

June 2004

The United States Conference of Mayors  
Homeland Security Monitoring Center

Third 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

This is the third in The U.S. Conference of Mayors series of reports to the nation on the flow of federal homeland security funds through the states to our cities. These reports contain the results of 50-state surveys of cities which are being conducted by the Conference's Homeland Security Monitoring Center. We established this Center a year ago, following our 2003 Annual Conference of Mayors in Denver, because of mayors' continuing concerns about delays in the flow of the federal homeland security funding so badly needed by the first responders in our cities.

Our first survey report was released September 17 of last year, the second January 22 of this year. On the day following the release of our second report, and prior to his address that day to the 72<sup>nd</sup> Winter Meeting of The U.S. Conference of Mayors in Washington, President George W. Bush met with the top officers of our organization. In that meeting he was briefed by Conference President and Hempstead, New York Mayor James Garner on the delays in federal homeland security funding for cities which had been documented in our two 50-state survey reports.

In his remarks, President Bush thanked the mayors for their homeland security efforts. "Mayors get the credit for energizing joint terrorism task forces, mayors get the credit for good communication, and mayors get the credit for good response," he said. The President assured his audience that he was aware of the homeland security funding delays and said "we will work with the mayors to make sure it gets unstuck."

Since President Bush spoke to the mayors that day, Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge has taken several steps to define the problem and has involved both Conference leaders and staff in efforts to improve the funding process. His first step was to create a new task force of state and local officials to examine the problems affecting the more than \$7 billion in federal first responder funding that he acknowledged was stuck in the state funding pipeline – a direct response to the problems identified in the Conference surveys. In a meeting with me prior to the creation of the Task Force on State and Local Homeland Security Funding, Secretary Ridge said that while he continued to oppose the direct federal funding of cities to meet homeland security needs – something the Conference has sought from the beginning of the nation's homeland security response to the 9-11 attacks – he wanted to work with mayors and other state and local officials on changes to the current system that would get the funding to first responders more quickly.

Invited to name four members of the Task Force to represent the Conference of Mayors, Mayor Garner went with the top three officers – himself as President; Vice President Donald Plusquellic, Mayor of Akron; and Advisory Board Chair Beverly O'Neill, Mayor of Long Beach – and with Criminal and Social Justice Committee Chair J. Christian Bollwage, Mayor of Elizabeth. On March 11, Task Force members elected Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney Chair and Mayor Plusquellic Vice Chair.

The product of the Task Force's three months' work, its report on the homeland security funding system, has just been published. This report recommends many positive steps for DHS, among them: exempting domestic preparedness grants from the normal reimbursement requirements for federal grants which have posed such a problem for local governments; allowing local governments to use state homeland security funds to meet operational costs, including personnel overtime; providing funding for protection of high-risk critical infrastructure and major events; establishing deadlines for the obligating of grants from one level of government to another; and improving the tracking of the distribution and use of homeland security funds. Many of the Task Force recommendations require action by Congress and apply only to future homeland security funding, not the funding currently in the pipeline.

The Conference's work on homeland security funding has been guided by our own Homeland Security Task Force, which is co-chaired by Baltimore Mayor Martin O'Malley and Sugar Land, Texas Mayor David Wallace. Our surveys have been developed by a leadership team comprised of Mayors O'Malley and Wallace; Elizabeth Mayor Bollwage; Gary Mayor Scott King, who chairs our Mayors and Police Chiefs Task Force; and Louisville Metro Mayor Jerry Abramson, a Past President of the organization.

### **First Survey – September 17, 2003**

The first survey we conducted included information from 168 cities 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, through most of the 10 federal homeland security programs examined. 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.

Because the September report 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, our leadership team determined that a second survey should be conducted in time for results to be released in January during the Conference's 2004 Winter Meeting in Washington.

### **Second Survey – January 22, 2004**

The second survey asked for basically the same information on the same set of 10 federal programs, and 215 cities responded. That survey found that, five months later, while some additional cities had received FY 2003 funding through some of the programs, most had 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 was an improvement over the 90 percent of cities not funded in August, it continued to fall far short of meeting this nation's goal of providing homeland security funding to our first responders.

The second survey also found that, for some programs, we actually lost ground: Larger numbers of survey cities did not expect to be helped through the Urban Area Security Initiative and were dissatisfied with their involvement in their state's planning process, and larger numbers reported that their airport operators had not been reimbursed for the additional law enforcement costs associated with airport security, that their ports were not being funded through the Post Security Grant Program, and that their "highest risk" transit systems were not being funded through the Mass Transit Security Grant Program.

### **Third Survey – June 25, 2004**

The findings of our third survey, which follow in this report, show some progress in some areas, little or none in others. By the end of May, 24 percent of the survey cities had received FY 2003 funding through the Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure program, the same percentage reported in the previous survey. Another 24 percent had been told that they will receive funding. But the balance of the cities – a larger group than in the previous survey – reported that they would not be receiving funding.

More than half the survey cities reported receiving funding through the State Domestic Preparedness program – a much larger group than in the previous survey – but the percentage of those saying they would not receive funding through this program stayed the same. The fact that more cities are reporting this time that they are being funded through the FY 2004 State and Local First Responder Programs is encouraging.

But differences in the findings from one survey to another tell only part of the story: Even where progress is being recorded, the percentages of cities reporting that they are being funded, or that allowable uses of funds will address their top priorities, or that they have been given opportunities to influence state decisions on spending, remain at unacceptably low levels.

The Conference's monitoring of homeland security funding over the past year has been motivated by the conviction that far too much is at stake for our nation's homeland security system to be allowed to perform below its fullest capacity. Our first two surveys found that there were problems and that the homeland security funding needed in our cities was being diluted and delayed. The survey findings in this third report show that while some progress continues to be made, problems and frustration with the system continue in our cities.

It is in the purest spirit of patriotism that we offer this report to the nation. In doing so, we pledge to work with President George W. Bush, Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge, and the Congress to overcome the problems that have surfaced in this nation's homeland security system, and we pledge to help implement the recommendations of the Task Force on State and Local Homeland Security Funding that mayors had a hand in developing.

Our message to our first responders, the men and women whose lives are on the line in our cities day and night, is that we are continuing to press for the resources and support they need and deserve. Our message to the American people who live and work in our cities – the vast majority of all Americans – is that their safety and security is never out of our minds.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tom Cochran". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly stylized font.

Tom Cochran  
Executive Director

June 25, 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>Fiscal Year 2003 Funding</b>	<b>11</b>
Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure	11
State Domestic Preparedness	14
Urban Area Security Initiative	21
Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Hospital Preparedness	23
Airport Law Enforcement Reimbursement	24
Port Security Grant Program	25
Mass Transit Security Grant Program	25
Emergency Management Performance Grants	25
Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program	26
Community Emergency Response Teams	26
<b>Fiscal Year 2004 Funding</b>	<b>27</b>
State and Local First Responder Programs	27
Urban Area Security Initiative	30
Metro Rail Transit Grants	31
Port Security Grant Program	32
Emergency Management Performance Grants	32
<b>Planning and Communications</b>	<b>33</b>
City Involvement in State Planning Processes	33
Local Emergency Communications Capacity	35
<b>Approaches to Effective Administration</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Appendix A: Comparative Survey Findings</b>	
<b>Appendix B: Survey Cities</b>	

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Appropriations bills enacted by Congress in 2003, nearly a year-and-a-half after the September 11 attacks on the nation, funded several state and local homeland security programs. While these bills did not provide for the direct federal funding of cities that mayors had aggressively sought, creating instead a federal system for the distribution of homeland security funds that generally operates through the states, the bills did 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.

A few months later, 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 June 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, Puerto Rico and the Northern Marianas 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.

## **SECOND 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 second survey would be necessary to gauge whether experience over an additional five months would show improvement in the performance of the funding system. The second 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 second 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 second survey asked for information on the flow of FY 2003 funding and for information on FY 2004 funding which had been announced prior to the time the survey was conducted.

The findings of the second survey were released January 22. The responses from 215 cities in every state and Puerto Rico showed progress in some areas, set-backs in others. Some additional cities had received FY 2003 funding through some of the programs, but most had not. By the end of 2003, for example, more than three out of four survey cities still had not received funding through the Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure program, and nearly two-thirds of the cities still had not received state domestic preparedness funding. This survey also found larger numbers of cities not expecting funding under the Urban Area Security Initiative, and larger numbers not being reimbursed for airport security, port security, and “highest risk” transit system security.

### **THIRD SURVEY FINDINGS**

The problems described in the second survey were cited by such large percentages of officials surveyed that the Conference leadership saw a need for a third survey to gauge whether an additional five months’ experience would show evidence of improvement in the performance of the funding system. This third survey was sent to mayors on May 17; it sought basically the same information on the same federal programs covered in the first two surveys.

Responses to the third survey were received from 231 cities representing every state in the nation, Puerto Rico and the Northern Marianas. Information was submitted by cities as small as Los Lunas, NM (population 10,034) and as large as New York City. The average population of survey cities is 229,386.

#### **Cities’ Fiscal Year 2003 Funding Experience at End of May 2004**

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

1

- Officials in 52 percent of the survey cities have neither received funds nor been notified that they will receive this first responder/critical infrastructure funding through their states.
- Twenty-four percent of the cities have received funds and another 24 percent have been notified that funds will be received.
- Eighty-one percent of the cities receiving funds have been notified that they are eligible to expend funds on a reimbursement basis. Of these, 51 percent say that the reimbursement process is making it more difficult to take advantage of these funds and 37 percent say it is creating a fiscal hardship for the city.
- Officials in 70 percent of the cities report that other jurisdictions in their area have received first responder/critical infrastructure funding that would contribute to their cities’ security efforts. The largest group of these officials, 81 percent, says this funding is going to their county; 60 percent say it is going to one or more area cities.
- In 52 percent of the cities, officials say they have not been given an adequate opportunity to influence their states in regard to how these funds can be used in their cities.
- Officials in 66 percent of the survey cities say the allowable uses of the funds will address their top security priorities; those in 34 percent say they will not.

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

- Officials in just over half the survey cities (51 percent) say they have received this domestic preparedness funding through their states.
- Twenty-six percent have been notified that funds will be received, but 23 percent have neither received funds nor been notified that they will.
- Eighty-six percent of the cities receiving funds have been notified that they are eligible to expend funds on a reimbursement basis. Of these, 57 percent say that the reimbursement process is making it more difficult to take advantage of these funds and 31 percent say it is creating a fiscal hardship for the city.
- Officials in four in five of the survey cities report that other jurisdictions in their area have received domestic preparedness funding that would contribute to their cities’ security efforts. The largest group



of these officials, 82 percent, says this funding is going to their county; 65 percent say it is going to one or more area cities.

- In 44 percent of the cities, officials say they have not been given an adequate opportunity to influence their states in regard to how these funds can be used in their cities.
- Officials in 64 percent of the cities say the allowable uses of the funds will address their top security priorities; those in 36 percent say they will not.

