



# Homeland Security

## FY 2014 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)

---

### Overview

As appropriated by the *Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014* (Pub. L. No. 113-76); and authorized by sec. 2002 of the *Homeland Security Act of 2002*, as amended (Pub. L. No. 107-296) (6 U.S.C. § 603); the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) provides funding to states, territories, urban areas, and other local governments to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from potential terrorist attacks and other hazards.

*In Fiscal Year 2014, DHS awarded \$1,043,346,000 to enhance the ability of states and territories to prevent, protect against, respond to and recover from potential terrorist acts and other hazards.*

The FY 2014 HSGP plays an important role in the implementation of the National Preparedness System by supporting the building, sustainment, and delivery of core capabilities essential to achieving the National Preparedness Goal (the Goal) of a secure and resilient Nation. HSGP is comprised of three related programs: State Homeland Security Program (SHSP), Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI), and Operation Stonegarden (OPSG). Per Sec. 2006 of the *Homeland Security Act of 2002*, as amended (6 U.S.C. § 607), states are required to ensure that at least 25 percent (25%) of the combined HSGP funds allocated under SHSP and UASI are dedicated to law enforcement terrorism prevention activities (LETPA) linked to one or more core capabilities within the Goal. The LETPA allocation can be from SHSP, UASI, or both.

---

### Funding

In FY 2014, total amount of funds distributed under the FY 2014 HSGP are \$1,043,346,000. Below is the funding distribution across FY 2014 HSGP’s three related grant programs:

HSGP Programs	FY 2014 Allocation
State Homeland Security Program	\$401,346,000
Urban Areas Security Initiative	\$587,000,000
Operation Stonegarden	\$55,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,043,346,000</b>

Based upon the requirements of the *Homeland Security Act of 2002*, as amended, DHS continues to inform final grant allocation decisions based upon risk. DHS defines risk as: “potential for an unwanted outcome resulting from an incident, event, or occurrence, as determined by its likelihood and the associated consequences” (see <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/dhs-risk-lexicon-2010.pdf>). DHS utilizes a comprehensive risk methodology focused on three principal elements:

- *Threat*
- *Vulnerability*
- *Consequence*

The risk methodology determines the relative risk of terrorism faced by a given area. It takes into account the potential risk of terrorism to people, critical infrastructure, and economic security. The threat analysis continues to account for threats from domestic violent extremists as well as international terrorist groups and those individuals inspired by terrorists abroad.

### ***SHSP Allocations***

FY 2014 SHSP funds are allocated based on three factors: minimum amounts as statutorily mandated, DHS's risk methodology, and anticipated effectiveness of proposed projects. The anticipated effectiveness was assessed based on the applicant's description of how the proposed projects, as outlined in the applicant's Investment Justification (IJ), align with the State Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA). Each State and territory received a minimum allocation under SHSP using the thresholds established in the *Homeland Security Act of 2002*, as amended. All 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico received 0.35 percent of the total funds appropriated for grants under 6 U.S.C. §§ 604 and 605. Four territories (American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands) received a minimum allocation of 0.08 percent of the total funds appropriated for grants under 6 U.S.C. §§ 604 and 605. For details on program-specific funding amounts, refer to the FY 2014 HSGP FOA.

### ***UASI Allocations***

FY 2014 UASI funds are allocated based on DHS's risk methodology and anticipated effectiveness of proposed projects. The anticipated effectiveness was assessed based on the applicant's description of how the proposed projects, as outlined in the IJ, align with the Urban Area THIRA. Eligible candidates for the FY 2014 UASI program were determined through an analysis of relative risk of terrorism faced by the 100 most populous metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) in the United States, in accordance with the *Homeland Security Act of 2002*, as amended. Detailed information on MSAs is publicly available from the United States Census Bureau at <http://www.census.gov/population/www/metroareas/metrodef.html>. For details on program-specific funding amounts, refer to the FY 2014 HSGP FOA.

### ***OPSG Allocations***

FY 2014 OPSG funds are allocated based on risk-based prioritization using a U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Sector-specific border risk methodology. Factors considered include, but are not limited to: threat, vulnerability, miles of border, and other border-specific "law enforcement intelligence," as well as feasibility of FY 2014 Operation Orders to designated localities within the United States Border States and territories. For details on program-specific funding amounts, refer to the FY 2014 HSGP FOA.

