



U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Office of Grants and Training

FY 2006 Infrastructure Grant Programs

Program Summary



Foreword

I am pleased to provide this summary of the FY 2006 program guidelines for the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Infrastructure Protection Grant Programs.

This is the first grant cycle since completion of the Department's Second Stage Review last summer and our creation of a unified Preparedness Directorate, which includes the essential work of the Office of Grants and Training. The preparedness mission is shared by the entire Department. Our approach to preparedness aggregates critical assets within DHS to support our operating components and the work of our external partners to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from threats to America's safety and security. The Directorate serves a strategic integration function of people, funding and programs.

In managing our grant programs, DHS is committed to supporting risk-based investments. We are equally committed to continuous innovation. As new infrastructure is built, existing facilities improved, or as our assessment of specific threats change, DHS grant programs will focus on being agile and making high-return investments to combat terrorism. The grant guidance for each of the individual FY2006 grant programs indicates the specific risk-based priorities that will drive DHS investments during the current grant cycle.

In 2006, \$399 million is available for a series of related infrastructure protection grants. These grants programs are:

Port Security Grant Program: More than \$168 million will be provided for port security grants to create sustainable, risk-based efforts for the protection of critical port infrastructure from terrorism. The Nation's 100 most critical seaports (plus an additional seaport eligible in 2005), representing 95 percent of the foreign waterborne commerce of the United States, are eligible to participate in the port grant program.

Transit Security Grant Program: Transit security grants are funded at more than \$136 million this fiscal year for grants to the owners and operators of the nation's critical transit infrastructure including rail, intracity bus and ferry systems. Eligibility for funding is limited to those who provide services within a defined Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) jurisdiction. A priority for this grant cycle is the protection of underground operations from improvised explosive devices.

Intercity Bus Security Grant Program: Approximately \$9.5 million will be provided to eligible owners and operators of fixed route intercity and charter bus services to protect bus systems and the traveling public from terrorism. Program priorities include facility, driver and vehicle security enhancements; emergency communications technology; coordinating with local police and emergency responders; training and exercises; and passenger and baggage screening programs in defined UASI service areas.

Intercity Passenger Rail Security Grant Program: Amtrak will be awarded more than \$7.2 million to continue security enhancements for intercity passenger rail operations in the Northeast Corridor (service between Washington, DC and Boston), Amtrak's hub in Chicago and expand these enhancements into the West Coast Service Area in key, high-risk urban areas.

Trucking Security Program: The American Trucking Association will receive \$4.8 million for the Highway Watch program to continue to enhance security and overall preparedness on our nation's highways. The grant priorities of the Trucking Security Program include participant identification and recruitment; ensuring that the Highway Watch Program addresses homeland security and safety issues in conjunction with the National Preparedness Goal; and maintaining a full-time Highway Watch Call Center.

Buffer Zone Protection Program Grants: The Buffer Zone Protection Program provides grant funding to build security and risk-management capabilities to secure critical infrastructure including chemical facilities, nuclear and electric power plants, dams, stadiums, arenas and other high-risk areas. In FY06, this program will award approximately \$48 million in grant funds to state and local authorities.

Chemical Sector Buffer Zone Protection Grant Program: The Chemical Sector Buffer Zone Protection Grant Program is a targeted effort that provides funds to build security and risk-management capabilities at the state and local level for chemical sector critical infrastructure from acts of terror and other hazards. In FY06, the Chemical Buffer Zone Protection Program will receive \$25 million.

For each grant, the Preparedness Directorate will rely on an integrated team of subject matter experts drawn from both DHS operating components and sector specific Departments to develop, design, compete, review, and support the infrastructure grants as part of the national preparedness effort.

DHS is committed to working with the owners and operators of America's critical infrastructure as part of the national effort to reduce the risks from terrorism and other threats to the homeland.



Michael Chertoff
Secretary
Department of Homeland Security

Note

This summary document of the FY 2006 infrastructure protection grant programs does not constitute nor substitute for grant guidance. Detailed guidance and grant application information are contained in the individual grant program packages available at www.grants.gov. This summary is intended for information purposes only as a convenient compendium of the infrastructure protection grant programs of the Department of Homeland Security.

Contents

Port Security Grant Program	6
Transit Security Grant program	11
Intercity Bus Security Grant Program	21
Intercity Passenger Rail Security Grant Program	24
Trucking Security Program	26
Buffer Zone Protection Program	28
Chemical Sector Buffer Zone Protection Program	32

FY 2006 Port Security Grant Program (PSGP)

Purpose

The purpose of the FY 2006 PSGP is to create a sustainable, risk-based effort for the protection of critical port infrastructure from terrorism, especially explosives and non-conventional threats that would cause major disruption to commerce and significant loss of life.

