain 1) a comparison of selected findings of the first survey and the follow-up survey, and 2) a list of the survey cities.

For each of the findings reported in this document, calculations are based on the number of cities responding to individual survey questions. Within individual survey items, percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

# SURVEY FINDINGS

## FY 2003 FUNDING

### Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure

*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, 2003. States were required to submit their applications by May 30, and the Department of Homeland Security 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 had been met.*

*Under this program, funds may be used by local governments for equipment acquisition, training, exercises, and planning.*

#### Funds Received

Survey city officials were asked whether, by the end of December, their governments had received funds from their state under this program, or whether they had been notified that they would receive funds.

- 76 percent reported that they had not received these funds from their states.
- Of these, 31 percent have been notified that funds will be received, and 45 percent had neither received funds nor been notified that they would.
- 24 percent reported that they had received funds.

#### Other Jurisdictions

Officials in 59 percent of the survey cities reported that other jurisdictions in their area had received funding that could contribute to their cities' homeland security efforts. Of these,

- 79 percent said this funding is going to the county in which their city is located;
- 56 percent said it is going to another city, or to other cities;
- 43 percent said it is going to another county, or to other counties;
- 38 percent said it is going to a regional agency or organization;
- 26 percent said it is going to other agencies or organizations.

Thirty-one percent of the officials said that some of the funding going to other jurisdictions is being sub-allocated to their city.

#### Use of Funds

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



- 93 percent of survey city officials said equipment purchase;
- 44 percent said training;
- 38 percent said exercises;
- 32 percent said planning.

### **Opportunity to Influence Use of Funds**

Officials in 59 percent of the survey cities said they were not given an adequate opportunity to influence use of the funds in their city; those in 41 percent of the cities 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 had no input in this process.

*New Haven, CT:* Decisions are made at the State level, as that is where funds are disbursed.

*Miami-Dade County, FL:* There was limited input from local jurisdictions.

*Port St. Lucie, FL:* The information regarding this funding was not communicated to the proper personnel, and not on a timely basis – often after the deadline had passed and funding was received at the regional level. No input was solicited from local municipal government.

*Smyrna, GA:* The State works with the counties and the cities are left out.

*Niles, IL:* All major decisions are made by State officials.

*Gary, IN:* We disagree with the formula and award process. Funding should be allocated to cities according to threat assessment.

*Alexandria, LA:* When a regional meeting was planned, this administration was not notified. We learned of this meeting (in the *Alexandria Daily Town Talk*) the day after it was held.

*Fitchburg, MA:* Every police and fire official felt there should have been training money to go along with the money for equipment.

*Detroit, MI:* Eligible spending criteria were pre-determined without input from our jurisdiction.

*Hempstead, NY:* The State decided what would be bought and distributed to the counties to distribute to the cities, towns and villages.

*Lawton, OK:* We were notified how much money was allocated and how it could be expended. There was no input prior to allocation.

*Redmond, WA:* The State passes on funding to the regional level (King County), which is considered local government. Funds are not passed on directly to the cities (other than Seattle) in this region.

*Seattle, WA:* Decision-making at the regional homeland security district level (County level) is made without input from the City.

## Security Priorities

Thirty-seven percent of the cities receiving funds indicated that the uses of funds permitted will not address their top security priorities. Many of the comments offered by officials elaborate on this, and on the inadequacy of the funding available. Among these:

*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.

*Santa Ana, CA:* There is no money for prevention (i.e., intelligence, investigation, etc.).

*Santa Barbara, CA:* Critical Infrastructure funds were used to reimburse local governments for overtime security expenses.

*New Haven, CA:* We have been notified of overtime reimbursement to the City for the onset of the Iraq war only.

*Jacksonville, FL:* As a previous "Nunn-Lugar-funded City," our top priorities are not PPE, detection or mass decontamination equipment; our priorities have to do with increasing our prevention efforts through medical surveillance, law enforcement intelligence and uniformed presence.

*Frankfort, KY:* A majority of the cities' security concerns deal with stopping an event before it happens. As of now, we are only purchasing equipment (e.g., hazmat equipment) to respond after an event occurs.

*Louisville Metro, KY:* Funding doesn't adequately address interoperability and infrastructure needs.

*Baltimore, MD:* Critical Infrastructure funds were used to reimburse personnel costs (overtime) associated with national Orange alerts.

*Manchester, NH:* The level of funding does not allow the City of Manchester to address its top security priorities.

*Henderson, NV:* Our State Homeland Security Committee fails to interpret the ODP requirements appropriately, therefore negating some valid requests. Furthermore...they re-prioritize grant items we submit.

*New York, NY:* New York City addressed several critical needs through this grant program. However, City 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.