#### ***Urban Area Security Initiative – \$600 Million***

- Officials in 61 percent of the cities which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, the 30 urban areas receiving funding through the UASI expect to share in the UASI funds; those in 39 percent of these cities do not.
- Officials in two-thirds of the survey cities say they have been involved in the state planning process for the use of the UASI funds, and 60 percent of these believe they have had a satisfactory opportunity to influence how the funds will be used.
- Sixty percent of the cities believe that local governments in their area will be able to use the funds they receive to address their top security priorities; 40 percent say they will not.
- Fifty-five 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 nearly one-fourth (24 percent) of the cities say they have gotten an indication that their city or area will 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 85 percent of the survey cities, officials say that the health department serving their residents is being funded through this program; officials in 83 percent of the cities expect that one or more of their hospitals is receiving funding.
- Officials in 60 percent of the cities say their city government or health department have 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 64 percent of the cities say 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, 52 percent of the airport operators have been reimbursed for additional law enforcement costs associated with security at airport checkpoints.
- For those airports which have been reimbursed, 70 percent of the cities report that the airport operator has provided reimbursement to the city government.

#### ***Port Security Grant Program – \$245 Million***

- Officials in 54 percent of the survey cities with a port that is receiving funding through this program say they are responsible for providing security or other services to that port.
- Of these cities, 69 percent say they are not receiving funding through the program.

### ***Mass Transit Security Grant Program – \$65 Million***

- Officials in 42 percent of the survey cities 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.
- Of these cities, 83 percent say they are not receiving funding through this program.
- Officials in 21 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.

### ***Emergency Management Performance Grants – \$165 Million***

- Fifty-six percent of the survey cities have neither received emergency management funds from their states nor been notified that they will receive them.
- Officials in 53 percent of the cities report that other jurisdictions in their area have received funding through this program that would contribute to their cities’ security efforts.
- Officials in 55 percent of the cities feel they were given an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used in either their cities or their areas; those in 45 percent say they were not.

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

- Seventy 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 58 percent of the cities report that other jurisdictions in their area have not received funding through this program that will contribute to their cities’ security efforts.
- Officials in 52 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; those in 48 percent say they were.

### ***Community Emergency Response Teams – \$19 Million***

- Citizen volunteers in 60 percent of the survey cities are participating in a CERT Program, receiving 20 hours of training on disaster preparedness, basic disaster operations, fire safety, and light search and rescue.

### ***Cities’ Fiscal Year 2004 Funding Experience at End of May 2004***

#### ***State and Local First Responder Programs – \$2.2 Billion***

- Forty-five percent of the survey cities have been notified that they will receive funding for one or more of the State and Local First Responder Programs – the State Homeland Security Program, Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, and Citizen Corps Program – through their states. Forty percent of the cities have neither received nor been notified that they will receive funds through this program. Fifteen percent of the cities have actually received funding.
- Seventy-seven percent of the cities receiving funds have been notified that they are eligible to expend funds on a reimbursement basis. Of these, 61 percent say that the reimbursement process is making it more difficult to take advantage of these funds and 43 percent say it is creating a fiscal hardship for the city.
- Officials in 66 percent of the cities report that other jurisdictions in their area are receiving first responder/critical infrastructure funding that could contribute to security efforts in their cities. The largest group of these officials, 84 percent, reports that this funding is going to their county; 64 percent say it is going to one or more area cities.
- In 59 percent of the cities, officials believe they have been given an adequate opportunity to influence how these funds can be used in their city; in 41 percent they do not.

- Officials in 65 percent of the cities say the allowable uses of the funds will address their top security priorities; those in 35 percent say they will not.

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

- Officials in 57 percent of the survey cities which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, the 50 urban areas receiving funding through the UASI expect to share in the UASI funds.
- Officials in 65 percent of the cities say they have been involved in the state planning process for the use of the funds.
- Among those involved in the planning process, 64 percent believe they have had a satisfactory opportunity to influence how the funds will be used; 36 percent say they have not.
- Sixty-three percent of the cities believe that local governments in their area will be able to use the funds they receive to address their top security priorities; 37 percent say they will not.
- Fifty-four 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 more than one-fifth (21 percent) of the cities say they have gotten an indication that their city or area will receive less funding under other homeland security programs because they are receiving UASI funds.

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

- Officials in 47 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, 76 percent say they are not receiving funding through this program.
- Officials in one-fourth 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.

#### ***Port Security Grant Program – \$179 Million***

- Officials in 67 percent of the survey cities with a port that is receiving funding through this program say they are responsible for providing security or other services to that port.
- Of these cities, 71 percent say they are not receiving funding through the program.

#### ***Emergency Management Performance Grants – \$173.5 Million***

- Fifty-four percent of the survey cities have neither received emergency management funds from their states nor been notified that they will receive them.
- Officials in just over half of the cities report that other jurisdictions in their area have received funding through this program that would contribute to their cities' security efforts; 49 percent say they have not.
- Officials in 53 percent of the cities feel they were not given an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used in either their cities or their areas; 47 percent say they were.

#### **Planning and Communications**

- Officials in 78 percent of the survey cities say they have been asked to submit a needs assessment to their state.
- In 62 percent of the cities, officials say they have been involved in, or been contacted by the state to become involved in, the development of the state homeland security strategy; 38 percent say they have not.
- Sixty percent of the survey cities report that their state has conducted a threat and vulnerability study for their area.

- Eighty-six percent of the cities have conducted a threat and vulnerability study for their area, either on their own or in conjunction with neighboring local governments.
- Ninety-four percent of the survey cities have an emergency operation center. In 89 percent of these cities, however, the EOC is not staffed 24/7.
- In 63 percent of these cities the EOC has interoperable communications capabilities which allow different agencies and units to communicate with both the EOC and other units.
- Sixty-six percent of the survey cities are served by a county or regional EOC.

# **INTRODUCTION**

This is the third in a series of reports to the nation on the flow of federal homeland security funds through the states to the nation's cities. Its purpose is to update the findings of the first two surveys of cities which substantiated many of the mayors' initial concerns about the federal homeland security funding system – among them, concerns 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 would not be afforded adequate opportunities to influence how federal funds managed by the states could be used in their cities, with the result that the resources provided would frequently not be the resources needed.

## **BACKGROUND**

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 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 should be closely monitored to determine whether it was being followed, whether it was performing adequately, and whether improvements could be made.

In that meeting, the mayors called for the creation of a Homeland Security Monitoring Center within the Conference and 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, Puerto Rico and the Northern

Marianas 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.

## **FINDINGS OF SECOND SURVEY**

Because the problems described in the first survey were cited by such large percentages of officials surveyed, the leadership of the Conference determined that a second 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 second survey results should be released during the organization's January 2004 Winter Meeting in Washington, where more than 250 mayors would be assembled, and where homeland security would be a top agenda issue.

The second 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 second 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 second 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.

The findings of the second survey, released January 22, were based on responses received from 215 cities representing every state in the nation and Puerto Rico. Among the major findings for the \$1.5 billion Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure program:

- As of the end of 2003, 76 percent of the cities had not received any funds under this program from their states. Thirty-one percent had been told 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 said that other jurisdictions in their area had received funding that could contribute to their security. The largest group – 79 percent – said this funding was going to counties.
- 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 would be used in their cities. In 37 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:

- As of the end of the year, 64 percent of the survey cities had not received any funds under this program from their states. Forty-one percent had been notified that funds would be received, but 23 percent had neither received funds nor been notified that they would.
- Just over three-fourths of the cities said that other jurisdictions in their area had received funding through this program, with the largest group – 80 percent – saying this funding was going to counties.

Among the findings for the \$600 million Urban Area Security Initiative :

- 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 did not expect to share in the UASI funds.
- Officials in 46 percent of the survey cities said they had not been involved in the state planning process for the use of the UASI funds. Of those who had been involved in this process, 23 percent did not believe they had a satisfactory opportunity to influence how the funds will be used.

The second survey report contained similar assessments of cities' experience with the other seven programs examined. And the second report, similar to the first, 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 THIRD SURVEY**

As in the first survey, the problems described in the second survey were cited by such large percentages of officials surveyed that the leadership of the Conference determined that another survey should be conducted to gauge, once again, whether additional experience over time – in this case, over six months – would show evidence of improvement in the performance of the funding system. It was determined that a third survey, covering cities' experience through the end of May, would be released during the 2004 Annual Conference of Mayors, January 25-29 in Boston.

The third survey, sent to the mayors on May 17, sought basically the same information on the same 10 federal programs covered in the first and second surveys. The third survey asked for information on the flow of FY 2003 funds, and for information on FY 2004 funding for four of the programs which had been announced prior to the time the survey was conducted.

Additional information sought in the third survey related to 1) effectiveness of threat and vulnerability studies conducted by states or cities, 2) cities' eligibility to expend funds under reimbursement programs, 3) extent to which cities received all funds requested under programs, 4) existence and capacity of emergency communications centers, and 5) approaches to the administration of homeland security funds believed to be particularly effective.

## **SURVEY RESPONDENTS**

Survey responses were received from 231 cities representing every state in the nation, Puerto Rico, and the Northern Marianas. Information was submitted by cities as small as Los Lunas, NM (10,034) and Holly Hill, FL (12,119) 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 Houston (1.95 million).

Cities with populations up to 100,000 comprise the largest group of respondents (132); cities in the 100,000-200,000 population range comprise the next largest group (52). Twenty-nine respondents are in the 200,000-500,000 range, and 10 are between 500,000 and one million. The populations of all survey cities average 229,386.

States with the largest numbers of respondents are California (39 cities), Texas (19 cities), Illinois (15 cities), Florida (11 cities), and Ohio (11 cities).

The appendices to this report contain 1) a comparison of selected findings of the three surveys, 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.



# **SURVEY FINDINGS**

## **FISCAL YEAR 2003 FUNDING**

### **Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure**

*Of the \$1.5 billion available, \$1.3 billion are for First Responder Preparedness and \$200 million are for Critical Infrastructure Preparedness, and states received separate allocations for these two categories on April 30, 2003. 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 (or June 15 at the latest). States were required to sub-allocate 80 percent of the funds to local governments within 45 days.*

*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 May 2004, their governments had received funds from their state under this program, or whether they had been notified that they would receive funds.

- 52 percent report that they have neither received funds nor been notified that they will receive these funds from their states.
- 24 percent report that they have received funds.
- 24 percent have been notified that funds will be received.

#### **Other Jurisdictions**

Officials in 70 percent of the survey cities report that other jurisdictions in their area have received funding that could contribute to their cities' homeland security efforts. Of these,

- 81 percent say this funding is going to the county in which their city is located;
- 60 percent say it is going to another city, or to other cities;
- 34 percent say it is going to a regional agency or organization;
- 33 percent say it is going to another county, or to other counties;
- 12 percent say it is going to other agencies or organizations, including state agencies.

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

Fifty-six percent of the cities report that they are not receiving all of the funding requested – either from the state or another government entity within the state – under this program.