The FY 2006 PSGP also seeks to assist the Nation's ports in obtaining the resources and capabilities required to support the National Preparedness Goal and the associated National Priorities. Through its focus on port-wide risk management planning, improvised explosive devices, non-conventional methods of attack and domain awareness in the port environment, the FY 2006 PSGP directly addresses six of the seven National Priorities:

1. Expanding regional collaboration;
2. Implementing the National Incident Management System and the National Response Plan;
3. Implementing the National Infrastructure Protection Plan;
4. Strengthening information sharing and collaboration capabilities;
5. Enhancing interoperable communications capabilities; and,
6. Strengthening chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive detection and response capabilities.

In addition, the FY 2006 PSGP also supports strengthening emergency operations planning and citizen protection capabilities, and assists in addressing security priorities specific to the port environment.

Funding

Funding is **\$168,052,500** for port security grants. Funding will be provided directly to successful applicants.

Public sector applicants must provide matching funds supporting **at least 25 percent of the total project cost** for each proposed project. **Private sector** applicants must provide matching funds supporting **at least 50 percent of the total project cost** for each proposed project.

Solicitation

The FY 2006 Port Security Grant Program is the sixth round of grants and builds upon the previous five rounds. Successful applications will be selected by a competitive process. Eligible applicants in each port area may submit one application for funding of up to five (5) individual projects.¹ Funding may be awarded for all, some or none of the projects submitted based on the outcome of the evaluation process.

¹ An individual project could be a single activity or multiple activities required to complete an action, such as the establishment of a canine program or an enhanced employee identification system. Individual projects must take place at a single port area.

Project Selection

A series of reviews will be conducted by local and national subject matter experts to ensure the most effective distribution of funding among these ports. Awards under this program will not be based on formula distributions, but rather on risk-based analytical assessments that align with the program goals outlined in the full grant application package.

In order to assure that port areas are competing for funds on an equal footing with port areas with similar risk ratings, each port area will be sorted by risk into tiers. Each tier will be given a specific allotment of grant funds for which port areas will compete. *Consequently, applicants will compete for funding against only those port areas with similar risk rankings.*

The series of reviews are:

1. **Initial Screening.** DHS Office of Grants and Training (G&T) staff will receive and conduct an initial review of all FY 2006 PSGP applications.
2. **Field Review.** Field level reviews will be managed by the applicable United States Coast Guard (USCG) Captain of the Port (COTP) in coordination with the Maritime Administration (MARAD) Regional Director and appropriate personnel from the Area Maritime Security Committee and/or local law enforcement (as identified by the COTP). For each port, the COTP will submit to DHS evaluations that include the following:
(1) each specific application will be scored for compliance with the four core grant program criteria enumerated below, and a total score will be computed; and (2) all proposals received from each port will be rank ordered from highest to lowest in terms of their contributions to risk reduction and cost effectiveness. The four core PSGP criteria are as follows:
 - *Criteria #1.* Projects that support the national port security priorities:
 - Prevention and detection of Improvised Explosive Device (IED) attacks by small craft;
 - Prevention and detection of vehicle-borne IEDs on ferries;
 - Prevention and detection of underwater IED attacks; and,
 - Enhancement of the port area's Maritime Domain Awareness (e.g., access control/standardized credentialing, command and control, communications and enhanced intelligence sharing and analysis);
 - *Criteria #2.* Projects that address priorities outlined in the applicable Area Maritime Security Plan;
 - *Criteria #3.* Projects that address additional security priorities based on the COTP's expertise and experience with the specific port area; and,
 - *Criteria #4.* Projects that offer the highest potential for risk reduction for the least cost.

Projects will be rated against the above noted program criteria. The COTP will score specific applications on a four-point scale, and scores will reflect responsiveness to the four core criteria.

After completing field reviews, the COTPs will submit prioritized listings of projects for each port area to USCG District staff to ensure consistent application of field review guidance. After review by USCG District staff, COTPs will then submit the field review prioritized lists to G&T to begin coordination of the national review process.

- 3. National Review.** Following the field review, a National Review Panel will be convened. The panel will include subject matter experts from USCG, Transportation Security Administration (TSA), Customs and Border Patrol (CBP), Office of Infrastructure Protection (IP), MARAD, and G&T. The purpose of the National Review Process is to identify a final, prioritized list of projects for funding.

Eligibility

The Nation's 100 most critical seaports², representing 95 percent of the foreign waterborne commerce of the United States, plus an additional port area eligible in FY 2005, have been identified for inclusion in the FY 2006 PSGP. Eligible facilities within these port areas must be within two miles of the commercial waterway. Additionally, if a facility falls outside the recognized boundaries of one of these port areas, but is addressed in the port's Area Maritime Security Plan, it will be considered eligible. **Presence on the FY 2006 PSGP eligibility list does not guarantee funding.**

Within the eligible port areas, applicants must be:

- Owners/operators of federally regulated public or private ports, terminals, U.S. inspected passenger vessels, or ferries as defined in 33 CFR Parts 101, 104, and 105;
- Port authorities, and/or State and local agencies that provide layered security protection to federally regulated facilities; or,
- Consortia composed of local stakeholder groups (i.e. river groups, ports, and terminal associations) representing federally regulated ports, terminals, U.S. inspected passenger vessels, or ferries.