*Newport, RI:* Equipment needs are being addressed with these funds but our lack of training remains our biggest obstacle to effective preparedness.

*Nashville, TN:* It only begins to address a few security issues, but no significant infrastructure protection.

*Murray City, UT:* These monies were used to purchase response and mitigation equipment. We still need training, exercise, and pre-event infrastructure monies.

*Chesapeake, VA:* Funds are insufficient to protect critical infrastructure such as the City's reservoirs.

*Seattle, WA:* Funds will not be available to address cyber security issues.

*Vancouver, WA:* Top priorities include FTE for information/intelligence sharing, but these were not included.

### **Allocation Criteria**

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

- 35 percent of the survey cities said population density;
- 27 percent said presence of critical infrastructure;
- 27 percent said existence of potential threat;
- 10 percent identified other criteria used by the states, including base plus population, regional priorities and/or approach, needs assessment, the number of first responders, and a competitive state grant process;
- 28 percent did not know what criteria their state used to allocate the funds.

### **State Domestic Preparedness**

*State allocations for this \$566 million program were announced March 7, 2003 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.*

### **Funds Received**

City officials were asked whether, by the end of December, their government had received funds from their state through this program, or whether they had been notified that they would receive funds.

- 64 percent had not received funds.
- Of these, 41 percent had been notified that funds would be received, and 23 percent had neither received funds nor been notified that they would.
- 37 percent reported that they had received funds.

### **Other Jurisdictions**

Officials in more than three-fourths of the survey cities (76 percent) reported that other jurisdictions in their area had received funding that would contribute to their cities' homeland security efforts. Of these,

- 80 percent said this funding is going to the county in which their city is located;
- 52 percent said it is going to another city or to other cities;
- 42 percent said it is going to another county or to other counties;
- 43 percent said it is going to a regional agency or organization;
- 23 percent said it is going to other agencies or organizations.

Thirty-six percent of the officials said that some of the funding going to other jurisdictions is being sub-allocated to their city.

### **Use of Funds**

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

- 98 percent of survey city officials said equipment purchase;
- 48 percent said training;
- 42 percent said exercises;
- 37 percent said planning.

### **Opportunity to Influence Use of Funds**

Officials in 49 percent of the cities felt they were not given an adequate opportunity to influence use of the funds in their city. Among their comments:

*Pomona, CA:* We were told by the (State) Board what we could order.

*San Francisco, CA:* Grant requirements specified specific categories, equipment lists, etc. There was little flexibility for the jurisdiction to "think outside the box." Planning funds were limited.

*San Jose, CA:* The approval authority in California for non-UASI cities is based on a county-controlled committee of five representatives. The approval authority consists of the county sheriff, county health director, county fire chief, a member of the police chiefs' association (city), a member of the fire chiefs' association (city). This system does not give equal representation to first responders in cities.

*Santa Ana, CA:* We were not asked specifically how the funds should be allocated or spent. This is the fundamental problem. The red tape and limitations on how the funds are distributed represent perhaps the epitome of bureaucracy.

*Rockford, IL:* The budget process for the State is through committee recommendations, and our City has very little input to the committees.

*Louisville Metro, KY:* We were given specific guidelines and a list to select from that was created by a State committee on which we were not included.

*Peabody, MA:* The State dictated which categories the funds were to be used for.

*East Orange, NJ:* The amount requested was reduced without reason or discussion.

*Elizabeth, NJ:* Apparently the State has offered Union County a restricted list of equipment to be funded for local jurisdictions which does not necessarily meet our needs.

*Dayton, OH:* Monies are sent by the State to the County EMA. The City of Dayton contains the bulk of the potential threats. The dollars should go directly to the jurisdiction with the greatest threat to manage locally, and to provide a system of allocation for an entire region.

*Gahanna, OH:* We made written requests to the County, but the Committee decided on the priorities, and the County made the final decision.

*Knoxville, TN:* The County executive made the decision on allocation of funds. Requested items were reviewed by TEMA and limited by the "authorized equipment" list.

*Waukesha, WI:* The County asks each organization (fire, police, health department, etc.) to apply, and then some unknown process is used to select who gets funded.

## **Security Priorities**

Forty percent of the cities receiving funds indicate the uses of funds permitted will not address their top security priorities. Among their comments:

*Little Rock, AR:* Training is needed, and funds for administrative costs.

*Corona, CA:* The list does not address local needs. The list addresses anticipated terrorism at highest level of risk.

*Long Beach, CA:* The funds, as passed through the Operational Area, will only partially meet the needs of Long Beach. The airport and the port are critical components of this process.

*Pomona, CA:* We were required to have a minimal level of PPE before we could look at other equipment categories. Law enforcement was at a disadvantage because we had to meet that requirement. Also, public works responders were left out.