Twenty-six percent of those cities not receiving any funding directly from the state or through another local government under this program have received an explanation for this. Among the explanations received:

*West Hollywood, CA:* It has gone directly to the first responders that serve our City through LA County agencies.

*Pembroke Pines, FL:* Primary critical infrastructure (transit, fuel depots, reactors, electrical generating stations, ports and large airports) are not located in our jurisdiction.

*Valdosta, GA:* Funding decisions are based on the All Hazards Council's recommendations.

*Orland Park, IL:* Money to reimburse for overtime expenses is not available.

*Bowie, MD:* The County told us they did not receive enough money to distribute to municipalities.

*Minnetonka, MN:* Money was given to counties and cities of the first class only.

*Albuquerque, NM:* We were told only that we should be patient and that it takes time.

*Rock Hill, SC:* All purchases were made through the County for regional projects.

## **Funding Reimbursement**

Among those cities receiving funds, 81 percent have been notified by their state or another government entity within the state that they are eligible to expend funds under a reimbursement program. Of these,

- 62 percent of the cities have spent funds and sought reimbursement, and 65 percent of these have received reimbursement in a timely fashion.
- 51 percent say the process of expending local money and receiving the federal funds on a reimbursement basis is making it more difficult to take advantage of these funds.
- 37 percent say this process is creating a fiscal hardship for their city.

## **Use of Funds**

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

- 90 percent of survey city officials cite equipment;
- 51 percent cite training;
- 44 percent cite exercises;
- 44 percent cite planning.

Among those cities which are receiving equipment or funding for equipment from their state or another government, 30 percent say that the equipment is not consistent with their city's needs and priorities. Some of them described the problems encountered:

*Birmingham, AL:* We are to receive prevention equipment to share regionally. We had no input in this decision.

*Montgomery, AL:* The list of equipment selected by the State does not address the threats we have in our City.

*Miami-Dade, FL:* In several instances the equipment received was different from what we had been purchasing.

*Toledo, OH:* Our City's priorities were not considered and so the equipment provided does not meet the needs.

*Rock Hill, SC:* The County purchases were to support their projects, not the City's needs.

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

Officials in 52 percent of the survey cities say they were not given an adequate opportunity to influence use of the funds in their city; those in 48 percent of the cities feel they were given an adequate opportunity to do this. Among the comments from officials who do not feel they were given an adequate opportunity to influence how funds will be used in their city or area:

*Little Rock, AR:* We would prefer to select from the entire ODP list, but we are limited to Hazmat Team and Bomb Team equipment approved by the State. Training is not readily available.

*Baltimore, MD:* The State has retained control of critical infrastructure funds, and has distributed only a small portion of these funds.

*Jackson, MS:* Each city should have been consulted in the beginning about funding priorities and equipment on the list that is needed. Money should go directly to cities and decisions not made only by the Mississippi EMA. State capitols should be given top priority.

*Albuquerque, NM:* The City is given lists, and we still have to defend why we picked certain items on the list and whether they were appropriate. There is no explanation given as to why things get turned down.

*Florence, SC:* Basically we were told how much money was available for the Fire Service and how much we would get. FY 2003 funds for the Fire Service went in equal shares to 12 fire departments, regardless of size, and PTE's in their respective areas. FY 2004 funds are being distributed through the Pee Dee Terrorism Committee and the Director of Emergency Management for Florence County without regard for PTE's in the various fire departments' response areas.

*Rock Hill, SC:* The Committee was made up of five members – four from the County and one from the City.

The other comments offered made the same basic point: Decision-making occurs at state, regional and county levels, with little or no input from cities. These comments were made by a number of California cities – *Azusa, Fremont, Modesto, and San Jose* – and by *Birmingham and Montgomery, AL; Trumbull, CT; West Palm Beach, FL; Tupelo, MS; and Cidra, PR.*

## **Security Priorities**

Sixty-six percent of the cities receiving funds indicate that the uses of funds permitted address their top security priorities. Among the 34 percent of the cities which say the uses of funds do not address their top security priorities, several officials elaborated on the problems they are having and on the inadequacy of the funding available:

*Montgomery, AL:* We have several security needs that are far more important than what we were told we could spend the money for.

*North Little Rock, AR:* We have a large police, fire, and EMS force. Funding overtime for training and response is a big issue with their unions.

*Azusa, CA:* Funding is minimal; there is not much you can do with it.

*Freemont, CA:* The grant funding we are in line to receive does not adequately cover the personnel costs associated with our terrorism preparedness efforts – training, participating in exercises, attending forums on terrorism preparedness.

*San Jose, CA:* The funding is addressing only one out of nine priorities set by our public safety officials.

*Miami-Dade, FL:* The funding amount was so small that we had to focus only on projects that were feasible within the funding allocation.

*Fort Wayne, IN:* FY 2003 funding was limited to first responder response equipment only. No proactive programs or recovery projects were allowed.

*Louisville Metro, KY:* Funding has been limited and does not allow a city of our size to address all of its top security priorities. In addition, funding has not been very flexible; the City cannot spend it for some items.

*Jackson, MS:* Manpower and overtime are our greatest needs, but we were able to receive resources only in the funding categories presented.

*Asheville, NC:* Some funding addressing our priorities was received. Other high priority requests were not funded.

*Fargo, ND:* Funds were made available only for planning.

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

*Toledo, OH:* The City was not involved in choosing the infrastructure to be protected; other facilities that needed to be included were not.

*Tulsa, OK:* Funding for hardening/securing critical facilities does not appear to be a primary focus at the State level.

*Providence, RI:* This funding does not include any payment for police overtime to provide preventive security for our critical infrastructure.

*Seattle, WA:* Funds to address cyber security issues were not made available. While the regional homeland security district received \$1.6 million, the City of Seattle will receive only \$90,000.

### **Allocation Criteria**

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

- 35 percent of the survey cities say population density;
- 27 percent say presence of critical infrastructure;
- 26 percent say known threat analysis;
- 12 percent identified other criteria used by their states, including base plus population, regional priorities and/or approach, needs assessment, the number of first responders, competitive grants, and overtime costs during orange alert periods;
- 29 percent do not know what criteria their state used to allocate the funds.

### **State Domestic Preparedness**

*State allocations were announced March 7, 2003; applications were due at the Department of Homeland Security April 22. States were required to pass through 80 percent of the equipment funds to local governments within 45 days of receiving their grant award. Each state received specific allocations for equipment, exercises, training and planning.*

### **Funds Received**

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

- 51 percent report that they have received funds from their states.
- 26 percent have been notified that they will receive funds.

- 23 percent say they have neither received funds nor been notified that they will receive these funds from their states.

## Other Jurisdictions

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

- 82 percent say this funding is going to the county in which their city is located;
- 65 percent say it is going to another city or to other cities;
- 39 percent say it is going to a regional agency or organization;
- 38 percent say it is going to another county or to other counties;
- 25 percent say it is going to other agencies or organizations, including state agencies, hospitals and other health care agencies, and the Red Cross.

Thirty-nine percent of the officials say some of the funding going to other jurisdictions is being sub-allocated to their city.

Fifty-eight percent of the cities report that they are not receiving all of the funding requested – either from the state or another government entity within the state – under this program.

Forty-six percent of those cities not receiving any funding directly from the state or through another local government under this program have received an explanation for this. Among the explanations received:

*Birmingham, AL:* Funding will go to our County's point of contact, which is the EMA Director.

*Gadsden, AL:* The FY 2003 homeland security funds went for regional response teams.

*Freemont, CA:* The County uses the funding on what it determines to be the top priorities.

*Sunnyvale, CA:* The County Approval Authority used funding for regional response equipment and regional training. No funds were approved for the City directly.

*Hollywood, FL:* The funding guidelines allowed only local officials outside our normal area of jurisdiction to decide how funding would be used.

*Pembroke Pines, FL:* Funds are provided to a regional area anti-terrorism task force, which Florida law recognizes as a government entity.

*Bowie, MD:* We were denied water plant security money by the County, which said it had not received enough money from the State.

*Buffalo, NY:* The State will deal only with counties and will not deal directly with localities.

*New Rochelle, NY:* New York State will only interface with counties. It is our position that the public is better served by both cities and counties working as equal partners at every level. In most instances, cities have the majority of both population and available resources – such as fire, police, and EMS personnel and infrastructure – within a county.

*Dayton, OH:* The region has agreed to joint use of allocated dollars to help address communications interoperability issues affecting our area, although dollars are woefully inadequate, given the regional approach.

*Knoxville, TN:* Funds are given to the County to be distributed based on their concept of need, despite the fact that almost all vulnerable sites are within City limits.

Not all comments were negative. *Northbrook, IL* views the structure of the State Terrorism Task Force as inclusive of all interests and disciplines, with expert committees approaching everything in a mutual aid, regional context. Equipment and training goes directly to mutual aid systems serving cities.

## **Funding Reimbursement**

Among those cities receiving funds, 86 percent have been notified by their state or another government entity within the state that they are eligible to expend funds under a reimbursement program. Of these,

- 71 percent of the cities have spent funds and sought reimbursement, and 73 percent of these have received reimbursement in a timely fashion.
- 57 percent say the process of expending local money and receiving the federal funds on a reimbursement basis is making it more difficult to take advantage of these funds.
- 31 percent say this process is creating a fiscal hardship for their city.

## **Use of Funds**

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

- 99 percent of survey city officials cite equipment;
- 57 percent cite training;
- 46 percent cite exercises;
- 49 percent cite planning.

Among those cities which are receiving equipment or funding for equipment from their state or another government, 22 percent say that the equipment is not consistent with their city's needs and priorities. Some of them described the problems encountered:

*Fairbanks, AK:* We have not had a chance to help prioritize what equipment we need.

*Birmingham, AL:* We are to receive prevention equipment to share regionally. We had no input in this decision.

*Montgomery, AL:* We were told by the State what they would purchase with the funds. We weren't asked what we needed and were told to take it or leave it.

*Little Rock, AR:* We would prefer to select from the entire ODP list, but we are limited to hazmat team equipment approved by the State.

*Trumbull, CT:* They gave us four level A hazmat suits; we don't have a hazmat team.

*Miami-Dade, FL:* In several instances the equipment received was different from what we had been purchasing.

*Sunrise, FL:* The equipment provided duplicated some of the PPE equipment, such as gas masks and suits, that the City had already purchased.

*Gary, IN:* ODP and the State are telling the City what it needs to buy. The cities have a better idea of their own needs.

*Braintree, MA:* We cannot apply for what we really need. We applied for security cameras and installed them; they were necessary, but they did not address our top security problems.

*Brooklyn Park, MN:* The items on the purchase list were not what we could use.

*Manchester, NH:* A decontamination trailer was purchased but the City does not have a vehicle capable of moving it.

*Albuquerque, NM:* The State decides what can be ordered and has yet to release the City's "first priority stuff." There is very little input by local government and lots of discussion as to whether locally identified needs fit the State's definition of approved expenditures.

*Buffalo, NY:* The County provided escape hoods not suitable for emergency responders. When we finally asked for input on what we needed, the State replaced these with better masks.