² The Port Criticality List was developed by the U.S. Coast Guard using commercial, demographic and geographic data from various sources. Factors such as Cargo Volume and Passenger Volume, the presence of Critical Infrastructure/Key Assets (CI/KA), and Strategic Importance, among others, were used in the determination. Its purpose is to identify ports that are essential to the viability of the Marine Transportation System. Ports on this list represent 95 percent of the foreign waterborne commerce of the United States.

FY 2006 PSGP Eligible Port Areas

Port Areas	
Albany, NY	Nashville, TN
Anacortes, WA	New Haven, CT
Anchorage, AK	New London, CT
Baltimore, MD	New Orleans, LA
Baton Rouge, LA	New York/New Jersey
Beaumont, TX	Newport News, VA
Boston, MA	Norfolk Harbor, VA
Bridgeport, CT	Oakland, CA
Brownsville, TX	Palm Beach, FL
Buffalo, NY	Panama City, FL
Burns Harbor, IN	Pascagoula, MS
Camden, NJ	Paulsboro, NJ
Charleston, SC	Penn Manor, PA
Chattanooga, TN	Pensacola, FL
Chester, PA	Philadelphia, PA
Chicago, IL	Pittsburgh, PA
Cincinnati, OH	Plaquemines, LA
Cleveland, OH	Ponce, PR
Corpus Christi, TX	Port Arthur, TX
Detroit, MI	Port Canaveral, FL
Duluth-Superior, MN/WI	Port Everglades, FL
Everett, WA	Port Hueneme, CA
Freeport, TX	Port Manatee, FL
Galveston, TX	Port St. Joe, FL
Gary, IN	Portland, ME
Green Bay, WI	Portland, OR
Greenville, MS	Portsmouth, NH
Gulfport, MS	Providence, RI
Guntersville, AL	Richmond, CA
Helena, AR	San Diego, CA
Honolulu, HI	San Francisco, CA
Houston, TX	San Juan, PR
Huntington, WV	Savannah, GA
Indiana Harbor, IN	Seattle, WA
Jacksonville, FL	South Louisiana, LA
Kalama, WA	St. Louis, MO
Kansas City, MO	St. Paul, MN
Lake Charles, LA	Stockton, CA
Long Beach, CA	Tacoma, WA
Longview, WA	Tampa, FL
Los Angeles, CA	Texas City, TX
Louisville, KY	Toledo, OH
Marcus Hook, NJ	Tulsa, OK
Matagorda, TX	Two Harbors, MN
Memphis, TN	Valdez, AK
Miami, FL	Vancouver, WA
Milwaukee, WI	Vicksburg, MS
Minneapolis, MN	Victoria, TX
Mobile, AL	Wilmington, DE
Morehead City, NC	Wilmington, NC
Mount Vernon, IN	

Program Coordination

In developing the FY 2006 PSGP guidance, DHS coordinated with the following entities:

- *Department of Homeland Security:* Office of Grants and Training; United States Coast Guard; Transportation Security Administration; Office of Infrastructure Protection; Office of the Chief Intelligence Officer
- *Department of Transportation:* Maritime Administration
- *Industry:* American Association of Port Authorities; Port Security Council; various individual port and port facility operators and owners

This grant program was also informed by ongoing discussions with State and local law enforcement officials regarding infrastructure protection priorities.

Program Guidelines and Application Kit

The complete program guidelines and application kit for the Port Security Grant Program are available at the following web link: www.grants.gov.

FY 2006 Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP)

Purpose

The purpose of the FY 2006 Transit Security Grant Program is to create a sustainable, risk-based effort for the protection of critical transit infrastructure from terrorism, especially explosives and non-conventional threats that would cause major disruption to commerce and significant loss of life.

The FY 2006 TSGP also seeks to assist the Nation's transit systems in obtaining the resources required to support the Goal and the associated National Priorities. The program seeks to make risk-based investments focused on regional planning, infrastructure protection, improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and other non-conventional methods of attack, as well as training, exercises and citizen preparedness. The FY 2006 TSGP directly addresses six of the seven National Priorities:

1. Expanding regional collaboration;
2. Implementing the National Incident Management System and the National Response Plan;
3. Implementing the National Infrastructure Protection Plan;
4. Strengthening information sharing and collaboration capabilities;
5. Enhancing interoperable communications capabilities; and,
6. Strengthening chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive detection and response capabilities.

