



Homeland Security

Fiscal Year 2016 Homeland Security Grant Program

Overview

As appropriated by the *Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2016* (Pub. L. No. 114-113); and authorized by the *Homeland Security Act of 2002*, as amended (Pub. L. No. 107-296); the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) provides funding to states, territories, urban areas, and other local and tribal governments to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from potential terrorist attacks and other hazards.

In Fiscal Year 2016, DHS provides \$1,037,000,000 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 2016 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. Delivering core capabilities requires the combined effort of the whole community, rather than the exclusive effort of any single organization or level of government. HSGP is comprised of three grant programs: State Homeland Security Program (SHSP), Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI), and Operation Stonegarden (OPSG).

The State Administrative Agency (SAA) must pass through at least 80 percent (80%) of the funds awarded under SHSP and UASI to local or tribal units of government within 45 calendar days of receipt of the funds. "Receipt of the funds" occurs either when the SAA accepts the award or 15 calendar days after the SAA receives notice of the award, whichever is earlier.

Per section 2006 of the *Homeland Security Act of 2002*, as amended (6 U.S.C. § 607), DHS/FEMA is required to ensure that at least 25 percent (25%) of grant funding appropriated for grants awarded under HSGP's authorizing statute are used for law enforcement terrorism prevention activities. DHS/FEMA meets this requirement, in part, by requiring all SHSP and UASI recipients 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, as defined in 6 U.S.C. § 607, and linked to one or more core capabilities within the Goal. The LETPA allocation can be from SHSP, UASI, or both. This requirement does not include award funds from OPSG. The 25 percent (25%) LETPA allocation is in addition to the 80% pass through requirement to local units of government and Tribes.

The National Prevention Framework describes those activities that should be executed upon the discovery of intelligence or information regarding an imminent threat to the homeland, in order to

thwart an initial or follow on terrorist attack, and provides guidance to ensure the Nation is prepared to prevent, avoid, or stop a threatened or actual act of terrorism. Activities outlined in the *National Prevention Framework* are eligible for use as LETPA-focused funds. In addition, where capabilities are shared with the protection mission area, the *National Protection Framework* activities are also eligible. Other terrorism prevention activities proposed for funding under LETPA must be approved by the FEMA Administrator.

Funding

In FY 2016, the total amount of funds under the HSGP is \$1,037,000,000. Below is the funding distribution across the three grant programs:

HSGP Programs	FY 2016 Allocation
State Homeland Security Program	\$402,000,000
Urban Area Security Initiative	\$580,000,000
Operation Stonegarden	\$55,000,000
Total	\$1,037,000,000

Based upon the requirements of the *Homeland Security Act of 2002*, as amended, DHS/FEMA 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 2016 SHSP funds are allocated based on two factors: minimum amounts as legislatively mandated, and DHS’s risk methodology.

Each state and territory receives 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 receive 0.35 percent of the total funds allocated for grants under Section 2003 and Section 2004 of the *Homeland Security Act of 2002*. Four territories (American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands) receive a minimum allocation of 0.08 percent of the total funds allocated for grants under Section 2003 and 2004 of the *Homeland Security Act of 2002*. For details on program-specific funding amounts, refer to the FY 2016 HSGP Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO).

UASI Allocations

In the Explanatory Statement accompanying the FY 2016 Appropriation, Congress expressed its intent that the Secretary fund up to eighty-five percent (85%) of nationwide risk in the UASI program. In accordance with that intent, the Secretary designated twenty-nine (29) urban areas eligible for funding under UASI program. This is an increase from the twenty-eight (28) urban areas eligible in FY 2015. FY 2016 UASI funds are allocated based on DHS's risk methodology and anticipated effectiveness of proposed projects. The anticipated effectiveness is assessed based on the applicant's description of how the proposed projects, as outlined in the investment justification (IJ), align with the urban area Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA). The twenty-nine (29) eligible urban areas for the FY 2016 UASI program are determined through an analysis of relative risk of terrorism faced by the 100 most populous metropolitan statistical areas (MSA) 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 2016 HSGP NOFO.