*Porterville, CA:* Our top priority is adequate staffing of police and fire.

*Fairfield, CT:* Wrong needs are being met. We need core equipment and uniforms. We have received only in-kind equipment.

*Niles, IL:* We would like an allocation of funding to upgrade our communications equipment and communications center.

*Gary, IN:* The funding is inadequate for our top priorities.

*Baton Rouge, LA:* There is no latitude in spending.

*Springfield, MA:* The programs that disseminate the grant funds to the cities and towns are very specific about how the funds may be used. Also, the cities are asked to compete for these funds, oftentimes with other needy communities. These funds must be spent by the cities and reimbursed after the fact.

*Bowie, MD:* Our request for funds to help secure our water supply was turned down. Our police officers (County officers under contract to the City) have not received any extra training or equipment from the State or County. Any training/equipment they receive will come from our City budget.

*Bloomington, MN:* Bomb squad equipment and training were funded, but communication concerns hold a higher priority. Funds are received on a reimbursement basis.

*Brooklyn Park, MN:* We need people, not equipment.

*St. Louis, MO:* We have a large number of security priorities and these uses address a portion, but not all.

*Niagara Falls, NY:* Equipment needs are met, to a degree, but additional monies for training, planning and exercises – as well as manpower – are needed.

*Charlotte, NC:* Funds will help in meeting needs; additional funds, however, will be required to meet top security needs 100 percent.

*Newport, RI:* Equipment needs are being addressed with these funds but our lack of training remains our biggest obstacle to effective preparedness.

*Hilton Head Island, SC:* Funds were held by the County for the State, and their use was controlled by the State. Local government was unable to use funds as we felt appropriate.

*Pearland, TX:* Additional funding is needed to assist with the hardening of public safety facilities and critical infrastructure.

*Spokane, WA:* Our top priorities include information/intelligence-sharing capabilities requiring personnel (FTE), but there are no provisions for them.

### **Allocation Criteria**

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

- 57 percent of the survey cities said population density;
- 40 percent said existence of potential threat;
- 37 percent said presence of critical infrastructure;
- 20 percent identified other criteria, including base plus population, regional priorities and/or approach, needs assessment, the number of first responders, and a competitive state grant process;
- 27 percent did not know what criteria their state used to allocate the funds.

### **Urban Area Security Initiative**

*On April 8, 2003 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.*

### **Funds Received**

- Forty-one percent of the cities which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, an urban area receiving funding through the UASI do not expect to receive any funds through it.

- Within the 59 percent of the cities which do expect funding through this program, 63 percent 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.

### **Use of Funds**

Among the cities which expect to receive funding through this program,

- 84 percent will use it for equipment;
- 81 percent will use it for training;
- 78 percent will use it for planning;
- 70 percent will use it for exercises;
- 62 percent will use it for operations;
- 59 percent will use it for management and administration.

### **Involvement in Planning Process**

- Officials in 46 percent of the cities which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, the urban areas receiving funding through the UASI said they have not been involved in the planning process for the use of these funds.
- Among those which have been involved in the planning process, 23 percent did not believe they had a satisfactory opportunity to influence how the funds will be used.

### **Security Priorities**

Thirty-seven percent of the cities report that local governments in their area will not be able to use the funds they receive to address their top security priorities. Two UASI central cities commented on their inability to use the funds to address their top security priorities:

*Long Beach, CA:* The funding does not meet the existing needs for personnel costs and equipment costs as identified by the needs assessment and threat matrix.

*Cleveland, OH:* The funds were directed to the County. While we had significant input into the County process, we still had to operate within that process....Overall, the political process diluted the direct impact on the City.

### **Loss of Other Funds**

Officials in 15 percent of the cities involved in the Urban Area Security Initiative said they have gotten indications that this involvement would result in their city or area receiving less funding under other homeland security programs. Among their comments:

*Clearwater, FL:* The State of Florida told us that if we qualify under UASI, we would forfeit all other State-controlled federal funding.

*Honolulu, HI:* The State Homeland Security Grant Program II allocation was decreased when UASI was announced.

*Baltimore, MD:* We don't know, but we are concerned about the possibility.

*Detroit, MI:* The State has indicated that it is considering reducing homeland security funding as a direct result of the UASI grant.

*Kansas City, MO:* The State has indicated that the allocation of FY 2003 supplemental funds to the Kansas City area takes into consideration the UASI grant award. This suggests that the area may be receiving less than otherwise due to the UASI award.

*Seattle, WA:* It is to be determined whether the City will receive less funding as result of participating in the first three UASI rounds.