In addition, the FY 2006 TSGP also supports strengthening emergency operations planning and citizen protection capabilities, and assists in addressing security priorities specific to the transit sector.

Funding

Funding totals **\$136,045,000** for grants to the owners and operators of some of the Nation's most critical transit infrastructure, including heavy, light, and commuter rail, intracity bus and ferry systems. The Tier I and II structure used in the following table is explained below in the Project Selection section. In essence, Tier I funding is allocated to specific systems based upon risk and Tier II funding is allocated based upon risk-based competitive grants. All Ferry grants are allocated to specific systems based upon risk. The table below summarizes total program funding for this year's transit programs.

FY 2006 TSGP Funding by Mode

Transportation Mode	Funding
Rail Transit (<i>Tier I</i>)	\$103M
Rail Transit (<i>Tier II</i>)	\$7M
Intracity Bus (<i>Tier I</i>)	\$15M
Intracity Bus (<i>Tier II</i>)	\$6M
Ferry	\$5M

Solicitation

Equipment acquisitions, drills and exercises, employee training programs, and public awareness programs that focus on mitigating the risk priorities represent appropriate use of TSGP funding.

Rail. The following rail specific risk-based priorities should be addressed for rail-related grants (as applicable):

1. Protection of underwater and other deep bore tunnels and associated track mileage from attacks employing IEDs;
2. Development and enhancement of capabilities to prevent, detect, and respond to terrorist attacks employing improvised explosive devices on other transit assets including stations, yards, and trains; and,
3. Mitigation of other high consequence risks identified through individual transit system risk assessments.

Bus. The following bus specific risk-based priorities should be addressed for bus-related grants (as applicable):

1. Development and enhancement of capabilities to improve inventory control, such as ignition key-recognition systems and remote tracking/shut-down capabilities. The use of intracity buses as a weapon poses a threat of great concern to intracity bus systems and critical infrastructure;
2. Increased perimeter security at intracity bus depots and yards. Related to the first priority, access control at areas of storage is an effective way to deter the use of intracity buses as a vehicle borne IED (VBIED);
3. Development and enhancement of training and awareness among intracity bus operators and employees;
4. Development of emergency response and preparedness capabilities in the event an intracity bus used as a weapon to inflict damage on critical infrastructure;

5. Implementation of technology-driven surveillance (e.g., CCTV), either at intracity bus facilities or within the buses, that can increase the effectiveness of other detection and deterrence measures; and,
6. Suspicious activity detection and behavior pattern recognition.

Ferry. The following ferry specific risk-based priorities should be addressed for ferry-related grants (as applicable):

1. Development and enhancement of capabilities to prevent, detect, and respond to terrorist attacks employing IEDs and VBIEDs;
2. Mitigation of other high consequence risks identified through individual ferry system risk assessments;
3. Use of canine teams at the embarkation and exit points of a system as well as during passage;
4. Innovative utilization of mobile technology for prevention and detection of explosives or other threats and hazards. This may include implementation of technology-driven surveillance (e.g., CCTV);
5. Development and enhancement of physical and perimeter security capabilities to deny access around maintenance facilities, dry docks, and piers;
6. Development and enhancement of training and awareness among ferry operators and employees. Training and awareness should cover the detection and deterrence of efforts by terrorists to use ferries as a means to attack critical infrastructure and key resources;
7. Development of emergency response and preparedness capabilities or drills in the event of a ferry being used as a weapon to inflict damage on critical infrastructure (e.g., nearby LNG terminals or vital cargo shipping lanes); and,
8. Citizen awareness training.

The U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has established 20 security program action items for transit system security readiness. Implementation of these action items enhances security posture generally and supports achievement of the National Preparedness Goal and national and regional strategies to mitigate risk. Eligible applicants are encouraged to review these action items and adopt those currently missing from their security program.

Project Selection

The FY 2006 TSGP will use risk-based prioritization consistent with DHS policy. As described above, the total amount of available transit grant funding was first allocated by transportation mode: rail, bus, and ferry. Next, risk-based project selection criteria priorities – based upon DHS analysis of consequences, vulnerability and threat for individual systems – were established using a two-tiered approach. For the highest-risk systems, a maximum amount of funding was established for specific systems, with distribution of funds subject to

approval by DHS of qualified projects (the Tier I grants). In the case of intracity rail and bus systems, DHS also created a pool of funds that will be awarded on a competitive basis to eligible systems that submit the best risk-based and cost-effective applications (the Tier II grants). All of the available ferry grant funds will be based on individual system allocations (i.e., as Tier I grants).