OPSG Allocations

The FY 2016 OPSG risk assessment is designed to identify the risk to border security and to assist with the distribution of funds for the grant program. Funding under OPSG is distributed based on the risk to the security of the border. The risk model used to allocate OPSG funds considers the potential risk that certain threats pose to border security and estimates the relative risk faced by a given area. In evaluating risk, DHS considers the populations in a particular area that could be at risk, the concentration of people in the area, and specific characteristics of their location that might contribute to risk, such as intelligence community assessments of threat and the potential impacts that the threats pose to the security of the border area. For vulnerability and consequence, DHS/FEMA considers the expected impact and consequences of successful border events occurring in specific areas.

Eligibility

All 56 states and territories, including any state of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands, are eligible to apply for SHSP funds. For those states that are eligible for UASI and OPSG funding, the State Administrative Agency (SAA) is the only entity eligible to submit applications to DHS/FEMA on behalf of UASI and OPSG applicants.

Eligible high-risk urban areas for the FY 2016 UASI program have been determined through an analysis of relative risk of terrorism faced by the 100 most populous metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) in the United States.

Eligible sub-recipients under the FY 2016 OPSG Program are local units of government at the county level and federally-recognized tribal governments in states bordering Canada, states bordering Mexico, and states and territories with international water borders. All applicants must have active ongoing United States Border Patrol (USBP) operations coordinated through a USBP sector office to be eligible for OPSG funding. 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. States in this situation must advise DHS/FEMA in writing as to their intent to apply.

Other Eligibility Requirements

Emergency Operations Plan (EOP)

Recipients must update their EOP at least once every two years to comply with Comprehensive Preparedness Guide (CPG) 101 Version 2.0, *Developing and Maintaining Emergency Operations Plans*. Recipients will use the Unified Reporting Tool (URT) to report their compliance with this reporting requirement.

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) requires an SPR from any state or territory receiving federal preparedness assistance administered by DHS/FEMA. Each state submits an SPR to DHS/FEMA. Refer to the FY 2016 HSGP NOFO for additional guidance on SPR requirements.

Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA)

States and territories should review and, if necessary, revise and update the THIRA on an annual basis. Urban Areas should also review and, if necessary, revise and update the THIRA on an annual basis. A single THIRA submission will support multiple grant awards received by a jurisdiction. This submission is valid for the entire period of performance of the individual grant award(s).

Further details on the THIRA as it relates to HSGP requirements can be found in the FY 2016 HSGP NOFO. For additional guidance on THIRA, please refer to the Comprehensive Preparedness Guide (CPG) 201, Second Edition, available at www.fema.gov/plan.

National Incident Management System (NIMS) Implementation

Prior to allocation of any federal preparedness awards in FY 2016, recipients must ensure and maintain adoption and implementation of NIMS. Emergency management and incident response activities require carefully managed resources (personnel, teams, facilities, equipment, and/or supplies) to meet incident needs.

Although state, local, tribal, territorial, and private sector partners—including nongovernmental organizations—are not required to credential their personnel in accordance with these guidelines, DHS/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 on resource management and NIMS resource typing definitions and job titles/position qualifications is available under <https://www.fema.gov/national-incident-management-system>. 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.

Funding Guidelines

For FY 2016 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 thirty-six (36) months. For additional information regarding allowable costs, including management and administration costs, please refer to the FY 2016 HSGP NOFO.

Application Process and Evaluation Criteria

Review Criteria

Prior to making a federal award, the federal awarding agency is required by 31 U.S.C. 3321 and 41 U.S.C. 2313 to review information available through any Office of Management and Budget-designated repositories of government-wide eligibility qualification or financial integrity information. Therefore, application evaluation criteria may include the following risk-based considerations of the applicant: (1) financial stability; (2) quality of management systems and ability to meet management standards; (3) history of performance in managing federal awards; (4) reports and findings from audits; and (5) ability to effectively implement statutory, regulatory, or other requirements.