## **Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Hospital Preparedness**

*On March 20, 2003 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 their 2002 state plan; and d) accelerate timelines for critical activities.*

### **Funds Received**

Most survey city officials anticipate that the health department and/or one or more hospitals which serve their residents will receive funding through this program.

- Those in 81 percent of the cities anticipate that the health department will be funded.
- Those in 75 percent anticipate that one or more hospitals will receive funding.

### **Opportunity to Influence Use of Funds**

In response to the survey questions on the adequacy of opportunities offered city officials to participate in the state planning process for the use of program funds, and on the responsiveness of state plans to city priorities for the use of the funds,

- 41 percent of the city officials indicated that their city government or health department did not have an adequate opportunity to participate in their state's planning process for the use of the funds.
- 40 percent indicated that their state's plan did not adequately reflect their city's 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:

*Broomfield, CO:* We did have the opportunity to submit a Smallpox prophylaxis plan; most of the planning issues, however, have been dictated by the State's focus area groups.



*Oak Park, IL:* A small group of health departments participated in the planning process.

*Rockford, IL:* Budget recommendations were made by a committee and we have had little impact on the allocation of funds.

*Baltimore, MD:* Joint recommendations from local jurisdictions to the State regarding allocation of funds were not followed.

*Mount Vernon, NY:* During hazard mitigation meetings which included top hospital personnel, no information regarding this type of funding was provided.

*Akron, OH:* The State Department of Health made the decisions.

*Lawton, OK:* We were notified how much money was allocated and how it could be expended. There was no input prior to allocation.

### **Comments on State Plan**

Among the comments from officials who felt their state's plan does not adequately reflect their city's priorities:

*Tempe, AZ:* The State plan does not adequately cover Tempe's citizens. Tempe has over 150,000 citizens and one small hospital. We will need to rely on other communities.

*Broomfield, CO:* It underestimates staffing requirements and training issues. More funding to meet these needs should go to the local agencies.

*Baltimore, MD:* Funds are not passed through to locals at an appropriate rate (compared to funds retained by the State for its use), given the burden on local public health of responding to a terrorist incident.

*Kalamazoo, MI:* It appears to look only at the bigger population areas.

*Rochester, MN:* It does; however, we receive funds based on our size without adequate recognition of the existence of a unique medical center (the Mayo Clinic) in our midst.

*Columbus, OH:* The regional requirement has stretched the resources too thin.

*Newport, RI:* The State Health Department consults with hospitals but not local governments or response agencies. Our local capabilities, therefore, are incompatible with one another, leaving gaps in some areas and overlaps in others, which is wasteful and inefficient.

### **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 the provision of security at airport checkpoints.*

- 46 percent of the survey cities which provide law enforcement assistance to an airport report that their airport operator has not been reimbursed this year for additional law enforcement costs incurred in complying with the Memorandum of Understanding.
- For airports that have been reimbursed, 35 percent of the cities report that the airport operator has not provided the reimbursement to the city government.

Three of the cities which have not been reimbursed by their airport for their law enforcement services offered the following comments:

*Birmingham, AL:* The reimbursement was discontinued May 30th.

*Elizabeth, NJ:* The Port Authority Police have primary responsibility for providing security; Elizabeth police, however, have incurred expenses in providing exterior security for the airport and manning traffic control points during emergencies and drills.

*Albuquerque, NM:* There are too many restrictions.

## **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 2003; critical infrastructure security; security enhancements; training; exercises; equipment acquisition; 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, 2003, and \$170 million for more than 100 ports and companies on June 12.*

- Officials in half the cities having a port (either in or adjacent to them) which is receiving funding through this program said they were responsible for providing security or other services to that port.
- Officials in 64 percent of these cities said they were not receiving funding through the program.

## **Mass Transit Security Grant Program**

*This program is funded at \$65 million. On May 14, 2003 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 2003. Each transit system is required to conduct an assessment and preparedness plan on which to base resource allocations.*

- Officials in over half (51 percent) of the cities being served by a transit system funded through this program said they were responsible for providing security or other services to that system.
- Officials in more than three-fourths (76 percent) of these cities said they were not receiving funding through this Mass Transit Security program.

- Half of the cities said their state was exercising its option to keep a portion of the transit security funds to complement state assets at transit sites.

## **Emergency Management Performance Grants**

*On April 16, 2003 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.*

### **Funds Received**

- As of the end of December, 59 percent of the survey cities had 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.
- 53 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 55 percent of the cities do not feel they were given an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used in their city or area. Among their comments:

*North Little Rock, AR:* It's all "cut and dry" decided at the State level.

*Topeka, KS:* The State is running this and has not asked for any information or input.

*Fitchburg, MA:* No provision for local input was allowed.

*Hempstead, NY:* Funding was decided by the County and used by the County.