The Tier I transit regions or systems will have 90 days after the release of the grant guidance to submit detailed project plans to TSA for approval. Systems in the first tier may submit project plans as either regions or individual agencies. However, evidence of regional coordination and harmonization will be required. First tier rail, bus, and ferry regions are identified in the tables below in bold and with their proposed funding allocation listed. Project plans for Tier I systems will be evaluated on the following factors:

- Ability to reduce risk of catastrophic events;
- Overall effect on regional transit security;
- Cost effectiveness to include leveraging additional resources; and,
- Ability to complete the proposed project within the proposed timeframes.

Grants for both rail and bus Tier II systems will be competitively awarded based on the following factors:

- Ability to reduce risk;
- Cost effectiveness, to include leveraging additional resources; and,
- Ability to complete the proposed project within the timeframes.

The following method of selection will be used to evaluate Tier II system projects:

1. Rail and Bus agencies will submit concept papers for consideration. These concept papers will be submitted through www.grants.gov.
2. Concept papers will be reviewed and scored by a Federal Interagency Working Group consisting of TSA, FTA, and G&T;
3. Projects that are accepted will be required to complete full project applications;
4. G&T will verify compliance with each of the administrative and eligibility criteria identified in the application kit;
5. TSA will review the Federal Interagency Working Group recommendations and make recommendations for funding to G&T and the Secretary. TSA will brief all appropriate agencies on the final selections to ensure agreement for each grant work plan.

A Tier II grant applicant must be able to convey an understanding of the security priorities established under the TSGP guidance. At a minimum, each concept paper must:

- Define the vision, goals and objectives for the risk reduction the respondent is ultimately trying to achieve and how the proposed project will fit into an overall effort to meet critical infrastructure security priorities, including integration into existing security protocols;
- Describe the specific needs and/or resource limitations that need to be addressed;
- Identify any potential partners and their roles and staffing requirements, and provide information on any existing agreements such as Memorandums of Understanding (MOU);
- Propose a detailed budget and timeline; and,
- Adhere to a maximum limit of five pages.

In considering project plans for Tier I submissions, and concept papers for Tier II submissions, preference in awarding grants will be given to regions and agencies that propose providing matching funds or operations assets. DHS plans to implement matching grant criteria, similar to the port security program, for all FY 2007 transit grants.

Eligibility

Eligibility for intracity rail, intracity bus, and ferry grants under the 2006 TSGP for specific regions and transit systems was established based upon risk-analysis criteria developed at DHS, based upon inputs from our Federal, State, local, and industry partners. The eligible regions and systems for these grants are identified in the following three tables.

In the case of Tier I eligible awardees, the maximum possible funding is identified by dollar amount. All Tier II eligible awardees may compete for awards. The total pool of funds for Tier II awards will be: rail, \$7 million; and bus, \$6 million.

FY 2006 TSGP Eligible Rail Transit Systems

State	Urban Area	Regional Allocation/Eligibility	Eligible System	Eligible Mode
CA	Bay Area	Tier I - \$8.4M	Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	Commuter Rail
			San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	Heavy Rail
			Altamont Commuter Express	Commuter Rail
			Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	Light Rail
			San Francisco Municipal Railway	Commuter Rail, Light Rail
	Greater Los Angeles Area (Los Angeles/Long Beach and Anaheim/Santa Ana UASI Areas)	Tier I - \$4.0M	Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink)	Commuter Rail
			Los Angeles County Metro Transportation Authority	Heavy Rail, Light Rail
			Sacramento	Tier II
	San Diego	Tier II	North San Diego County Transit District	Commuter Rail
			San Diego Trolley, Inc.	Light Rail
CO	Denver	Tier II	Denver Regional Transportation District	Light Rail
DC/MD/VA ³	Greater National Capital Region (NCR and Baltimore UASI Areas)	Tier I - \$13.0M	Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority	Heavy Rail
			Virginia Railway Express	Commuter Rail
			Maryland Transit Administration	Commuter Rail, Heavy Rail, Light Rail
FL	Jacksonville	Tier II	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Other Rail (AG)
	Miami/Fort Lauderdale	Tier II	Tri-County Commuter Rail	Commuter Rail
			Miami-Dade Transit	Heavy Rail, Other Rail (AG)
GA	Atlanta	Tier I - \$2.0M	Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority	Heavy Rail
IL/IN ⁴	Chicago	Tier I - \$11.0M	Northeast Illinois Regional Commuter Railroad Corporation	Commuter Rail
			Chicago Transit Authority	Heavy Rail
			Northern Indiana Commuter Transportation District	Commuter Rail
LA	New Orleans	Tier II	New Orleans Regional Transit Authority	Light Rail
MA	Boston	Tier I - \$9.6M	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Commuter Rail, Heavy Rail, Light Rail
MI	Detroit	Tier II	City of Detroit Department of Transportation	Other Rail (AG)
MN	Twin Cities Area	Tier II	Metro Transit	Light Rail
MO	Saint Louis	Tier II	Bi-State Development Agency	Light Rail
NY	Buffalo	Tier II	Niagara Frontier Transp. Authority	Light Rail