FY 2016 HSGP applications are evaluated through a review process for completeness, adherence to programmatic guidelines, and anticipated effectiveness of the proposed investments. Applicants are required to align all projects to at least one core capability identified in the Goal. Descriptions of projects should be clear and concise and should include whether the project supports a NIMS-typed resource and whether assets are deployable or shareable. The grant-funded activities of every project must align to the HSGP solution areas: Planning, Organization, Exercises, Training, and/or Equipment. A project may have activities in more than one solution area.

Grant projects must be: 1) both feasible and effective at reducing the risks for which the project was designed; and 2) able to be completed fully within the 36-month period of performance. FEMA uses the information provided in the application and after the submission of the first Biannual Strategy Implementation Report to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of the grant project. Information that assists in the feasibility and effectiveness determination includes the following:

- Scope of work (purpose and objectives of the project, identification of what is being protected, identification of core capability addressed and whether the core capability is identified in the SPR, where applicable, as a priority);
- Desired outcomes, including expected long-term impact where applicable, and discussion of which core capability gap it helps to close and how;
- Summary of status of planning and design accomplished to date (e.g. included in a capital improvement plan); and
- Project schedule.

Recipients are expected to conform, as applicable, with accepted engineering practices, established codes, standards, modeling techniques, and best practices.

Review and Selection Process

SHSP and UASI

To ensure the effectiveness of proposed investments and projects, all applications undergo a federal review. The federal review is conducted by FEMA Headquarters (HQ) Program Analysts. HQ Program Analysts use a checklist to verify compliance with all administrative and eligibility criteria identified in the FY 2016 HSGP NOFO. Additionally, using previously submitted SPR data, HQ Program Analysts verify alignment of the proposed investments and projects to gaps identified through the THIRA/SPR process and national priorities identified in the National Preparedness Report. IJs are reviewed at both the investment and project level. The IJ receives either an approval or conditional approval. Those IJs that are conditionally approved must be revised and must receive final approval prior to access to full funding.

Fusion Center investments are jointly reviewed by FEMA and the DHS Office of Intelligence and Analysis for compliance with FY 2016 HSGP NOFO requirements to prioritize the alignment of requests with results from the annual Fusion Center Assessment Program. Investments that do not meet the requirements will be revised by the recipient and must receive approval prior to accessing funds allocated to fusion center activities.

OPSG

Applications are reviewed by the SAA and USBP Sector Headquarters for completeness and adherence to programmatic guidelines and evaluated for anticipated feasibility, need, and impact of the Operations Orders.

FEMA verifies compliance with all administrative and eligibility criteria identified in the FY 2016 HSGP NOFO and requires submission of Operations Orders and Inventory of Operations Orders by the established due dates. FEMA and USBP use the results of both the risk analysis and the federal review by FEMA to make recommendations for funding to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

FY 2016 OPSG funds are allocated competitively based on risk-based prioritization using the USBP Sector-specific border risk methodology described above. Final funding allocations are determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, who may consider information and input from various law enforcement offices or subject matter experts within the Department. 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 2016 Operation Orders to designated localities within Border States and territories.

HSGP Resources

There are a variety of resources available to address HSGP programmatic, technical, and financial questions.

- The FY 2016 HSGP NOFO is located online at: <http://www.fema.gov/grants> as well as on <http://www.grants.gov>.
- For additional program-specific information, please contact the Centralized Scheduling and Information Desk (CSID) help line at (800) 368-6498 or via e-mail at

AskCSID@dhs.gov. CSID hours of operation are from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EDT, Monday through Friday.

- For financial-related questions, including pre- and post-award administration and technical assistance, applicants may contact the DHS/FEMA Grant Programs Directorate Call Center at (866) 927-5646 or via e-mail to ASK-GMD@dhs.gov.