---

## **Eligibility**

All 56 States, territories and Commonwealths are eligible to apply for SHSP funds. For those States, territories and Commonwealths that are eligible for UASI and/or OPSG funds, the SAA is the only entity eligible to submit applications to FEMA on behalf of UASI and OPSG applicants.

Eligible sub-recipients under the FY 2014 OPSG are local units of government at the county level and Federally-recognized tribal governments in the States bordering Canada, States bordering Mexico, and States and territories with international water borders. All applicants must have active ongoing CBP operations coordinated through a sector office. Eligible States and territories with a county or similar level of government structure are authorized to accept applications on behalf of

the alternative unit of local government. SAAs in this situation must advise FEMA in writing as to their intent to apply.

## **Other Eligibility Requirements**

### ***Emergency Operations Plan (EOP)***

Grantees must update their EOP at least once every two years to comply with Comprehensive Preparedness Guide (CPG) 101 v2, *Developing and Maintaining Emergency Operations Plans*. Grantees will use the State Preparedness report (SPR) to report their compliance with this reporting requirement. An evaluation matrix to describe and calculate the percentage towards compliance with CPG 101 v.2 is available at <http://www.fema.gov/national-preparedness/plan>.

### ***State Preparedness Report (SPR)***

The SPR is an annual capability assessment. Sec. 652(c) of the *Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006* (Pub. L. No. 109-295), which requires an SPR from any state/territory receiving federal preparedness assistance administered by DHS. Each state submits an SPR to FEMA. Refer to the FY 2014 HSGP FOA for additional guidance on SPR requirements.

### ***Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA)***

Grantees must update their THIRA through the State Preparedness Report by December 31, 2014. Further details on the THIRA as it relates to HSGP requirements can be found in the FY 2014 HSGP FOA. For additional guidance on THIRA, refer to CPG 201, Second Edition, available at <http://www.fema.gov/plan>.

### ***National Incident Management System (NIMS) Implementation***

Per FEMA Information Bulletin (IB) # 391, available at <http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/90125>, grantees receiving funding under the FY 2014 HSGP must ensure and maintain the adoption and implementation of NIMS. Instructions for NIMS reporting is contained in IB #391, and completed through the Unified Reporting Tool (URT).

FEMA has developed the NIMS Guideline for Credentialing of Personnel to describe national credentialing standards and to provide written guidance regarding the use of those standards. Additional information on resource management and national Tier I NIMS Resource Types can be found at <http://www.fema.gov/resource-management>. Although State, local, tribal, and private sector partners—including nongovernmental organizations—are not required to credential their personnel in accordance with these guidelines, FEMA strongly encourages them to do so in order to leverage the Federal investment in the Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) 201 infrastructure and to facilitate interoperability for personnel deployed outside their home jurisdiction. Additional information can be found at [http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nims/nims\\_alert\\_cred\\_guideline.pdf](http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nims/nims_alert_cred_guideline.pdf). Information regarding credentialing for personnel can be found at (NIMS Guideline for Credentialing of Personnel) [http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nims/nims\\_alert\\_cred\\_guideline.pdf](http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nims/nims_alert_cred_guideline.pdf).

---

## **Funding Guidelines**

For FY 2014 HSGP, allowable investments made in support of the HSGP priorities as well as other capability-enhancing projects must fall into the categories of planning, organization, equipment, training, or exercises. The period of performance for HSGP is 24 months from the date of award.

For additional information regarding allowable costs, including management and administration costs, please see the FY 2014 HSGP FOA.