³ The DC SAA will administer these funds

⁴ The IL SAA will administer these funds

State	Urban Area	Regional Allocation/Eligibility	Eligible System	Eligible Mode
NY/NJ/CT ⁵	New York City/Jersey City/Newark	Tier I - \$47.0M	Metropolitan Transportation Authority	Heavy Rail, Commuter Rail
			Port Authority of New York and New Jersey	Heavy Rail
			New Jersey Transit Corporation	Light Rail, Commuter Rail
			Connecticut Department of Transportation	Commuter Rail
OH	Cleveland	Tier II	The Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority	Heavy Rail, Light Rail
OR	Portland	Tier II	Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon	Light Rail
PA	Pittsburgh	Tier II	Cambria County Transit Authority	Other Rail (IP)
			Port Authority of Allegheny County	Light Rail, Other Rail (IP)
PA/NJ	Philadelphia	Tier I - \$8.0M	Pennsylvania Department of Transportation	Commuter Rail
			Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority	Commuter Rail, Heavy Rail, Light Rail
			Port Authority Transit Corporation	Heavy Rail
			New Jersey Transit Corporation	Commuter Rail
TN	Memphis	Tier II	Memphis Area Transit Authority	Light Rail
TX	Dallas/Fort Worth/Arlington	Tier II	Dallas Area Rapid Transit	Light Rail
			Trinity Railway Express	Commuter Rail
	Houston	Tier II	Metropolitan Transit Authority Of Harris County	Light Rail
WA	Seattle	Tier II	Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority	Commuter Rail, Light Rail

⁵ The NY SAA will administer these funds

FY 2006 TSGP Eligible Intracity Bus Systems

State	Urban Area	Regional Allocation/Eligibility	Eligible System ⁶
AZ	Phoenix		<i>Valley Metro Regional Public Transportation Authority</i> <i>City of Phoenix Public Transit Department</i>
CA	Bay Area	Tier I - \$2.1M	<i>Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District</i>
			<i>Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District</i>
			<i>San Francisco Bay Municipal Transportation Authority</i>
			<i>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority</i>
			<i>Central Contra Costa Transit Authority</i>
			<i>San Mateo County Transit District</i>
			<i>Caltrans (Transbay Bus Terminal)</i>
	Greater Los Angeles Area (Los Angeles/Long Beach and Anaheim/Santa Ana UASI Areas)	Tier I - \$2.2M	<i>Los Angeles County Metro Transportation Authority</i>
			<i>Orange County Transportation Authority</i>
			<i>City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation</i>
<i>Foothill Transit</i>			
San Diego	Tier II	<i>San Diego Metropolitan Transit System</i> <i>North San Diego County Transit District</i>	
CO	Denver	Tier II	<i>Denver Regional Transportation District</i>
DC/MD/VA	Greater National Capital Region (NCR and Baltimore UASI Areas)	Tier I - \$1.3M	<i>Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority</i>
			<i>Maryland Transit Administration</i>
			<i>Ride-On Montgomery County Transit</i>
			<i>Prince George's County Transit</i>
			<i>City of Alexandria - Alexandria Transit Company</i>
			<i>Fairfax Connector Bus System</i>
			<i>Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission</i>
FL	Miami/Fort Lauderdale	Tier II	<i>Miami-Dade Transit</i> <i>Broward County Mass Transit Division</i>
GA	Atlanta	Tier II	<i>Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority</i> <i>Georgia Regional Transportation Authority</i>
HI	Honolulu	Tier II	<i>City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services</i>
IL/IN	Chicago	Tier I - \$1.5M	<i>Chicago Transit Authority</i> <i>Pace - Suburban Bus Division</i>
LA	New Orleans	Tier II	<i>New Orleans Regional Transit Authority</i> <i>Jefferson Parish Department of Transit Administration</i>
MA	Boston	Tier I - \$1.0M	<i>Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority</i>
MI	Detroit	Tier II	<i>City of Detroit Department of Transportation</i> <i>Suburban Mobility Authority for Regional Transportation</i>
MN	Twin Cities Area	Tier II	<i>Metro Transit</i>
MO	St. Louis	Tier II	<i>Bi-State Development Agency</i> <i>Madison County Transit District</i>
NV	Las Vegas	Tier II	<i>Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada</i>

⁶ Phoenix, Cincinnati, and San Antonio are newly eligible urban areas for this program in 2006; those systems identified in italics are newly eligible in 2006. Transit systems in Cleveland, Detroit, New Orleans, and St. Louis are newly eligible for bus grants.

