

August 2010

## HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS - DISTRIBUTION HISTORY

This memorandum provides information on the state distribution of grant funding from the federal Department of Homeland Security.

The federal homeland security grant process requires the state to develop state investment strategies in alignment with national priorities established by the federal Department of Homeland Security. The Department of Emergency Services, with assistance from the Department of Emergency Services Advisory Committee, developed a state homeland security strategic plan to use in the federal homeland security grant submission and the homeland security allocation process. The Department of Emergency Services has received approximately \$81 million in federal homeland security funding from 1999 through 2009, summarized as follows:

Fiscal Years 1999-2009 Federal Homeland Security Funding Awarded	
Fiscal Year	Award Amount
1999	\$410,000
2000-01	\$777,000
2002	\$2,700,000
2003	\$13,200,000
2004	\$19,400,000
2005	\$14,600,000
2006	\$10,700,000
2007	\$6,550,000
2008	\$6,170,000
2009	\$6,524,500
2010	\$6,613,200 <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Federal homeland security funding for fiscal year 2010 has not yet been awarded. This is the amount requested by the Department of Emergency Services.

According to federal guidelines, 80 percent of the federal homeland security funding received must be distributed to local governments for activities that support terrorism preparedness by building or enhancing capabilities. Federal grant guidance requires that a state senior advisory committee be used to coordinate grant resources. The Department of Emergency Services utilizes the Department of Emergency Services Advisory Committee for this purpose. There is no federal guidance that defines the state senior advisory committee's role in the review of the grant program.

The Department of Emergency Services Advisory Committee is established in North Dakota Century Code Section 37-17.1-02.2 for purposes of advising the department regarding collaboration with political subdivisions. There is no specific state legislation providing guidance to the Department of Emergency Services Advisory Committee in overseeing the federal homeland security funding distribution. The Century Code limits the Department of Emergency Services Advisory Committee to 11 members. The current committee consists of the following members:

2009-11 Biennium Department of Emergency Services Advisory Committee	
Name	Department/Agency
Sheriff Steve Bay	North Dakota Sheriff's Association
Mr. Jerry Bergquist	North Dakota 911 Association
Mr. Brad Erickson	North Dakota Healthcare Association
Mr. Mark Johnson	North Dakota Association of Counties
Mr. Jerry Kemmet	Bureau of Criminal Investigation
Mr. Shawn Kessel	North Dakota League of Cities
Mr. Curt Halmrast	North Dakota EMS Association
Mr. Dean Pearson	North Dakota Emergency Management Association
Captain Bill Brown	North Dakota Peace Officers Association
Chief Bob Sivak	Fire Services
Mr. Tim Wiedrich	State Department of Health

In 2010 the 80 percent local share will be distributed through a regional distribution and a competitive grant process. There is no state or federal law specifically mandating how the 80 percent is to be distributed to local units of government. As a general rule, the Department of Emergency Services provides \$4 million in regional distributions and any remainder of federal homeland security funding to competitive grant applicants.

Under the Department of Emergency Services' regional distribution plan for the 80 percent local share, the department utilizes regional advisory groups and a regional policy network to assist in the distribution. Regional advisory group members are appointed from each county representing various response groups. Regional policy network members are appointed by the Department of Emergency Services. A summary of current regional advisory group and regional policy network members is shown in [Appendix A](#). Each emergency response or service agency requesting regional funding must submit a regional grant application to the department. The regional advisory group members review and prioritize the applications for their area, then submit recommendations to the regional policy network. The regional policy network allocates funding to regions, taking into consideration the extent to which applications meet federal grant guidance and the priority phase that the response activities identified will support.

The portion of the 80 percent local share that will be distributed through a competitive grant process requires each emergency response or service agency to submit a separate application to the Department of Emergency Services. The department along with a peer review group evaluates the applications and allocates funding based on the extent to which the application meets federal grant guidance. The department selects peer review group members based on geographic area and respective fields. The group consists of at least four members.

A historical summary of the methodologies used to distribute federal homeland security funds is provided below:

Year	Historical Federal Homeland Security Funding Distribution Methodology
1999 to 2003	Federal homeland security funding was provided through the Department of Justice and was very narrow in scope.
2003	The complexity of homeland security grants increased in 2003. A primary grant of \$3.7 million and a supplemental grant of \$8.6 million were received. In March 2003, the federal Department of Homeland Security was created. The majority of the previously existing agencies, such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Transportation Security Administration, the Coast Guard, the United States Customs and Border Protection, and the United States Secret Service, transferred to the new department.
2004	In 2004 the grant was divided into two categories--the state homeland security grant program and the law enforcement terrorism prevention program.
2005	Homeland security funding for 2005 was allocated on a base percentage rate plus population. The grant required 80 percent of the funds to be passed through to local units of government. The department distributed the 2005 funds to jurisdictions through a series of funding formulas based upon threat, vulnerability, and capability of compliance with the state's strategy at that time. Local jurisdictions were provided the flexibility to determine spending based upon federal grant guidance.
2006	For 2006 grant guidance, the United States Department of Homeland Security established eight national priorities that had to be considered when spending 2006 grant funds. States were required to align their state homeland security strategies with the national priorities. These have remained priorities for the United States Department of Homeland Security through subsequent grant years.
2007	<p>The federal homeland security funding distribution shifted to a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive regional response priority. This was done to enhance the state's capability to prevent, protect, respond, and recover from terrorism as it was intended and also to meet two of the eight United States Department of Homeland Security national priorities--strengthen chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive detection, response, and decontamination capabilities and expand regional collaboration.</p> <p>The chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive regional response priorities were set and agreed upon by the Department of Emergency Services Advisory Committee and were based on a three-phased approach. Phase I was to build the capabilities of bomb, SWAT, and hazardous materials to include mass casualty. Phase II was to build the capability of search and rescue. Phase III was to build capabilities related to all hazards which were</p>

	further refined to fit into the terrorism preparedness requirement.
2008	<p>In 2007 funding distributions included \$1 million to local governments for Phase I chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive regional response activities. The remainder of the local share--\$4.24 million--was distributed to counties based upon a formula that gave consideration to the population of the county and the assessment of the county's security needs.</p> <p>In 2008 funding distributions included \$4 million to local governments for Phase I chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive regional response activities. The remainder of the local share--\$936,000--was distributed to counties based upon a formula that gave consideration to the population of the county and the assessment of the county's security needs.</p>
2009	<p>In 2009 funding distributions included \$4 million to local governments for Phase I chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive regional response activities. The remainder of the local share--\$1,219,600--was allocated based on the need to program radios across the state according to the state's frequency management plan to meet a Federal Communications Commission requirement that responders be able to demonstrate response-level emergency communications within one hour for routine events involving multiple jurisdictions and agencies. This also meets another United States Department of Homeland Security national priority to strengthen interoperable and operable communications capabilities.</p>
2010	<p>The federal homeland security funding has not yet been awarded for 2010. However, the Department of Emergency Services anticipates that in 2010, \$4 million will be awarded for Phases I and II chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive regional response activities, with the emphasis on Phase II search and rescue. The Department of Emergency Services will use a regional response policy network to determine the best allocation of these funds based on the established phases to assure uniform regional response policy is implemented in terms of interoperable operating procedures, equipment, and protocols.</p> <p>In fiscal year 2010, the remainder of the local share funding, estimated to be \$1,290,560, will be distributed based on a competitive grant process. The Department of Emergency Services believes the move from formula to competitive grant funding will permit the state to distribute funding based on need and capability and ensure the funds are being used to support terrorism preparedness.</p>

The total federal homeland security funding allocated to local governments for the period 1999 to 2009 was approximately \$65.1 million. Amounts per county or tribe are shown below:

<b>Fiscal Years 1999-2009 Federal Homeland Security Funds Received by County</b>	
<b>County/Tribe</b>	<b>Award Amount</b>
Adams	\$280,495
Barnes	1,027,016
Benson	402,003
Billings	235,162
Bottineau	692,227
Bowman	335,023
Burke	407,189
Burleigh	9,390,528
Cass/Fargo	8,932,064
Cavalier	643,817
Dickey	363,130
Divide	510,200
Dunn	258,179
Eddy	288,746
Emmons	349,388
Foster	482,934
Golden Valley	278,995
Grand Forks	7,224,698
Grant	359,351
Griggs	216,029
Hettinger	289,217
Kidder	329,759
LaMoure	414,167
Logan	329,757
McHenry	375,549
McIntosh	373,261
McKenzie	480,877
McLean	598,024
Mercer	619,521
Morton	1,566,790
Mountrail	396,723
Nelson	372,691
Oliver	236,086
Pembina	983,699
Pierce	371,841
Ramsey	1,399,625
Ransom	421,410
Renville	413,103
Richland	1,157,766
Rolette	997,979
Sargent	386,781
Sheridan	288,766
Sioux	238,159
Slope	159,501
Stark	2,117,102
Steele	258,329
Stutsman	2,222,120
Towner	442,537
Trail	627,750
Walsh	2,953,894
Ward	6,944,006
Wells	357,183
Williams	1,706,856
Spirit Lake Tribe	465,068
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe	307,801
Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation	496,829
Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians	295,990
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$65,073,691<sup>1</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup>Total does not include the following 2009 awards: \$1.4 million for regional coordinators and \$166,850 of 2009 funds and \$25,603 of 2008 funds allocated but not awarded.

In fiscal years 1999 to 2009, approximately \$36.5 million, or 56.1 percent, of total allocations were for chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive equipment and \$24.2 million, or 37.2 percent, of total allocations were for interoperable communications. A summary of funding allocation by county and region is attached as [Appendix B](#).

ATTACH:2