*University Heights, OH:* Our City has received 17 First Responder Kits (PPE suits) since September 11, 2001. This is the only equipment acquired for homeland security and our City has many "soft targets" associated with a large Jewish population. Communication, tactical gear, and computer equipment are all needed.

*Charleston, SC:* The items received are useful but not necessarily a City priority.

*Knoxville, TN:* We are limited by what the County government decides.

*Houston, TX:* First, the limited amount of funding was insufficient to address our highest priority equipment needs. Second, our regional Council of Governments required us to secure one specific piece of hazmat equipment (\$47,000) from our allocation that, although needed, was not one of our highest priorities.

*Laredo, TX:* We are not allowed to use the funding to purchase training equipment.

*Pearland, TX:* Needed computer equipment is excluded from the approved list of equipment.

Here again, not all comments are negative. For example, *Tempe, AZ* notes that Maricopa County thus far has passed funds through and allowed full discretion on expenditures. And *Seattle, WA* indicates that their equipment is consistent with their priorities, but only because the City insisted on State standards for interoperability and an approved equipment list.

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

Officials in 44 percent of the cities feel they were not given an adequate opportunity to influence use of the funds in their city. Among their comments:

*Birmingham, AL:* The main plan was already developed. We were allowed to make suggestions.

*Montgomery, AL:* We had very little input as to our top needs. The State set the priorities and selected the equipment; we have no use for most of it.

*Little Rock, AR:* We have no say until the State has decided how much we will get and the general category in which it must be spent.

*North Little Rock, AR:* We had absolutely no opportunity. We knew we were going to need "interoperability capability" and would have been very happy with that, but now the State wants to shift the interoperability funding to the Arkansas State Police.

*Fremont, CA:* The funding is passed down from the State to the counties. The funding that gets to the cities is determined by an Anti-Terrorism Approval Body consisting of five members representing law enforcement, firefighting, and EMS; we do not have a direct City representative. In our opinion, the County has been the

primary beneficiary of this process, at the expense of the large cities that actually have the primary targets for terrorism.

*Colorado Springs, CO:* There has been little or no guidance provided on how the grant process will be managed or how to prioritize requests.

*Hollywood, FL:* We put considerable time and effort into the assessments that were used to determine funding needs, then we were left out of the meeting on how funds would be allocated.

*Miami-Dade, FL:* Initially we were invited to the budget workshop. Later we found that the projects being considered for funding had already been identified.

*Pembroke Pines, FL:* Allocations and expenditure decisions were made at the county and regional levels.

*Gary, IN:* Realistically, Lake County faces the highest threat level in the State, but the State lowered our threat level assessment to below that of Marion County, in which the Capitol is located. Gary continues to point out to the State that they must support making Lake County an Urban Area Security Initiative grant recipient. But unless population density rules are changed, this will not happen.

*Kansas City, KS:* The State assessment was completed, but neither our County nor our City were involved in developing the strategy, or given any input into the funding distribution formula.

*Somerville, MA:* The funding mechanism to pay for training and drill costs is chaotic at best. There is no local budgetary control. The select equipment list is too restrictive.

*Springfield, MA:* By the time the State releases the grant application to cities, minimal time remains to submit a regional application. It is difficult enough to assemble a cross-disciplinary group in the City to present an application that represents the needs of the City groups.

*Detroit, MI:* Eligibility was pre-determined without regard to actual needs within the City.

*Tupelo, MS:* The State applied general rules for all jurisdictions without taking into consideration the differences in their abilities.

*Elizabeth, NJ:* Decisions were made by federal, State and County officials.

*Linden, NJ:* The State does not confer with municipalities on homeland security issues. They receive the money and disperse it through the County OEM.

*Albuquerque, NM:* We are constantly explaining to State "gatekeepers" why equipment on the ODP-approved lists is needed in the City. Somebody at the State level does not understand threat or the definition of "WMD."

*Syracuse, NY:* The City is represented on the local task force, but County officials constitute the majority of the members. While the City and County share some priorities, the City has different needs for training and equipment.

*Columbia, SC:* The federal government and State deal only with the County EMD, not the City.

*Knoxville, TN:* County officials determine allocations of funds and what may be purchased for our City.

*Seattle, WA:* Decision-making at the regional home land security district level occurs with limited input from the City.



Many other cities explain in the same basic terms that they were given little or no opportunity to get involved in the decision-making affecting them. In California, *Gardena*, *Long Beach*, *Pomona*, *San Jose*, *Santa Barbara*, and *Thousand Oaks* include this comment. *Fairbanks, AK*; *Sunrise, FL*; *Fort Wayne, IN*; and *Manchester, NH* say simply that they had no input, or that local input was not solicited. *Las Vegas, NV* and *New Rochelle, NY* say simply that they were not involved in the process. Two cities in Illinois, however – *Niles* and *Northbrook* – state that this process is handled very well by their State.

## **Security Priorities**

Sixty-four percent of the cities receiving funds indicate the uses of funds permitted will address their top security priorities. Among the comments of the 36 percent of cities who said the use of funds will not address their top security priorities:

*Fairbanks, AK*: We need more planning and needs/vulnerability assessments or money to do them ourselves. We are also trying to start a Citizen Corps program, but we were refused funding for that.

*Birmingham, AL*: The items we requested over a year ago have not been funded. Having level C suits in all patrol cars is one of our priorities.

*Montgomery, AL*: We were allowed to give very little input as to our actual needs. The State provided a list of what they wanted to purchase.

*Little Rock, AR*: We were limited to equipment only, and only in specific categories.

*North Little Rock, AR*: We got some equipment. We've had some training and planning. We are part of a large metro area and depend on one bomb team that is expected to respond to other counties as well. This is a major concern. Also, there are issues concerning special events such as those at the Alltel Arena and Riverfest and the future Clinton Library opening: Overtime costs are going to drain our budget.

*Azusa, CA*: We have begun the first phase of purchasing equipment such as Personal Protective Equipment. Security has been addressed with minimal funding. Protection of first responders is still a priority.

*Cathedral City, CA*: There is insufficient personnel to use equipment that was funded.

*Modesto, CA*: We do not receive the funds. The County purchases the equipment and allows us to use it.

*Pomona, CA*: In some cases the priorities that are established by the task forces do not represent the needs of the local jurisdiction. If you request equipment that's outside of their priorities you will be denied, so you have to stay within their parameters. The focus of the grants has been on first responder equipment which is needed but hasn't enhanced our security.

*Riverside, CA*: We need training funds but California does not distribute these funds.

*San Gabriel, CA*: We need more ODP-approved classes, especially USAR. We need more training money with backfill.

*Santa Barbara, CA*: There are needs for additional equipment, training, and planning.

*Vista, CA*: More broad-based training for city employees and first responders is a top priority that is not being met by equipment-biased grants.

*Trumbull, CT*: We have to use items the State feels are important, not those we need.

*Wallingford, CT:* Training is needed.

*Athens, GA:* More focus on cyber terrorism at the local level is needed.

*Fort Wayne, IN:* FY 2003 funding was limited to first responder response equipment only; no proactive programs or recovery projects were allowed.

*Gary, IN:* Funds were sent to the County, cities submitted equipment lists and other costs to the County, the County required three quotes to purchase equipment on the approved list from ODP, and we still have not received the equipment that we bought with 2003 funds. We have now completed the initial steps in the 2004 funding process.

*Louisville Metro, KY:* Funding has been limited and does not allow a city of our size to address all of its top security priorities. Additionally, funding has not been very flexible; we cannot spend for some needed items.

*Baton Rouge, LA:* Training guidance was unclear. Our training was budgeted and approved and upon initiation of the program it was disapproved. The process to get training re-approved is cumbersome and extremely time-consuming.

*Somerville, MA:* We have not been able to receive funding for exercises, training, and planning. The funding mechanisms are too restrictive and obtuse.

*Springfield, MA:* The City is in a severe fiscal crisis. The police, fire and other City departments have had significant layoffs, which result in significant manpower shortages. Public safety is operating at the lowest personnel level in many years. More money for equipment, training, exercises, etc. is not addressing our first priority concern of personnel shortages.

*Baltimore, MD:* Although funds are being used to address some top priority needs, the City's critical needs exceed the amount of available funds. Also, the allowable uses of grant funds do not cover some important needs related to security, such as personnel costs, EOC office equipment, etc.

*Bowie, MD:* Specifically, we requested funds for water plant security. We were denied these by the County, which stated that not enough funds had been received from the State.

*Minnnetonka, MN:* Although we purchased personal protection equipment, the County limited what we could purchase.

*Jackson, MS:* Priorities were set by the State. The City's highest priority needs are manpower and overtime.

*Tupelo, MS:* There is a lack of critical infrastructure funding. Most of the funds have been spent to provide equipment for first response.

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

*Las Vegas, NV:* The City wanted to acquire FY 2003 funds for training purposes, but all training and exercise funds were retained by the State. No FY 2003 training funds were passed to local jurisdictions.

*Florence, SC:* It is too little, too late. Much more funding is needed for our City's priorities; needs are tremendous and funding is minimal.

*Houston, TX:* Houston is to receive less than six percent of the funds allocated to our 13-county region of the State (that is, \$810,081 of a \$13.8 million allocation). In contrast, Harris County is to receive more than 34

percent of this allocation. The limited amount of funding and the restriction that funds be spent only on equipment make it impossible for the City to use these funds to address our highest security problems.

*Janesville, WI:* We need portable radios but the funding restrictions do not allow the purchase of items that are used to meet daily needs.

Several cities noted that personnel shortages and funding limitations were a major problem. Comments on this came from *Long Beach, CA; Revere, MA; Providence, RI; Alexandria, VA; and Renton, WA.*

## **Allocation Criteria**

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

- 60 percent of the survey cities say population density;
- 41 percent say known threat analysis;
- 40 percent say presence of critical infrastructure;
- 19 percent identified other criteria, including base plus population, regional priorities and/or approach, needs assessment, number of first responders, competitive grants, and specific projects or activities;
- 23 percent do 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 for the New York City, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Seattle and Houston areas and the National Capital Region. On May 14 DHS announced an additional \$500 million in funding and increased the number of urban areas receiving funds to 30. (The 30 urban areas are listed at <http://usmayors.org/securitysurvey>.) 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 July 8. Funds can be used for planning, equipment acquisition, training, exercises, management and administration, and operations.*

## **Funds Received**

- Sixty-one percent of the cities which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, an urban area receiving funding through the UASI are receiving funds through it.
- 55 percent of these 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.

## **Use of Funds**

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

- 96 percent are using it for equipment;
- 76 percent are using it for planning;
- 67 percent are using it for training;
- 63 percent are using it for exercises;
- 41 percent are using it for management and administration;
- 39 percent are using it for operations.

## **Involvement in Planning Process**

- Officials in 67 percent of the cities which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, the urban areas receiving funding through the UASI say they have been involved in the planning process for the use of these funds.
- Among these cities, 60 percent believe they have had a satisfactory opportunity to influence how the funds will be used; 40 percent believe they have not had a satisfactory opportunity.