State	Urban Area	Regional Allocation/Eligibility	Eligible System ⁷
NY/NJ/CT	New York City/ Jersey City/ Newark	Tier I - \$5.5M	Metropolitan Transportation Authority
			New Jersey Transit Corporation
			<i>Westchester County Department of Transportation</i>
			<i>Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ Manhattan Bus Terminals)</i>
OH	Cincinnati	Tier II	<i>Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority</i>
	Cleveland	Tier II	<i>Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky</i>
OR	Portland		<i>The Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority</i>
			Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon
PA	Pittsburgh	Tier II	<i>Clark County Public Transportation Benefit Area Authority</i>
			Port Authority of Allegheny County
PA/NJ	Philadelphia	Tier I - \$1.4M	Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority
			New Jersey Transit Corporation
TX	Dallas/Forth Worth/Arlington	Tier II	Dallas Rapid Area Transit
			<i>Ft. Worth Transportation Authority</i>
	Houston	Tier II	Metropolitan Transit Auth. Of Harris County
			Island Transit
San Antonio	Tier II	<i>VIA Metropolitan Transit</i>	
WA	Seattle	Tier II	King County Department of Transportation - Metro Transit Division
			<i>Pierce County Transportation Benefit Area Authority</i>
			<i>Snohomish County Transportation Benefit Area Corporation</i>
WI	Milwaukee	Tier II	Milwaukee County Transit System

FY 2006 TSGP Eligible Ferry Systems

State	Urban Area	FY 2006 Regional Allocation	Eligible System ⁸
CA	Bay Area	\$700,000	Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District
			<i>City of Alameda Ferry Services (Blue and Gold Lines Fleet)</i>
			<i>City of Vallejo Transportation Program</i>
LA	New Orleans	\$300,000	Crescent City Connection Division - Louisiana Department of Transportation
MA	Boston	\$400,000	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
NY/NJ	New York City	\$1,300,000	New York City Department of Transportation
			Port Authority of Trans Hudson Corporation
TX	Houston	\$300,000	Texas DOT (Bolivar Roads Ferry)
WA	Seattle	\$2,000,000	Washington State Ferries

⁷ Phoenix, Cincinnati, and San Antonio are newly eligible urban areas for this program in 2006; those systems identified in italics are newly eligible in 2006. Transit systems in Cleveland, Detroit, New Orleans, and St. Louis are newly eligible for bus grants.

⁸ Those systems identified in italics are newly eligible in 2006.

Program Coordination

The following entities were involved in developing the FY 2006 TSGP guidance:

- *Department of Homeland Security:* Office of Grants and Training; Transportation Security Administration; Office of Infrastructure Protection; Science and Technology Directorate; United States Coast Guard; Office of the Chief Intelligence Officer
- *Department of Transportation:* Federal Transit Administration
- *Industry:* American Public Transportation Association; various individual transit system owners and operators.

This grant program was also informed by ongoing discussions with State and local law enforcement officials regarding infrastructure protection priorities.

Program Guidelines and Application Kit

The complete program guidelines and application kit for the Transit Security Grant Program are available at the following web link: www.grants.gov.

FY 2006 Intercity Bus Security Grant Program (IBSGP)

Purpose

The purpose of the FY 2006 IBSGP is to create a sustainable program for the protection of intercity bus systems and the traveling public from terrorism, especially explosives and non-conventional threats that would cause major loss of life and severe disruption.

The FY 2006 IBSGP also seeks to assist owners and operators of fixed route intercity and charter bus services in obtaining the resources required to support the Goal and the associated National Priorities. Through its focus on enhanced planning, facility security enhancements, vehicle and driver protection, as well as training and exercises, the FY 2006 IBSGP directly addresses five of the seven National Priorities:

1. Implementing the National Incident Management System and the National Response Plan;
2. Implementing the National Infrastructure Protection Plan;
3. Strengthening information sharing and collaboration capabilities;
4. Enhancing interoperable communications capabilities; and,
5. Strengthening chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive detection and response capabilities.

In addition, the FY 2006 IBSGP also supports strengthening emergency operations planning and citizen protection capabilities, and assists in addressing security priorities specific to the intercity bus industry.

Funding

Provides **\$9,503,000** to owners/operators of fixed route intercity and charter bus services using over-the-road buses.

Solicitation

The FY 2006 IBSGP is the fourth round of grants and builds upon the previous three rounds. *Successful applications will be selected through a competitive process.* The FY 2006 program focuses on the following national intercity bus security priorities:

- Facility security enhancements in defined Urban Area Security Initiative jurisdictions;
- Driver security enhancements;
- Vehicle security enhancements;
- Emergency communication technology;
- Coordinating with local police and emergency responders; and,
- Training and exercises.

Each of these priorities further enhances efforts for prevention and protection against terrorist activities and will greatly serve to assist with response and recovery efforts in the event of an attack.

Eligible applicants may submit one application for funding of up to three individual projects that address the priorities identified in this section. Funding may be awarded for all, some or none of the projects submitted based on the outcome of this evaluation process.