*Cleveland, OH:* All funds went to the County for Emergency Management.

*Midwest City, OK:* We were not given the opportunity to participate in the risk vulnerability study for our region. It was our understanding that due to the sensitive nature of this process, the risk assessment for the region was done by State and federal law enforcement.

*Beaumont, TX:* We believe the local County applied for EMPG funding. This was done, however, without input from the cities within the County on how the funding will be used.

## **Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program**

*On March 3, 2003 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.*

## **Funds Received**

- As of the end of December, just over three-fourths (76 percent) of the survey cities 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.
- 64 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 60 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:

*Frankfort, KY:* State Emergency Management partners with Area Development Districts (ADDs) and uses these funds for mitigation planning statewide.

*Dearborn, MI:* The pre-disaster Mitigation Program Grant is being handled by Wayne County.

*St. Louis, MO:* These funds are paying a contractor to look at the City mitigation needs and come up with a plan to address these issues.

*Tulsa, OK:* The local Project Impact Director is VERY dissatisfied with the lack of coordination and planning at the State level.

*Chesapeake, VA:* The State tells the City how funds will be used.

## **Community Emergency Response Teams**

*On May 29, 2003 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 the end of December, citizens and emergency managers in 52 percent of the survey cities were participants in the CERT Program.

## **City Involvement in State Planning Processes**

*On July 1, 2003 the 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 were to submit their assessments to their state; states were to incorporate these assessments in their strategies and submit them to ODP by December 31, 2003. DHS clearly expects states to involve local governments in the development of their homeland security strategies.*

- Twenty-two percent of the survey cities said that, as of December 15, they had not been asked to submit a needs assessment to their state. Of these, 10 percent anticipate they will be asked, 20 percent anticipate they won't, and 71 percent don't know.
- 63 percent of the survey cities said they have been involved in the development of the state strategy. Among these, 38 percent report substantial involvement, another 38 percent report some involvement, and 24 percent report minimal involvement.
- Asked whether, as of December 15, they had been involved in, or contacted by their state to become involved in, development of its homeland security strategy, 37 percent of the survey cities said they had not. Of these, 16 percent anticipate they will be asked, 26 percent anticipate they won't, and 58 percent don't know.

Among the comments of officials not involved in the development of state strategies:

*Fairfield, CT:* The State seems to want to do it all on their own.

*Clearwater, FL:* The State of Florida traditionally does not seek assistance from cities or counties. They “do their thing” and we adapt.

*Jacksonville, FL:* The State agencies drive the process; therefore, the process, including its structure, questions asked, and conclusions are all designed to serve the interests of the State agencies. It is difficult to get City priorities into the existing State strategy development.

*Louisville Metro, KY:* We were asked to participate on a committee but, as of December 15, it has not met.

*Dearborn, MI:* The State planning team representatives are already picked and in place. These individuals are from the 11 different disciplines of emergency management.

*Tupelo, MS:* The State is slow to gather input from the local level – appearing to do the base work and then asking the locals for input.

*Linden, NJ:* The State never asks cities for advice.

*Henderson, NV:* Our State continues to focus on Local Emergency Planning Committees (counties in Nevada) as their local points of contact, and not to deal directly with cities.

*Gahanna, OH:* The State will deal only with the counties. The counties in most cases do not work specifically with individual cities. In the major metropolitan areas, the county does not have representation from all subdivisions; many cities, therefore, are overlooked and frustrated.

*Seattle, WA:* The needs assessment goes through the County as the State-designated homeland security region. There has been no formal request for the City to participate in the State's homeland security strategy.

## **FY 2004 FUNDING**

### **State and Local First Responder Programs**

*On November 3, 2003 DHS announced allocations to the states for the State Homeland Security Program (\$1.685 billion), the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (\$500 million) and the Citizen Corps Program (\$35 million). States were required to submit a single application for the three programs by November 30. DHS was required to act on state applications within 15 days (December 15, at the latest). States are required to sub-allocate 80 percent of the funds to local governments within 60 days (February 13, at the latest, assuming earlier deadlines are met). Local governments are to use funds received in support of goals and objectives identified in the State Homeland Security Strategy and, where applicable, their Urban Area Security Initiative Strategy.*

#### **Funds Received**

Survey city officials were asked whether, as of the end of December, their governments had been notified that they would receive funds under this program. Officials in 60 percent of the cities said they had not received this notification; the balance reported that they had.

#### **Other Jurisdictions**

Asked if any other jurisdictions in their area had been notified that they will receive funding that could contribute to their cities' homeland security efforts, officials in 46 percent of the survey cities said this had occurred. Of these,

- 76 percent said this funding is going to the county in which their city is located;
- 61 percent said it is going to another city or to other cities;
- 38 percent said it is going to a regional agency or organization;
- 33 percent said it is going to another county or to other counties;
- 29 percent said it is going to other agencies or organizations.