## **Security Priorities**

Sixty percent of the cities report that local governments in their area are able to use the funds they receive to address their top security priorities. Among the comments of the 40 percent of cities which say their local governments are not able to use the funds to address their top priorities:

*Fremont, CA:* The funding is not sufficient to completely address the top priorities in our Urban Area. It only provides seed money to start addressing them.

*San Jose, CA:* Priorities for the UASI were focused on bridges, ports and water-related terrorist concerns that do not impact San Jose.

*Tampa, FL:* Although required to develop a strategic plan, the time constraints placed on spending the FY 2003 funds do not allow sufficient time to integrate that spending with the strategy.

*Somerville, MA:* The City has attended every UASI meeting and we have nothing to show for our efforts.

*Dallas, TX:* There is not enough money to address top security issues. Although we are the central city we are mandated to share the limited UASI money with five other counties and all have an equal vote on how the money is spent.

## **Loss of Other Funds**

Officials in nearly one-fourth (24 percent) of the cities involved in the Urban Area Security Initiative say 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:

*New Haven, CT:* We have been told other homeland security funding will not be available to us.

*West Haven, CT:* The City has been told that it is not entitled to monies under any other program because we are a part of UASI. We need information to confirm this.

*Miami-Dade, FL:* Funds were reallocated to other areas not within UASI.

*Tampa, FL:* Funds are already being held back from the City because of the UASI funds.

*Honolulu, HI:* We were notified by the State administrative agent that our SHSGP II (2003) grant would be reduced due to the awarding of UASI II funds.

*Chicago, IL:* We have been informed, off the record, that UASI money deterred other funding.

*Northbrook, IL:* The statewide funding effort has been dramatically reduced (by about 80 percent) since the City and County have received direct funding. Mutual aid and cooperation are less important and sharing of their funds with others is out of the question.

*Detroit, MI:* The City is completely excluded from any additional homeland security funding.

*O'Fallon, MO:* Cities within the Urban Area were restricted from applying for other statewide grants, whether they received funds or not.

*St. Louis, MO:* A recent homeland security appropriation was earmarked for areas outside of UASI.

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

*On March 2, 2003 the Department of Health and Human Services announced the allocation of \$1.4 billion to the states, with each state receiving a separate allocation for public health preparedness and for hospital preparedness. To receive the funds, the states must submit a plan to HHS outlining the public health and hospital preparedness activities it plans to undertake. On September 2 HHS announced the allocation of an additional \$1.4 billion to the states, again with separate allocations for public health preparedness and for hospital preparedness.*

### **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 85 percent of the cities say that the health department is being funded.
- Those in 83 percent say that one or more hospitals are receiving 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,

- 60 percent of the city officials indicate that their city government or health department has had an adequate opportunity to participate in their state's planning process for the use of the funds; 40 percent say they have not..
- 64 percent indicate that their state's plan adequately reflects their city's priorities for use of the funds; 36 percent say it does not.

### **Comments on State Planning Process**

Among the comments from officials in the 40 percent of survey cities which did not have an adequate opportunity to participate in the state planning process for the use of these funds:

*Little Rock, AR:* This is done totally at the State level.

*Northbrook, IL:* We rely on Cook County Public Health which has taken an approach that involves all communities in the process.

*Baton Rouge, LA:* Many meetings were called to inform our City of how funds would be allocated, but not to decide how funds would be allocated.

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

*Albuquerque, NM:* The State is in the lead and the local health authority is just one of many players.

*Toledo, OH:* The State's Department of Health has not included the City in the planning process.

*Houston, TX:* The Texas Department of Health developed and submitted its plan without consultation with local jurisdictions. The City does not know whether local plans were reviewed and/or incorporated in the State plan.

*Tacoma, WA:* The State Health Department controlled this process.

### **Comments on State Plan**

Among the comments from officials of the 36 percent of survey cities who feel their state's plan does not adequately reflect their city's priorities:

*Baton Rouge, LA:* In our City, the hospitals are in need of more funding than they are receiving. We would allocate more to the end user than to the State administrative agency.

*New Orleans, LA:* The City does not feel it received adequate access to the funds distributed.

*Baltimore, MD:* Local health departments bear a greater responsibility for incident prevention and response than is reflected in the portion of funds allocated to local government.

*Manchester, NH:* The City has the only formal health department in the State, and the State plan reflects the needs of the rural non-formal health system.

*Toledo, OH:* The State's plan continues to be developed in a vacuum.

*Laredo, TX:* The City has greater needs because of its location on the U.S.-Mexico border. The City expends funds for frontline security which is not recognized at the federal level.

*Seattle, WA:* Currently, funding is not allocated based on risk, population, complexity, and vulnerability.

A number of cities – *Miami-Dade, FL; Cedar Rapids, IA; Albuquerque, NM; and Tacoma, WA*, among them – offered the same basic comment: The state, not the cities, decides priorities.

### **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.*

- 52 percent of the survey cities which provide law enforcement assistance to an airport report that their airport operator has been reimbursed this year for additional law enforcement costs incurred in complying with the Memorandum of Understanding.
- For airports that have been reimbursed, 70 percent of the cities report that the airport operator has provided reimbursement to the city government.

## **Port Security Grant Program**

*The Port Security Grant Program 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 2003, 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 announced two rounds of port security grants – \$75 million in grants for 13 ports on May 14, 2003 \$170 million for more than 100 ports and/or companies on June 12.*

- Officials in 54 percent of the cities having a port (either in or adjacent to them) which is receiving funding through this program say they are responsible for providing security or other services to that port.
- Officials in 69 percent of these cities say they are not receiving funding through the program.

## **Mass Transit Security Grant Program**

*On May 14, 2003 DHS announced grants through the states to the 20 “highest risk” transit systems. States may use 20 percent of the funds to complement state assets at those 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 2003. Each transit system is required to conduct an assessment and preparedness plan on which to base resource allocations.*

- Officials in 42 percent of the cities being served by a transit system funded through this program say they are responsible for providing security or other services to that system.
- Officials in 83 percent of these cities say they are not receiving funding through this Mass Transit Security program.
- Twenty-one percent of the cities say their state is 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. 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 May, 56 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 report that they have received, or expect to receive, funds.
- 53 percent of the survey city officials report that other jurisdictions in their area have 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 feel they were given an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used in their city or area. Comments on this fell into two categories: Cities reporting that the funding is going only to the county level – *Fremont* and *West Covina, CA*, and *Minneapolis, MN* – and cities

reporting that no local input was solicited and that decisions are being made at state and county levels – *Fort Wayne, IN; Manchester, NH; Los Lunas, NM; and Springfield, OH.*

## **Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program**

*On March 3, 2003 FEMA announced the availability of mitigation planning grant funds for FY 2003. Each state received \$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 May 2004, 70 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 report that they have received or expect to receive funds.
- 58 percent of the survey city officials report 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 52 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. Many of the comments offered on this underscored the same problem: Cities have had no input on use of funds; states and counties make the decisions. This was expressed by *Fairbanks, AK; Minnetonka, MN; Asheville, NC; New York and Syracuse, NY; Springfield, OH; and Oklahoma City, Stillwater, and Tulsa, OK.*

Other comments related to the inadequacy of the funding that was made available to them. *Freemont, CA* said that there is not enough funding for the cities to accomplish much. *West Covina, CA* said all the money was being used before it reached local jurisdictions.

## **Community Emergency Response Teams**

*On May 29, 2003 DHS announced allocations to the states to train citizens who participate in Community Emergency Response Teams to be better prepared to respond to emergency situations in their communities. 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 May 2004, citizens and emergency managers in 60 percent of the survey cities were participants in the CERT Program.



## FISCAL YEAR 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 all three programs by November 30. DHS was required to act on state applications within 15 days of receipt (December 15), but not before the state had submitted its Homeland Security Strategy to DHS and DHS had approved it. States were required to sub-allocate 80 percent of the funds to local governments within 60 days of DHS's approval of their application. 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 Areas Security Initiative Strategy.*

#### Funds Received

Survey city officials were asked whether, as of the end of May 2004, their governments had been notified that they would receive funds under this program.

- 45 percent have been notified that funds will be received from their states.
- 15 percent report that they have received funds.
- 40 percent report that they have neither received funds nor been notified that they will receive these funds.

#### 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 66 percent of the survey cities say this had occurred. Of these,

- 84 percent say this funding is going to the county in which their city is located;
- 64 percent say it is going to another city or to other cities;
- 40 percent say it is going to another county or to other counties;
- 35 percent say it is going to a regional agency or organization;
- 20 percent say it is going to other agencies or organizations, including state agencies, hospitals, and other health care agencies.

Thirty-five percent of the officials report that some of the funding going to other jurisdictions will be sub-allocated to their city.

Sixty-three percent of the cities report that they are not receiving all of the funding requested – either from the state or another government entity within the state – under this program. One-third of those cities not receiving any funding directly from the state or through another local government under this program have received an explanation for this. Among the explanations that were received:

*Modesto, CA:* The County does the purchasing and loans the City the equipment.

*New Haven, CT:* No funding comes to the City under this program because we have the UASI grant.

*Gary, IN:* The funds for this program are allocated through the County.

*Wichita, KS:* The State has not finished spending FY 2003 funds, thus delaying the distribution of the 2004 funds.

*Albuquerque, NM:* The State cannot spend new money until all earlier grants have been spent statewide.

*Buffalo, NY:* The State will not deal with cities directly; it will award grants to counties only. The City may receive some equipment from the County.

*Dayton, OH:* Our county EMA has offered CERT funds but we have declined because the funds offered are inadequate for the mission.

*Knoxville, TN:* Despite almost all vulnerable sites being located within the City limits, the funds are given to the County to be distributed based on their concept of need.

## **Funding Reimbursement**

Among those cities receiving funds, 77 percent have been notified by their state or another government entity within the state that they are eligible to expend funds under a reimbursement program. Of these,

- 27 percent of the cities have spent funds and sought reimbursement, and half of these have received reimbursement in a timely fashion.
- 61 percent say the process of expending local money and receiving the federal funds on a reimbursement basis is making it more difficult to take advantage of these funds.
- 43 percent say this process is creating a fiscal hardship for their city.

## **Use of Funds**

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

- 89 percent of survey city officials cite equipment;
- 57 percent cite training;
- 47 percent cite planning;
- 41 percent cite exercises.

## **Security Priorities**

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

*Montgomery, AL:* Our City has several security needs which are far more important than what we were told we could spend the money for, and the list of equipment selected by the State does not address the concerns or threats we have in our City.

*Little Rock, AR:* The State has mandated that all local funds be used only to purchase 800 MHz radios. Our priorities might have included some radios, but we would not use the entire grant this way.

*Beverly Hills, CA:* The City needs additional funding for cyber terrorism and for hardening facilities.

*Fremont, CA:* The City should be eligible to recoup some expenses, but we are at the mercy of the approval body as far as what expenses we get reimbursement for. We can't count on this funding to address our City's top priorities.