---

### Key FY 2014 HSGP Changes

FEMA has identified several ways to better organize the grant requirements in order to reduce the burden on the grantees to manage the completion and timely submission of reporting requirements. The following updates to grant reporting requirements are effective starting in FY 2014:

- **Initial Strategy Implementation Plan (ISIP):** In FY 2014, the ISIP is no longer required.
- **Unified Reporting Tool (URT):** The URT is a collection mechanism managed by FEMA to gather data. Beginning in FY 2014, grantees will use the URT to submit Emergency Operation Plans (EOP), THIRAs/SPRs, NIMS data and the Senior Advisory Committee (SAC) Charter.
- **Mass Casualty Events:** Grantees will no longer report the percentage of funding used for mass casualty events. This includes grantees with FY 2013 funds. Information Bulletin #388b details changes to HSGP reporting requirements.
- **Community Preparedness:** Grantees are no longer required to report the percentage of funding used for community preparedness. This includes grantees with FY 2013 funds. Information Bulletin #388b details changes to HSGP reporting requirements.

Allowable training and exercise language was revised to provide clarification around reporting requirements. Those changes include the following:

- **Training:** Reporting training activities through Web-Forms is not required under FY 2014 HSGP. Additionally, grantees are no longer required to request approval for training from FEMA for personnel to attend non-FEMA training as long as the training is coordinated with and approved by the State Administrative Agency (SAA) state/territory or Training Point of Contact (TPOC) and falls within the jurisdiction's Emergency Operations Plan (EOP).

Grantees will, however, be required to report Nationwide Suspicious Activity Reporting SAR Initiative awareness level training in the Performance Progress Report (PPR). All activities that fall under the Training category will continue to be reported in the Bi-annual Implementation Strategy Report (BSIR).

- **Exercises:** In FY 2014, all grantees will develop and maintain a progressive exercise program consistent with the Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) ([http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1914-25045-8890/hseep\\_apr13\\_.pdf](http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1914-25045-8890/hseep_apr13_.pdf)). A progressive, multi-year exercise program enables organizations to participate in a series of increasingly complex exercises, with each successive exercise building upon the previous one until mastery is achieved while also taking into account prior lessons learned. The After-Action Report (AAR)/Improvement Plan (IP) are still submitted to [hseep@dhs.gov](mailto:hseep@dhs.gov).

The HSGP Investment Justification (IJ) template was modified to gather more project level data.

---

## **Application Process and Evaluation Criteria**

FY 2014 HSGP applications were evaluated through a review process for completeness, adherence to programmatic guidelines, and anticipated effectiveness of the proposed Investments. The results from the review process may require applicants to revise submissions before the release of HSGP funding.

**i. SHSP and UASI**

FEMA verified compliance with all administrative and eligibility criteria identified in the application kit, to include the required submission of risk driven, capabilities-based Investment Justifications (IJs) by the established due dates and verification of alignment to Urban Area, State, and regional THIRAs and SPRs. State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies were examined for further context regarding current capability levels and how IJs address potential gaps to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from disasters. FY 2014 SHSP and UASI are non-competitive programs.

**ii. OPSG**

Applications were reviewed by the SAA and CBP/Border Patrol (BP) Sector Headquarters for completeness and adherence to programmatic guidelines and evaluated for anticipated feasibility, need, and impact of the Operations Orders.

FEMA verified compliance with all administrative and eligibility criteria identified in the FOA and required submission of Operations Orders and Inventory of Operations Orders by the established due dates. FEMA and CBP/BP used the results of both the risk analysis and the Federal review to make recommendations for funding to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

FY 2014 OPSG funds are allocated competitively based on risk-based prioritization using a U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Sector-specific border risk methodology. Factors considered include, but were not limited to: threat, vulnerability, miles of border, and other border-specific “law enforcement intelligence,” as well as feasibility of FY 2014 Operation Orders to designated localities within the U.S. border States and territories.