Fifty-four percent of the officials anticipate that some of the funding going to other jurisdictions will be sub-allocated to their city.

#### **Use of Funds**

Asked how the funds they expect to receive through this program would be used,

- 90 percent of survey city officials said equipment purchase;
- 88 percent said training;
- 64 percent said exercises;
- 62 percent said planning.

#### **Security Priorities**

Forty-one percent of the cities receiving funds indicate that the uses of funds permitted will not address their top security priorities. Among their comments:

*Birmingham, AL:* The decision on how the funds would be used was made without input from our City. The State Director of Homeland Security made the decision and said it was in accordance with the guidelines from Secretary Ridge.

*San Francisco, CA:* We're unable to tell, as the State has not yet published grant guidance.

*Macon, GA:* Information flows slowly at best, and then there is very little time to submit a well-thought-out comprehensive application.

*Baltimore, MD:* Allowable uses of grants still do not allow items such as personnel expenses, which are critical to local preparedness efforts.

*Killeen, TX:* Communications between the State and municipalities is, of necessity, somewhat confused concerning the financing of homeland security. The majority of the problems rest with the way the funds are received from the federal level.

*Redmond, WA:* Uses do not address intelligence or overtime reimbursement issues.

### **Opportunity to Influence Use of Funds**

Officials in 43 percent of the survey cities do not expect to be given an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used in their cities. Among their comments:

*Wallingford, CT:* There is very little communication from State homeland security, and it is always at the last minute.

*Miami-Dade County, FL:* Florida Region VII Domestic Security Task Force will decide how these funds will be distributed. The politics will preclude this (involvement) due to our receipt of UASI monies.

*Rockford, IL:* The State budgeting process for terrorism is through committees, with very little influence exerted by cities.

*Minneapolis, MN:* The State appears to have determined the strategy for this money at this time.

*Cleveland, OH:* We will receive adequate input on funds received by the City, but the amount of funds will be limited by the political process of going through the County.

*Tulsa, OK:* In the past, we have been instructed by the State on how the money would be spent. Parameters were established by the State and adherence to them by the local jurisdiction was required.

*Seattle, WA:* Decisions at the regional homeland security district level (County level) are made with no input from the City.

### **Allocation Criteria**

Asked what criteria their state is using to allocate these funds to local governments,

- 26 percent of the survey cities said population density;
- 20 percent said existence of potential threat;
- 18 percent said presence of critical infrastructure;

- 9 percent identified other criteria used by the states, including base plus population, regional priorities and/or approach, needs assessment, and a competitive state grant process;
- 30 percent do not know what criteria their state is using to allocate the funds.

## **Urban Area Security Initiative**

*On November 18, 2003 DHS announced \$675 million under the Urban Area Security Initiative for 50 urban areas. The 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.” State applications were due December 15.*

### **Funds Received**

- One-third of the cities which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, an urban area receiving funding through the UASI do not expect to receive any funding through it.
- Nearly three-fourths of the UASI cities (74 percent) 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.

### **Involvement in Planning Process**

- Officials in 44 percent of the UASI cities said they were not involved in the planning process for the use of the funds.
- Among those which have been involved in the planning process, 18 percent do not believe they have had a satisfactory opportunity to influence how the funds will be used.

### **Use of Funds**

Among the 67 percent of the UASI cities which do expect funding through this program,

- 90 percent will use it for equipment;
- 88 percent will use it for training;
- 78 percent will use it for exercises;
- 68 percent will use it for planning;
- 61percent will use it for operations;
- 59 percent will use it for management and administration.

Twenty-eight percent of the cities report that local governments in their area will not be able to use the funds they receive to address their top security priorities.

### **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 12 percent of the cities said they had. Among their comments:

*Clearwater, FL:* We were told by State DEM officials that our DHS funds outside of UASI would be compromised if we applied for UASI.



*Detroit, MI:* Discussions at the State level indicate reductions may be considered.

*Minneapolis, MN:* It appears that there will be no equipment money allocated to Minneapolis out of the FY 2004 grant.

## **Metro Rail Transit Grants**

*On November 18, 2003, in conjunction with the UASI grant announcement, DHS announced \$50 million for 30 mass transit agencies. The 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.” State applications were due December 15.*

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.

- 56 percent of the cities said they have such responsibilities.
- Of these, 71 percent said they were not receiving funding through this program.
- 58 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.