*San Jose, CA:* Resource allocation is out of our control and current funds were used for non-priority needs.

*Santa Ana, CA:* Although this grant is addressing priorities, it does not address the question of personnel. We have bought equipment, trained our personnel and made plans, but we lack the personnel or overtime funding to conduct investigations and concentrate on prevention. None of these grants is addressing the personnel issue, which is a critical one.

*Sunnyvale, CA:* The Approval Authority did not approve our equipment requests for the grant. The programs and equipment approved are for a regional response program.

*Thousand Oaks, CA:* Top security needs are defined by the County, not the City.

*Wichita, KS:* Our State adjusted the 2004 funding formula and cut local funding by 40 percent. We are the largest city in the State and are receiving nearly the same dollar amounts as small communities. \$22 million is being spread over 105 counties.

*Detroit, MI:* The City is receiving funding only for the Citizen Corps program and has been excluded from any additional funding.

*Jackson, MS:* The City needs money for additional manpower and overtime, but what can be requested is limited to what is on the list.

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

*Dayton, OH:* The Citizens Corp grant has stipulations and requirements that make it counter-productive: To receive funds you must establish a Citizens Corps council, TAPS program, neighborhood watch, and VIPs. None of these address our top security priorities, but they consume almost all the dollars.

*Providence, RI:* This funding does not include any payment for police overtime needed to provide security for our critical infrastructure.

*Houston, TX:* We are certainly planning to use these funds to address our highest priorities, but the number of high priority projects far exceeds the funding being allocated to our City through these grant programs.

*Laredo, TX:* We are currently providing U.S. frontline security but we are not being funded accordingly.

*Seattle, WA:* The City has only one vote in the regional process. Whether funding received will address top security priorities is to be determined.

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

Officials in 59 percent of the survey cities say they were given an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds will be used in their cities. Among the comments of the 41 percent which were not given an adequate opportunity:

*Little Rock, AR:* We had no option other than to "take it or leave it" for 800 MHz radios.

*Fremont, CA:* We will be able to provide input to the approval body but we won't have a direct vote on the outcome.

*Miami-Dade, FL:* Initially we were invited to the budget workshop. Later we found that the projects being considered for funding had already been identified.

*Wichita, KS:* The funding meeting conducted by the local emergency management folks allows funding to be dispensed at the will of the County officials.

*Albuquerque, NM:* We expect we will have to argue over each and every expenditure with someone at the State who says "Homeland Security won't approve that."

*Dayton, OH:* The State EMA attached so many conditions that we had no flexibility. The State EMA also ignored the input from a steering committee and simply crafted a program of its own design.

*Florence, SC:* The Pee Dee Terrorism Committee (the members of which are, with one exception, representatives of County or County-dependent agencies) and the Director of Emergency Management for Florence County basically tell us what funds are available, how these funds will be spent, and to whom they will be distributed.

*Laredo, TX:* We are not kept informed. The funding formula is based heavily on population density and does not take into account the location of jurisdictions, and emphasis is placed on the vulnerability assessment provided, along with the economic factors associated with the jurisdiction.

*Wichita Falls, TX:* The Council of Governments does not provide a logical allocation of funds.

*Seattle, WA:* Decisions at the regional homeland security district level are made with little input from the City.

*Vancouver, WA:* We did participate in the process, but decisions were dominated by State agencies and the larger cities and urban areas.

Several of the cities offering comments – including *San Jose, CA; Trumbull, CT; Fort Wayne, IN; Albany, NY;* and *Springfield, OH* – say simply that they had no opportunity to provide input on the state and county decisions affecting them.

## **Allocation Criteria**

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

- 51 percent of the survey cities say population density;
- 31 percent say presence of critical infrastructure;
- 30 percent say known threat analysis;
- 13 percent identify other criteria used by the states, including base plus population, regional priorities and/or approach, needs assessment, number of first responders, competitive grants, and specific projects or activities;
- 29 percent do not know what criteria their state is using to allocate the funds.

## **Urban Area Security Initiative**

*On November 18, 2003 DHS announced \$725 million under the Urban Area Security Initiative, \$675 million through the states to 50 urban areas and \$50 million through the states to 30 mass transit agencies. (The 50 urban areas and 30 transit agencies are listed at <http://usmayors.org/securitysurvey> ). 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**

- Fifty-seven percent of the cities which are in, or are mutual aid partners with, an urban area receiving funding through the UASI expect to receive funding through the program.
- Fifty-four percent of the UASI 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, with their states retaining an average of 19 percent of the funds.

## **Involvement in Planning Process**

- Officials in 65 percent of the UASI cities say they were involved in the planning process for the use of the funds.
- Among those which have been involved in the planning process, 64 percent 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 expect funding through this program,

- all will use it for equipment;
- 92 percent will use it for training;
- 75 percent will use it for exercises;
- 69 percent will use it for planning;
- 54 percent will use it for management and administration;
- 38 percent will use it for operations.

Sixty-three percent of the cities report that local governments in their area will 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 21 percent of the cities say they have.

The majority of the cities offering comments on this question say basically the same thing: Because we are receiving UASI funds or in a UASI area, other homeland security funding is being reduced or eliminated. This was stated by *Santa Ana, CA; West Haven, CT; Miami-Dade, FL; Tampa, FL; Chicago and Northbrook, IL; Detroit, MI; and Minneapolis, MN.*

*O'Fallon, MO* notes that cities within the Urban Area were restricted from applying for other statewide grants whether or not they received UASI funds. *Houston, TX* says one argument being used by DHS in support of terminating MMRS funding is that cities should be able to sustain MMRS with UASI funds.

## **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.

- 47 percent of the cities say they have such responsibilities.
- Of these, 76 percent say they are not receiving funding through this program.
- One-fourth of the cities report that their state is exercising its option to keep a portion of the transit security funds to complement state assets at transit sites.

## **Port Security Grant Program**

*On December 10, 2003 DHS announced \$179 million in Port Security Grants. These grants are used to fund security planning and projects to improve dockside and perimeter security. The grants go directly to state and local government agencies, including port authorities, and private companies.*

- Officials in 67 percent of the cities having a port (either in or adjacent to them) which is receiving funding through this program say they are responsible for providing security or other services to that port.
- Officials in 71 percent of these cities say they are not receiving funding through the program.

## **Emergency Management Performance Grants**

*On December 18, 2003 DHS announced the allocation of \$173.5 million to the states to help state and local governments better prepare to respond to all hazards and enhance preparedness activities and emergency management. 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 May 2004, 54 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 report that they have received, or expect to receive, funds.
- 51 percent of the survey city officials report that other jurisdictions in their area have received funding under this program that will contribute to their city's homeland security efforts.

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

Officials in 53 percent of the cities do not believe that their city was given an adequate opportunity to influence how the funds are used in their city or area. All of the comments offered on this question sounded by now familiar themes: Cities have little or no opportunity to influence funding decisions made at higher levels in their states, the allowable use of funds is too limited, and funding from the state stops at the county level. Such comments were offered by *Little Rock, AR; North Little Rock, AR; Phoenix, AZ; Santa Clarita, CA; West Covina, CA; Portland, ME; and Minnetonka, MN.*

## PLANNING AND COMMUNICATIONS

### City Involvement in State Planning Processes

*On July 1, 2003 the Office for Domestic Preparedness 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 the state; states were to incorporate them into their strategies and submit them to ODP by December 31, 2003.*

- 78 percent of the survey cities say that, as of the end of May 2004, they had been asked to submit a needs assessment to their state. Among those not asked, 31 percent anticipate they won't be asked, 16 percent anticipate they will be asked, and 53 percent don't know.
- 62 percent of the survey cities say they have been involved in the development of the state strategy. Among these, 46 percent report some involvement, 32 percent report minimal involvement, and 22 percent report substantial involvement
- Among the 38 percent of cities which have not been involved in the development of their state strategy, 41 percent do not anticipate they will be asked to be involved, six percent anticipate they will, and 53 percent don't know.

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

*Fairbanks, AK:* We have not been asked to participate with the State in most areas.

*Little Rock, AR:* We have already been advised that the State has determined the strategy for the next three years – 2004-2006.

*North Little Rock, AR:* The State has a committee that makes most of the decisions, although they play word games that suggest we made decisions together. An example is interoperability: We had meetings, but the game plan changed somewhere along the way. Logistical differences between our rural and large metropolitan areas created problems when the State distributed the money for radios.

*Pomona, CA:* The Cities in LA County are receiving guidance directly from the (County-level) Operational Area in terms of projects and priorities that are decided by the grant task forces. They've determined the vision and the mission of the grants on a regional level – and not necessarily in the best interest of the cities.

*Riverside, CA:* The State does not usually involve local jurisdictions in this type of planning.

*Santa Barbara, CA:* Planning for the Operational Area has been geared to completing the grants. There needs to be a time when all stakeholders – firefighters, sheriff, independent police and fire agencies, health, public works, and emergency management – meet to develop a strategic planning and implementation strategy. A County-wide assessment needs to take place. The contract cities for the LA County Sheriff do not know what the game plan is for the funding. Cities need to be better informed and updated on what the funding means for their local Sheriff's Stations.

*Temecula, CA:* The Operational Area (County) may have been asked to participate, but we have not been asked directly.

*Vista, CA:* The City's involvement is channeled through the County Office of Emergency Services.

*West Hollywood, CA:* The City has participated in the County-level planning. LA County has worked directly with the State.

*Broomfield, CO:* The regional planning group, of which Broomfield is a member, has appointed a representative.

*Holly Hill, FL:* The City has provided emergency planning and response information to the State.

*Miami-Dade, FL:* The strategy has been completed. We may be involved in updates because of our efforts to be included.

*Sunrise, FL:* Our Regional Domestic Security Task Force, not the cities, appears to be the focal point for needs assessment and input.

*Lawrence, IN:* We are an excluded city within Marion County (Indianapolis); there are three other excluded cities and nine townships in the County. As the 11th largest city in Indiana, Lawrence should be included in the planning, as should the others. To date, we have never been advised of available grants or any planning for the County.

*Baton Rouge, LA:* We have participated only as it relates to providing information specifically needed for the Region II UASI Strategy.

*Bowie, MD:* Information and money flows from the Maryland EMA to Prince George's County to the municipalities. We get less than stellar information from the County.

*Albuquerque, NM:* The State and County completed the surveys which are allegedly used by the State to develop the strategy. But there is no direct City input into the strategy except for data reported to the State.

*Las Vegas, NV:* The City was provided an opportunity to provide local level assessment information that was integrated into the State's plan. We had no opportunity for direct participation in the State planning process.

*Toledo, OH:* The City is represented on a State fire chiefs' WMD committee, but that "strategy development" is specific to training and equipment for firefighters. As a City we have had no involvement beyond this.

*University City, OH:* Local involvement in the State planning process only involves jurisdictions with "hard targets," such as nuclear power plants.

*Oklahoma City, OK:* The City participates in regional meetings established by the State, and homeland security response issues are discussed at these meetings. The State claims to have a formal homeland security strategy but the City has been unsuccessful in efforts to secure information on it.