---

### FY 2014 SHSP Allocations

State/Territory	FY 2014 Allocation	State/Territory	FY 2014 Allocation
Alabama	\$3,733,000	Montana	\$3,733,000
Alaska	\$3,733,000	Nebraska	\$3,733,000
American Samoa	\$854,000	Nevada	\$3,733,000
Arizona	\$4,568,000	New Hampshire	\$3,733,000
Arkansas	\$3,733,000	New Jersey	\$8,354,000
California	\$60,035,000	New Mexico	\$3,733,000
Colorado	\$3,979,000	New York	\$76,742,000
Connecticut	\$3,978,000	North Carolina	\$5,489,000
Delaware	\$3,733,000	North Dakota	\$3,733,000
District of Columbia	\$4,119,000	Northern Mariana	\$854,000
Florida	\$11,010,000	Ohio	\$7,698,000
Georgia	\$6,807,000	Oklahoma	\$3,733,000
Guam	\$854,000	Oregon	\$3,837,000
Hawaii	\$3,733,000	Pennsylvania	\$10,026,000
Idaho	\$3,733,000	Puerto Rico	\$3,733,000
Illinois	\$16,357,000	Rhode Island	\$3,733,000
Indiana	\$3,978,000	South Carolina	\$3,733,000
Iowa	\$3,733,000	South Dakota	\$3,733,000
Kansas	\$3,733,000	Tennessee	\$3,978,000
Kentucky	\$3,978,000	Texas	\$21,448,000
Louisiana	\$3,978,000	U.S. Virgin Islands	\$854,000
Maine	\$3,733,000	Utah	\$3,733,000
Maryland	\$6,125,000	Vermont	\$3,733,000
Massachusetts	\$5,622,000	Virginia	\$7,414,000
Michigan	\$6,658,000	Washington	\$6,493,000
Minnesota	\$3,978,000	West Virginia	\$3,733,000
Mississippi	\$3,733,000	Wisconsin	\$3,978,000
Missouri	\$3,978,000	Wyoming	\$3,733,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$401,346,000</b>

## FY 2014 UASI Allocations

State/Territory	Funded Urban Area	FY 2014 UASI Allocation
Arizona	Phoenix Area	\$5,500,000
California	Anaheim/Santa Ana Area	\$5,500,000
	Bay Area	\$27,400,000
	Los Angeles/Long Beach Area	\$67,500,000
	Riverside Area	\$1,000,000
	Sacramento Area	\$1,000,000
	San Diego Area	\$16,874,000
Colorado	Denver Area	\$3,000,000
District of Columbia	National Capital Region	\$53,000,000
Florida	Miami/Fort Lauderdale Area	\$5,500,000
	Orlando Area	\$1,000,000
	Tampa Area	\$3,000,000
Georgia	Atlanta Area	\$5,500,000
Hawaii	Honolulu Area	\$1,000,000
Illinois	Chicago Area	\$69,500,000
Indiana	Indianapolis Area	\$1,000,000
Louisiana	New Orleans Area	\$3,000,000
Maryland	Baltimore Area	\$5,500,000
Massachusetts	Boston Area	\$18,000,000
Michigan	Detroit Area	\$5,500,000
Minnesota	Twin Cities Area	\$5,500,000
Missouri	Kansas City Area	\$1,000,000
	St. Louis Area	\$3,000,000
Nevada	Las Vegas Area	\$1,000,000
New Jersey	Jersey City/Newark Area	\$21,800,000
New York	New York City Area	\$178,926,000
North Carolina	Charlotte Area	\$3,000,000
Ohio	Cincinnati Area	\$1,000,000
	Cleveland Area	\$1,000,000
	Columbus Area	\$1,000,000
Oregon	Portland Area	\$1,000,000
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Area	\$18,500,000
	Pittsburgh Area	\$3,000,000
Texas	Dallas/Fort Worth/Arlington Area	\$15,500,000
	Houston Area	\$24,000,000
	San Antonio Area	\$1,000,000
Utah	Salt Lake City Area	\$1,000,000
Virginia	Hampton Roads Area	\$1,000,000
Washington	Seattle Area	\$5,500,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$587,000,000</b>

### FY 2014 OPSG Allocations

State	Allocation
Alabama	\$99,923
Arizona	\$12,415,661
California	\$9,334,826
Florida	\$872,116
Idaho	\$30,322
Louisiana	\$269,274
Maine	\$514,929
Michigan	\$401,105
Minnesota	\$388,389
Mississippi	\$50,115
Montana	\$617,420
New Hampshire	\$99,333
New Mexico	\$2,647,317
New York	\$1,284,299
North Dakota	\$433,149
Ohio	\$423,268
Pennsylvania	\$74,007
Puerto Rico	\$809,572
Texas	\$23,124,196
Vermont	\$200,460
Washington	\$910,319
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$55,000,000</b>