# APPENDICES

## COMPARATIVE SURVEY FINDINGS – FY 2003 FUNDING

Selected Survey Items	September 2003 168 Cities	January 2004 215 Cities
<b>Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure</b>		
Cities which have not received funding	90%	76%
Other area jurisdictions receiving funding	66%	59%
Of these, county receiving funding	85%	79%
Use of funds will not address top priorities	30%	37%
Officials not given adequate opportunity to influence use of funds in their cities	58%	59%
<b>State Domestic Preparedness Funding</b>		
Cities which have not received funding	80%	64%
Other area jurisdictions receiving funding	74%	76%
Of these, county receiving funding	89%	80%
Use of funds will not address top priorities	30%	40%
Officials not given an adequate opportunity to influence use of funds in their cities	58%	49%
<b>Urban Area Security Initiative</b>		
Cities not involved in state planning process	36%	46%
Cities not expecting to receive funding	40%	41%
Use of funds will not address top priorities	34%	37%
Cities where state is keeping portion of the funding	44%	63%
Cities which may receive less money from other programs because they receive UASI funds	20%	15%
<b>Public Health Emergency/Hospital Preparedness</b>		
Cities expecting health department to receive funding	83%	81%
Cities expecting area hospital(s) to receive funding	82%	75%
Cities/health departments not involved in state planning process	48%	41%
State plan does not adequately reflect city's priorities	48%	40%
<b>Airport Law Enforcement Reimbursement</b>		
Airport operators not reimbursed for additional law enforcement costs	37%	46%
Of those reimbursed, funds not provided to city for additional law enforcement costs	40%	35%
<b>Port Security Grant Program</b>		
Cities responsible for providing security to funded ports	52%	50%
Of these, cities not receiving funding through program	58%	64%
<b>Mass Transit Security Grant Program</b>		
Cities providing security to funded transit systems	54%	51%
Of these, cities not receiving funding through program	69%	76%
Cities where state is keeping portion of the funding	44%	50%
<b>Emergency Management Performance Grants</b>		
Cities which have not received funding	65%	59%
Officials not given adequate opportunity to influence use of funds in their city or area	67%	55%
<b>Pre-Disaster Mitigation</b>		
Cities which have not received funding	82%	76%
Officials not given adequate opportunity to influence use of funds in their city or area	69%	60%
<b>Community Emergency Response Teams</b>		
Cities where residents are being trained through program	50%	52%
<b>State Planning Process</b>		
Cities not asked to submit needs assessment to state	44%	22%
Cities not involved in development of state homeland security strategy	49%	37%

## SURVEY CITIES

Birmingham	AL	242,820	New Haven	CT	123,626
Florence	AL	36,264	Wallingford	CT	43,026
Gadsden	AL	38,978	West Haven	CT	52,360
Huntsville	AL	158,216	Wilmington	DE	72,664
Fairbanks	AK	30,224	Clearwater	FL	108,787
Chandler	AZ	176,581	Hollywood	FL	139,357
Mesa	AZ	396,375	Jacksonville	FL	735,617
Scottsdale	AZ	202,705	Miami-Dade County	FL	2,057,000
Tempe	AZ	158,625	Ocala	FL	45,943
Little Rock	AR	183,133	Pembroke Pines	FL	137,427
North Little Rock	AR	60,433	Port St. Lucie	FL	88,769
Cerritos	CA	51,488	West Palm Beach	FL	82,103
Corona	CA	124,966	Augusta	GA	199,775
Costa Mesa	CA	108,724	Macon	GA	97,255
Culver City	CA	38,816	Smyrna	GA	40,999
Fresno	CA	427,652	Honolulu	HI	23,475
Gardena	CA	57,746	Lihue-Kauai County	HI	58,463
Irvine	CA	143,072	Maui	HI	97,100
Long Beach	CA	471,000	Boise	ID	185,787
Los Angeles	CA	3,694,820	Carpentersville	IL	30,586
Modesto	CA	188,856	Chicago	IL	2,896,016
Morgan Hill	CA	33,556	Des Plaines	IL	58,720
Newark	CA	42,471	Highland Park	IL	31,365
Norwalk	CA	103,298	Lincolnwood	IL	12,359
Pomona	CA	149,473	Niles	IL	30,068
Porterville	CA	39,615	North Chicago	IL	35,918
Poway	CA	48,044	Oak Park	IL	52,524
Redondo Beach	CA	63,261	Orland Park	IL	51,077
Rialto	CA	91,873	Palatine	IL	65,479
Salinas	CA	151,060	Rock Island	IL	39,684
San Bernardino	CA	185,401	Rockford	IL	150,115
San Francisco	CA	776,733	Carmel	IN	37,733
San Gabriel	CA	39,804	Fort Wayne	IN	205,727
San Jose	CA	894,943	Gary	IN	102,746
Santa Ana	CA	337,977	Michigan City	IN	32,900
Santa Barbara	CA	92,325	Cedar Rapids	IA	120,758
Santa Rosa	CA	147,595	Kansas City	KS	146,866
Temecula	CA	57,716	Topeka	KS	122,377
Thousand Oaks	CA	117,005	Frankfort	KY	27,741
Ventura	CA	100,916	Louisville Metro	KY	694,000
West Hollywood	CA	35,716	Alexandria	LA	46,342
Broomfield	CO	38,272	Baton Rouge	LA	227,818
Colorado Springs	CO	360,890	New Iberia	LA	32,623
Littleton	CO	40,340	Portland	ME	64,249
Wheat Ridge	CO	32,913	Annapolis	MD	35,838
Fairfield	CT	57,340	Baltimore	MD	651,154
Middletown	CT	43,167	Bowie	MD	50,269