*Pearland, TX:* In Texas, communication from the State regarding homeland security issues usually occurs via the County, and our County does not communicate or coordinate adequately with its municipalities regarding these issues.

*Murray, UT:* The State took the lead on the strategy, and most cities are "slightly involved" in the plan.

*Tacoma, WA:* An assistant fire chief is a member of the State strategy development working group.

A number of California cities – including *Beverly Hills, Campbell, Cerritos, Modesto, and Poway* – explain that their working relationship is with the Operational Area which is at the county level, not directly with the State. Several other cities – including *Henderson, NV* and *Grapevine, TX* – also said their involvement was limited to the county or regional level.

Other cities simply say they had no input to the strategy – among these, *Fort Wayne, IN, Fargo, ND, Dover Township* and *Linden, NJ, Houston, TX, Alexandria, VA, and Seattle, WA*. *Coppell, TX* observed that,



due to the size of the State, it's likely that the Texas Homeland Security Office will seek input only from major jurisdictions.

Michigan cities such as *Dearborn* and *Kentwood* report that they provide data for the State's strategy through the State assessment program, and *Detroit* has a representative on the State Planning Team responsible for developing the State strategy.

*Athens, GA* reports that the State of Georgia has focused on a regional approach and that, overall, this has been a successful plan.

### **Threat and Vulnerability Studies**

Sixty percent of the survey cities report that their state has conducted a threat and vulnerability study for their area. Nineteen percent indicate their state has not conducted such a study; 21 percent don't know. Among those cities whose states have conducted a threat and vulnerability study, two-thirds have found it to be somewhat helpful to their planning efforts. Eighteen percent say it was not at all helpful; 15 percent say it was very helpful.

Eighty-six percent of the survey cities report that they have conducted a threat and vulnerability study for their area, either on their own or in conjunction with neighboring local governments. Among those which have not, 88 percent believe that such a study would be desirable.

### **Local Emergency Communications Capacity**

Ninety-four percent of the survey cities have an emergency operation center (EOC). Among these:

- 11 percent say that their EOC is staffed 24/7. It should be noted that many cities say the EOC is staffed 24/7 if an emergency occurs.
- 63 percent have interoperable communications capabilities which allow different agencies and units to communicate with both the EOC and other units.
- 89 percent permit command and control capabilities for the mayor and/or top decision-makers. Among those which do not, 85 percent believe that such command and control capabilities would be desirable.
- 73 percent have a backup EOC site or sites in case the primary EOC is out of commission.

Sixty-two percent of the cities have the capability to establish a crisis call center to handle inquiries from the public after an incident. Among those which do not, 97 percent believe that having such a crisis call center would be desirable.

Nearly two-thirds (66 percent) of the survey cities are served by a county or regional EOC.



## APPROACHES TO EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION

Survey cities were invited to provide a brief description of an initiative or process underway in their state that provides an example of a particularly effective approach to the administration of federal homeland security funds at either the state or local level.

A wide variety of approaches to coordination of efforts within individual cities, counties, regions, and states were submitted. Many of these described cooperative efforts among jurisdictions to prioritize their needs, assess existing capabilities, take full advantage of funding opportunities, and share equipment and other resources.

The following are representative of responses received from survey cities.

*Huntsville, AL:* A subcommittee created to determine the needs for and allocation of DHS funding consisted of EMA, EMS, Law Enforcement, Fire Service, and Emergency Communications representatives. Taking this approach, the City was able to efficiently determine needs and requirements at various levels of public safety response, and WMD multi-agency response plans were modified and coordinated to incorporate the enhanced response capabilities.

*Mesa, AZ:* The regional and statewide WMD response system consists of rapid response teams that will respond anywhere in the State of Arizona. This system allows for individual jurisdictions to contribute resources to a State response while still maintaining resources to protect their own communities.

*Phoenix, AZ:* In response to the requirement for a regional approach that is part of the Urban Area Security Initiative, an Urban Area Working Group was established to bring all stakeholders together to plan, implement, and oversee the program. Efforts have also been underway to standardize policies, procedures, equipment, and training to ensure uniformity within the region. Protocols established by the Urban Area Working Group are being implemented as State standards. This partnership, in existence prior to UASI, has been strengthened.

*Tucson, AZ:* The Tucson Fire Department has collaborated with Pima Community College to offer a training curriculum for the Metropolitan Medical Response System in four areas: fire, law, medical, and the community. The curriculum documents on file at the college show each course title, description, content, and performance objectives. The qualified instructors that have been recruited are well trained to run the classes and affiliated exercises. Numerous classes, workshops, and drills already have been executed in the immediate Tucson metropolitan area and their frequency is increasing. Over 7,000 individuals have been trained to date.

*Redlands, CA:* The San Bernardino County Operational Area has created a decision group which includes representatives from the municipal police and fire departments, the County sheriff and fire department, and the County health department. Monies from the State are allocated based on decisions made by this group. A committee comprised of representatives from several cities has oversight of planning and spending requests to ensure compliance, cohesion, and collaboration on equipment and training related to the overall response plan.

*Vista, CA:* The City has been well served by the regional approach adopted by the members of the Unified Disaster Council who represent local jurisdictions. The City's input regarding how funding is allocated is channeled through this body, which is administered through the County of San Diego Office of Emergency Services. OES staff also has developed tracking systems and vendor relationships that have made the process easier for local jurisdictions.

*Northbrook, IL:* The Illinois Terrorism Task Force system incorporates all disciplines, public and private, and decisions are driven by goals of sharing, cooperation, standardization, and interoperability, not politics and parochialism. Local mutual aid consortiums drive the planning and execution processes. Committees exist in abundance and represent all venues and interests. Police, fire, and health departments work together and civilian

organizations are also closely involved. Functions such as training, planning, and exercises are centrally driven but implemented on a decentralized basis.

*Palatine, IL:* Generally, Illinois is taking a regional and statewide approach rather than passing on funds directly. The Illinois Terrorism Task Force has prioritized needs and purchased equipment (e.g., hazmat detection equipment) that is being distributed statewide. Special teams (e.g., hazmat, TRT, medical) are being formed and trained statewide.

*Kansas City, KS:* The Kansas Highway Patrol is the State's point of contact for homeland security equipment grant funds. They have entered into a contract with a private company to provide equipment for counties throughout the State. The EM Department coordinates the purchase and allocation of equipment for all municipalities within each county. The county orders for each municipality using an on-line system, equipment is shipped to the county for distribution, the State pays the bill directly, and each county tracks invoices and equipment. With this system, individual counties and municipalities do not have to go through the purchasing, budgeting and audit process, making it a cost-efficient way to administer the program.

*Louisville Metro, KY:* Kentucky recently created a state-level Homeland Security Office that is the coordination point for homeland security funding. In 2003, Mayor Abramson appointed the Criminal Justice Commission as the central point of coordination for homeland security grants for Louisville Metro Government. The Commission expanded its mission as a neutral criminal justice coordinating agency to include "public safety" collaboration and facilitation efforts. This has resulted in a higher level of multi-disciplinary cooperation, coordination and information sharing among local, state, and federal public safety agencies and organizations. It has also resulted in Louisville Metro becoming the recipient of many homeland security grants.

*New Orleans, LA:* The State of Louisiana has assigned the Adjutant General of the Louisiana National Guard to head the State homeland security effort; he is also the head of the Emergency Preparedness Office. He has assigned a permanent staff member to work with the UASI regional effort to ensure a seamless program of support for the grant and operational process. He has tasked the State Police to support all equipment purchases, hazmat planning, and interoperability communication efforts. This arrangement is improving every week and is ensuring a coordinated statewide effort.

*Somerville, MA:* The City of Somerville is part of the metropolitan mayors' coalition which is funded by the members and staffed by a project director who is employed by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council. This coalition has made great progress in securing equipment and developing regional emergency response plans. The Massachusetts Emergency Agency has also been very supportive, assisting local governments to plan for and respond to a terrorist attack involving WMD.

*Tupelo, MS:* The State of Mississippi has two programs of note. The first is the CBRNE Regional Response Team through which the State formed nine RRT's throughout the State to provide assistance in the event of a terrorist incident. This has provided a substantial base for resources statewide. The second is the Governor's executive order mandating ICS. The State has provided ICS training in all 82 counties, and the program has provided a template to assist local Emergency Management Directors in developing a Standard Operating Guideline for ICS.

*Manchester, NH:* The City has established a committee made up of representatives of the police, fire, EMS and health departments which reviews homeland security plans and procedures. All response guidelines, training, and emergency plans are coordinated through this committee; equipment purchases are also coordinated through this committee to ensure uniformity and non-duplication.

*Las Vegas, NV:* The State of Nevada, through legislative mandate, has established a State homeland security commission comprised of officials appointed by the Governor. Through this process the City has finally achieved a participative role in the homeland security matters that affect Las Vegas. The appointed

commissioners represent the wide array of population densities that exist throughout the state, and various functional disciplines.

*Oklahoma City, OK:* The City has formed a local Prevention and Preparedness Council comprised of representatives from the police department, fire department, public works department, and the ambulance service provider, as well as emergency management, County, and health care representatives. This group collectively recommends the use of grant funds for a unified City homeland security response.

*Tulsa, OK:* The Tulsa Mayor's Homeland Security Task Force, established in the summer of 2002, is made up of City and regional policy makers and members of the fire department, police department, sheriff's office, Emergency Medical Service Authority, public works department, the Tulsa International Airport, the Metropolitan Medical Response System, and others. The sub-committees of the Task Force include the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and the grant sub-committee. The Task Force meets twice monthly; reports from the TAG (on needs, priorities, emerging issues) and the grant subcommittee (on available funds, grant status, future funding) are delivered in these meetings, and decisions are made and actions are taken in an informed and unified manner.

*Sugar Land, TX:* The State of Texas requested assistance from the local Councils of Governments and the Texas Engineering Extension Service at Texas A&M University in the acquisition, allocation and disbursement of federal homeland security funds. This resulted in an equitable approach, in that small communities are included in the announcement of and the opportunity to apply for all monies made available.

*Renton, WA:* The State of Washington has taken a regional approach to the allocation of grant funds. Multiple jurisdictions join together to establish zones and the grant applications that are submitted benefit areas larger than single cities. At the same time, single city or jurisdiction applications continue to be allowed and encouraged.