Funding Tables

FY 2016 State Homeland Security Program Allocations

State/Territory	FY 2016 Allocation	State/Territory	FY 2016 Allocation
Alabama	\$3,734,500	Montana	\$3,734,500
Alaska	\$3,734,500	Nebraska	\$3,734,500
American Samoa	\$854,000	Nevada	\$3,734,500
Arizona	\$4,568,000	New Hampshire	\$3,734,500
Arkansas	\$3,734,500	New Jersey	\$8,354,000
California	\$60,178,500	New Mexico	\$3,734,500
Colorado	\$3,979,000	New York	\$76,949,000
Connecticut	\$3,978,000	North Carolina	\$5,489,000
Delaware	\$3,734,500	North Dakota	\$3,734,500
District of Columbia	\$4,141,500	Northern Mariana	\$854,000
Florida	\$11,040,500	Ohio	\$7,698,000
Georgia	\$6,807,000	Oklahoma	\$3,734,500
Guam	\$854,000	Oregon	\$3,837,000
Hawaii	\$3,734,500	Pennsylvania	\$10,054,500
Idaho	\$3,734,500	Puerto Rico	\$3,734,500
Illinois	\$16,408,500	Rhode Island	\$3,734,500
Indiana	\$3,978,000	South Carolina	\$3,734,500
Iowa	\$3,734,500	South Dakota	\$3,734,500
Kansas	\$3,734,500	Tennessee	\$3,978,000
Kentucky	\$3,978,000	Texas	\$21,498,000
Louisiana	\$3,978,000	U.S. Virgin Islands	\$854,000
Maine	\$3,734,500	Utah	\$3,734,500
Maryland	\$6,153,500	Vermont	\$3,734,500
Massachusetts	\$5,645,000	Virginia	\$7,445,500
Michigan	\$6,658,000	Washington	\$6,493,000
Minnesota	\$3,978,000	West Virginia	\$3,734,500
Mississippi	\$3,734,500	Wisconsin	\$3,978,000
Missouri	\$3,978,000	Wyoming	\$3,734,500
Total			\$402,000,000

FY 2016 Urban Area Security Initiative Allocations

State/Territory	Funded Urban Area	FY 2016 Allocation
Arizona	Phoenix Area	\$5,430,000
California	Anaheim/Santa Ana Area	\$5,430,000
	Bay Area	\$28,036,000
	Los Angeles/Long Beach Area	\$68,610,000
	Riverside Area	\$2,962,000
	Sacramento Area	\$2,962,000
	San Diego Area	\$16,658,000
Colorado	Denver Area	\$2,962,000
District of Columbia	National Capital Region	\$53,309,000
Florida	Miami/Fort Lauderdale Area	\$5,430,000
	Tampa Area	\$2,962,000
Georgia	Atlanta Area	\$5,430,000
Illinois	Chicago Area	\$68,610,000
Maryland	Baltimore Area	\$2,962,000
Massachusetts	Boston Area	\$17,770,000
Michigan	Detroit Area	\$5,430,000
Minnesota	Twin Cities Area	\$5,430,000
Missouri	St. Louis Area	\$2,962,000
Nevada	Las Vegas Area	\$2,962,000
New Jersey	Jersey City/Newark Area	\$20,534,000
New York	New York City Area	\$178,623,000
North Carolina	Charlotte Area	\$2,962,000
Ohio	Cleveland Area	\$2,962,000
Oregon	Portland Area	\$2,962,000
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Area	\$18,263,000
	Pittsburgh Area	\$2,962,000
Texas	Dallas/Fort Worth/Arlington Area	\$15,302,000
	Houston Area	\$23,693,000
Washington	Seattle Area	\$5,430,000
Total		\$580,000,000

FY 2016 Operation Stonegarden Allocations

State/Territory	FY 2016 Award
Alabama	\$150,000
Arizona	\$11,800,000
California	\$9,400,000
Florida	\$1,315,000
Idaho	\$25,178
Louisiana	\$345,000
Maine	\$800,111
Michigan	\$739,236
Minnesota	\$471,872
Mississippi	\$180,000
Montana	\$877,630
New Hampshire	\$123,760
New Mexico	\$2,700,000
New York	\$1,664,686
North Dakota	\$586,833
Ohio	\$700,763
Pennsylvania	\$109,480
Puerto Rico	\$1,180,000
Texas	\$20,100,000
U.S. Virgin Islands	\$130,000
Vermont	\$250,498
Washington	\$1,349,953
Total	\$55,000,000