Amesbury	MA	16,450	Niagara Falls	NY	55,593
Attleboro	MA	42,068	Asheville	NC	68,889
Boston	MA	589,141	Charlotte	NC	540,828
Brockton	MA	94,304	Fargo	ND	90,599
Cambridge	MA	101,355	Akron	OH	217,074
Fitchburg	MA	39,102	Cleveland	OH	478,403
Lowell	MA	105,167	Columbus	OH	711,470
Peabody	MA	48,129	Dayton	OH	166,179
Quincy	MA	88,025	Euclid	OH	52,717
Somerville	MA	77,478	Gahanna	OH	32,636
Springfield	MA	152,082	Hamilton	OH	60,690
Dearborn	MI	97,775	Lakewood	OH	56,646
Detroit	MI	951,270	Lima	OH	40,081
Kalamazoo	MI	77,145	University Heights	OH	14,146
Lansing	MI	119,128	Lawton	OK	92,757
Livonia	MI	100,545	Midwest City	OK	54,088
Taylor	MI	65,868	Oklahoma City	OK	506,132
Bloomington	MN	85,172	Stillwater	OK	39,065
Brooklyn Park	MN	68,128	Tulsa	OK	393,049
Minneapolis	MN	382,618	Hillsboro	OR	70,186
Rochester	MN	85,806	Medford	OR	63,154
Jackson	MS	184,256	Allentown	PA	106,632
Meridian	MS	39,968	Chester	PA	36,854
Natchez	MS	18,464	Harrisburg	PA	48,950
Tupelo	MS	34,211	Caguas	PR	140,502
Kansas City	MO	441,545	Carolina	PR	186,076
St Louis	MO	348,189	Cidra	PR	42,753
St. Peters	MO	51,381	Newport	RI	26,475
Billings	MT	89,847	Providence	RI	173,618
Butte	MT	34,606	Charleston	SC	96,650
Lincoln	NE	225,581	Hilton Head Island	SC	33,862
Henderson	NV	175,381	North Charleston	SC	79,641
Reno	NV	180,480	Rock Hill	SC	49,765
Derry	NH	34,021	Rapid City	SD	59,607
Manchester	NH	107,006	Knoxville	TN	173,890
East Orange	NJ	69,824	Memphis	TN	650,100
Elizabeth	NJ	120,568	Nashville	TN	569,891
Hoboken	NJ	38,577	Austin	TX	671,873
Linden	NJ	39,394	Beaumont	TX	113,866
Newark	NJ	273,546	Coppell	TX	35,958
Piscataway	NJ	50,482	Denton	TX	80,537
Woodbridge	NJ	97,203	DeSoto	TX	37,646
Alamogordo	NM	35,582	Eules	TX	46,005
Albuquerque	NM	448,607	Killeen	TX	86,911
Las Cruces	NM	74,267	Kingsville	TX	25,575
Albany	NY	95,658	La Porte	TX	31,880
Freeport	NY	43,783	McAllen	TX	106,414
Hempstead	NY	56,554	McKinney	TX	54,369
Mount Vernon	NY	68,381	Pearland	TX	37,640
New York	NY	8,008,278	San Antonio	TX	1,144,646

Sugar Land	TX	63,328
Waco	TX	113,726
Wichita Falls	TX	104,197
Murray City	UT	34,024
Provo	UT	105,166
Burlington	VT	38,889
Newport News	VA	180,150
Virginia Beach	VA	425,257
Kennewick	WA	54,693
Lakewood	WA	58,211
Longview	WA	34,660
Redmond	WA	45,256
Renton	WA	53,840
Seattle	WA	563,374
Spokane	WA	195,629
Vancouver	WA	143,560
Charleston	WV	53,421
Janesville	WI	59,498
Menomonee Falls	WI	32,647
Waukesha	WI	64,825
Cheyenne	WY	53,011