## APPENDIX A: COMPARATIVE SURVEY FINDINGS

Selected Survey Items	September 2003 168 Cities	January 2004 215 Cities	June 2004 231 Cities
<b>Fiscal Year 2003 FUNDING</b>			
<b>Federal First Responder/Critical Infrastructure</b>			
Cities which have received funding	10%	24%	24%
Cities which will receive funding	37%	31%	24%
Cities which are not receiving funding	53%	45%	52%
Other area jurisdictions receiving funding	66%	59%	70%
Of these, county receiving funding	85%	79%	81%
Use of funds will not address top priorities	30%	37%	36%
Officials not given adequate opportunity to influence use of funds in their cities	58%	59%	52%
<b>State Domestic Preparedness Funding</b>			
Cities which have received funding	20%	36%	51%
Cities which will receive funding	51%	41%	26%
Cities which are not receiving funding	29%	23%	23%
Other area jurisdictions receiving funding	74%	76%	80%
Of these, county receiving funding	89%	80%	82%
Use of funds will not address top priorities	30%	40%	34%
Officials not given an adequate opportunity to influence use of funds in their cities	58%	49%	44%
<b>Urban Area Security Initiative</b>			
Cities not involved in state planning process	36%	46%	33%
Cities not expecting to receive funding	40%	41%	39%
Use of funds will not address top priorities	34%	37%	40%
Cities where state is keeping portion of the funding	44%	63%	55%
Cities which may receive less money from other programs because they receive UASI funds	20%	15%	24%
<b>Public Health Emergency/Hospital Preparedness</b>			
Cities where health department is receiving funding	83%	81%	85%
Cities expecting area hospitals are receiving funding	82%	75%	83%
Cities/health departments not involved in state planning process	48%	41%	40%
State plan does not adequately reflect city's priorities	48%	40%	36%
<b>Airport Law Enforcement Reimbursement</b>			
Airport operators not reimbursed for additional law enforcement costs	37%	46%	48%
Of those reimbursed, funds not provided to city for additional law enforcement costs	40%	35%	30%
<b>Port Security Grant Program</b>			
Cities responsible for security at funded ports	52%	50%	54%
Of these, cities not receiving funding through program	58%	64%	69%
<b>Mass Transit Security Grant Program</b>			
Cities providing security to funded transit systems	54%	51%	42%
Of these, cities not receiving funding through program	69%	76%	83%
Cities where state is keeping portion of the funding	44%	50%	21%
<b>Emergency Management Performance Grants</b>			
Cities which have not received funding	65%	59%	56%

<b>Selected Survey Items</b>	<b>September 2003 168 Cities</b>	<b>January 2004 215 Cities</b>	<b>June 2004 231 Cities</b>
Officials not given adequate opportunity to influence use of funds in their city or area	67%	55%	45%
<b>Pre-Disaster Mitigation</b> Cities which have not received funding	82%	76%	70%
Officials not given adequate opportunity to influence use of funds in their city or area	69%	60%	52%
<b>Community Emergency Response Teams</b> City residents are being trained through program	50%	52%	60%
<b>Fiscal Year 2004 Funding</b>			
<b>State and Local First Responder Programs</b> Cities which have received funding	Na	Na	15%
Cities which will receive funding	Na	40%	45%
Cities which are not receiving funding	Na	60%	40%
Other area jurisdictions receiving funding	Na	46%	66%
Of these, county receiving funding	Na	76%	84%
Use of funds will not address top priorities	Na	41%	35%
Officials not given adequate opportunity to influence use of funds in their cities	Na	59%	41%
<b>Urban Area Security Initiative</b> Cities not involved in state planning process	Na	44%	35%
Cities not expecting to receive funding	Na	33%	43%
Use of funds will not address top priorities	Na	28%	37%
Cities where state is keeping portion of the funding	Na	74%	54%
Cities which may receive less money from other programs because they receive UASI funds	Na	12%	21%
<b>Metro Rail Transit Grants</b> Cities providing security to funded transit systems	Na	56%	47%
Of these, cities not receiving funding through program	Na	71%	76%
Cities where state is keeping portion of the funding	Na	58%	25%
<b>Planning and Communications</b>			
<b>State Planning Process</b> Cities not asked to submit needs assessment to state	44%	22%	22%
Cities not involved in development of state homeland security strategy	49%	37%	38%

## APPENDIX B: SURVEY CITIES

Birmingham	AL	242,820	Torrance	CA	137,946
Florence	AL	36,264	Vista	CA	89,857
Gadsden	AL	38,978	West Covina	CA	105,080
Huntsville	AL	158,216	West Hollywood	CA	35,716
Montgomery	AL	201,568	Broomfield	CO	38,272
Fairbanks	AK	30,224	Colorado Springs	CO	360,890
Mesa	AZ	396,375	New Haven	CT	123,626
Phoenix	AZ	1,321,045	Trumbull	CT	34,243
Scottsdale	AZ	202,705	Wallingford	CT	43,026
Surprise	AZ	30,848	West Haven	CT	52,360
Tempe	AZ	158,625	Wilmington	DE	72,664
Tucson	AZ	486,699	Hallandale Beach	FL	34,282
Little Rock	AR	183,133	Holly Hill	FL	12,119
North Little Rock	AR	60,433	Hollywood	FL	139,357
Anaheim	CA	328,014	Lakeland	FL	78,452
Azusa	CA	44,712	Miami-Dade County	FL	2,057,000
Beverly Hills	CA	33,784	Orlando	FL	185,951
Campbell	CA	38,138	Pembroke Pines	FL	137,427
Cathedral City	CA	42,647	Sunrise	FL	85,779
Cerritos	CA	51,488	Tampa	FL	303,447
Costa Mesa	CA	108,724	Wellington	FL	38,216
Culver City	CA	38,816	West Palm Beach	FL	82,103
Fremont	CA	203,413	Athens	GA	101,489
Gardena	CA	57,746	Augusta	GA	199,775
Hemet	CA	58,812	Valdosta	GA	43,724
Inglewood	CA	112,580	Honolulu	HI	423,475
Irvine	CA	143,072	Lihue-Kauai County	HI	48,000
Lakewood	CA	79,345	Boise	ID	185,787
Long Beach	CA	471,000	Arlington Heights	IL	76,031
Los Angeles	CA	3,694,820	Buffalo Grove	IL	42,909
Modesto	CA	188,856	Carpentersville	IL	30,586
Morgan Hill	CA	33,556	Chicago	IL	2,896,016
Pomona	CA	149,473	Hanover Park	IL	38,278
Poway	CA	48,044	Harvey	IL	30,000
Redlands	CA	63,591	Niles	IL	30,068
Rialto	CA	91,873	North Chicago	IL	35,918
Riverside	CA	255,166	Northbrook	IL	33,435
San Bernardino	CA	185,401	Orland Park	IL	51,077
San Gabriel	CA	39,804	Palatine	IL	65,479
San Jose	CA	894,943	Park Ridge	IL	37,775
San Pablo	CA	30,215	Springfield	IL	111,454
Santa Ana	CA	337,977	Waukegan	IL	87,901
Santa Barbara	CA	92,325	Wheaton	IL	55,416
Santa Clarita	CA	151,088	East Chicago	IN	32,414
Santa Cruz	CA	54,593	Fort Wayne	IN	205,727
Santa Rosa	CA	147,595	Gary	IN	102,746
Sunnyvale	CA	131,760	Lawrence	IN	38,915
Temecula	CA	57,716	Cedar Rapids	IA	120,758
Thousand Oaks	CA	117,005	Kansas City	KS	146,866



Wichita	KS	344,284	Albany	NY	95,658
Louisville Metro	KY	694,000	Buffalo	NY	292,648
Baton Rouge	LA	227,818	Freeport	NY	43,783
New Orleans	LA	484,674	Hempstead	NY	56,554
Portland	ME	64,249	New Rochelle	NY	72,182
Baltimore	MD	651,154	New York	NY	8,008,278
Bowie	MD	50,269	Syracuse	NY	147,306
Amesbury	MA	16,450	Asheville	NC	68,889
Attleboro	MA	42,068	Charlotte	NC	540,828
Boston	MA	589,141	Durham	NC	187,035
Braintree	MA	33,828	Fargo	ND	90,599
Cambridge	MA	101,355	Minot	ND	36,567
Holyoke	MA	39,838	Saipan	MP	73,990
Revere	MA	47,283	Akron	OH	217,074
Somerville	MA	77,478	Cleveland	OH	478,403
Springfield	MA	152,082	Columbus	OH	711,470
Dearborn	MI	97,775	Dayton	OH	166,179
Detroit	MI	951,270	Hamilton	OH	60,690
Kalamazoo	MI	77,145	Lima	OH	40,081
Kentwood	MI	45,255	Solon	OH	21,802
Lansing	MI	119,128	Springfield	OH	65,358
Livonia	MI	100,545	Strongsville	OH	43,858
Taylor	MI	65,868	Toledo	OH	313,619
Brooklyn Park	MN	67,388	University Heights	OH	14,146
Minneapolis	MN	382,618	Midwest City	OK	54,088
Minnetonka	MN	51,301	Oklahoma City	OK	506,132
Greenville	MS	41,633	Stillwater	OK	39,065
Jackson	MS	184,256	Tulsa	OK	393,049
Meridian	MS	39,968	Medford	OR	63,154
Tupelo	MS	34,211	Allentown	PA	106,632
Joplin	MO	45,504	Erie	PA	103,717
O'Fallon	MO	46,169	Harrisburg	PA	48,950
St. Joseph	MO	348,189	Wilkes-Barre	PA	43,123
St. Louis	MO	60,000	Cidra	PR	42,753
Billings	MT	89,847	Pawtucket	RI	72,958
Lincoln	NE	225,581	Providence	RI	173,618
Omaha	NE	390,007	Woonsocket	RI	43,224
Henderson	NV	175,381	Charleston	SC	98,795
Las Vegas	NV	478,434	Columbia	SC	116,278
Reno	NV	180,480	Florence	SC	30,248
Manchester	NH	107,006	Rock Hill	SC	49,765
Dover Township	NJ	89,706	Rapid City	SD	59,607
Elizabeth	NJ	120,568	Germantown	TN	37,348
Hoboken	NJ	38,577	Knoxville	TN	173,890
Linden	NJ	39,394	Murfreesboro	TN	68,816
Piscataway	NJ	50,482	Nashville	TN	569,891
Alamogordo	NM	35,582	Allen	TX	43,554
Albuquerque	NM	448,607	College Station	TX	67,890
Las Cruces	NM	74,267	Coppell	TX	35,958
Los Lunas	NM	10,034	Dallas	TX	1,188,580
Santa Fe	NM	62,203	Denton	TX	80,537

DeSoto	TX	37,646
Eules	TX	46,005
Frisco	TX	33,714
Grand Prairie	TX	127,427
Grapevine	TX	42,059
Houston	TX	1,953,631
Laredo	TX	176,576
McAllen	TX	106,414
McKinney	TX	54,369
Nacogdoches	TX	29,914
Pearland	TX	37,640
San Antonio	TX	1,144,646
Sugar Land	TX	63,328
Wichita Falls	TX	104,197
Murray	UT	34,024
Provo	UT	105,166
Alexandria	VA	128,283
Chesapeake	VA	199,184
Virginia Beach	VA	425,257
Burlington	VT	38,889
Redmond	WA	45,256
Renton	WA	53,840
Seattle	WA	563,374
Tacoma	WA	193,556
Vancouver	WA	143,560
Charleston	WV	53,421
Brookfield	WI	38,649
Janesville	WI	59,498
New Berlin	WI	38,220
Waukesha	WI	64,825
Cheyenne	WY	53,011