Project Selection

Each application will be evaluated by a National Review Panel. Federal staff from TSA and the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) and G&T will evaluate proposals as part of the National Review Panel. The following method of selection will be followed under this program:

1. G&T will verify compliance with each of the administrative and eligibility criteria identified in the application kit;
2. Eligible applications will be reviewed and scored by a National Review Panel against the evaluation criteria;
3. The National Review Panel will create a rank order listing of proposed projects;
4. TSA and Preparedness Directorate staff will review the National Review Panel recommendations and make final selections for funding. As part of the final selection process, DHS staff will coordinate facility security enhancement projects identified for funding with the State Administrative Agencies (SAA) and Homeland Security Advisors (HSA) in the affected states to ensure consistency with the State and Urban Area Homeland Security strategies. Both the SAA's and HSA's inputs will be factored into the final decision making process; and,
5. TSA will brief all appropriate agencies on the final selections to ensure agreement for each grant work plan.

Eligibility

Funding under this program will be limited to owners/operators of fixed route intercity and/or charter bus services using over-the-road buses.

Fixed route, intercity bus service is defined as passenger transportation service provided to the general public for compensation over specified, pre-determined, and published routes between cities or terminals using over-the-road-buses. Eligible fixed route and charter services use over-the-road buses, provide trips annually to a defined Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) jurisdiction or a facility located within a UASI jurisdiction. An over-the-road bus is defined as a vehicle designated for long-distance transportation of passengers, characterized by integral construction with an elevated passenger deck located over a baggage compartment and at least 35 feet in length with a capacity of more than 30 passengers.

Grantees must develop and implement a Security and Emergency Preparedness Plan (SEPP) within one year of the award. The SEPP is based on a model developed by the American Bus Association/United Motorcoach Association Joint Venture. Technical support for the development of the SEPP is available from the Joint Venture.

Program Coordination

The following entities were involved in developing the FY 2006 IBSGP guidance:

- *Department of Homeland Security:* Office of Grants and Training; Transportation Security Administration; Office of the Chief Intelligence Officer
- *Department of Transportation:* Federal Motor Carriers Safety Administration
- *Industry:* American Bus Association; United Motorcoach Association; various individual bus owners and operators

This grant program was also informed by ongoing discussions with State and local law enforcement officials regarding infrastructure protection priorities.

Program Guidelines and Application Kit

The complete program guidelines and application kit for the Intercity Bus Security Grant Program are available at the following web link: www.grants.gov.

FY 2006 Intercity Passenger Rail Security Grant Program (IPRSGP)

Purpose

The purpose of the FY 2006 IPRSGP is to maintain a sustainable program for the protection of our nation's intercity passenger trains and the traveling public from terrorism, especially explosives and non-conventional threats that would cause major loss of life and severe disruption. Financial assistance is provided solely to Amtrak.

The FY 2006 IPRSGP also seeks to assist Amtrak in obtaining the resources required to support the Goal and the associated National Priorities. Through its focus on regional planning, infrastructure protection, improvised explosive devices and other non-conventional methods of attack, as well as training and exercises, the FY 2006 IPRSGP directly addresses six of the seven National Priorities:

1. Expanding regional collaboration;
2. Implementing the National Incident Management System and the National Response Plan;
3. Implementing the National Infrastructure Protection Plan;
4. Strengthening information sharing and collaboration capabilities;
5. Enhancing interoperable communications capabilities; and,
6. Strengthening chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive detection and response capabilities.

In addition, the FY 2006 IPRSGP also supports strengthening emergency operations planning and citizen protection capabilities and assists in addressing security priorities specific to intercity passenger rail service.

Funding

Provides **\$7,242,855** in grant funding to Amtrak to continue security enhancements for intercity passenger rail operations in the Northeast Corridor (service between Washington, DC, and Boston), Amtrak's hub in Chicago and expand these enhancements into the West Coast Service Area in key, high-risk urban areas (Seattle, Sacramento, Oakland, San Jose, Los Angeles

Eligibility

The FY 2006 DHS Appropriations Act provided funds for a discretionary grant program to address security enhancements for intercity passenger rail transportation. As part of the FY 2006 IPRSGP, the Department will partner with Amtrak, the major national passenger railroad, to develop security enhancements for intercity passenger rail operations. ***Amtrak is the only entity eligible to apply for funding under the FY 2006 IPRSGP.***

Project Selection

The expenditure of FY 2006 funding must directly support a risk-based Security and Emergency Preparedness Plan and must be coordinated with the Regional Transit Security Strategies (RTSS) in the National Capitol Region, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Chicago, Seattle, Sacramento, Oakland, San Jose, Los Angeles and San Diego. To facilitate this coordination, Amtrak must provide a representative to the Regional Transit Security Working Groups responsible for the RTSS in these areas. Amtrak must also provide written certification that each applicable State Administrative Agency concurs that the required coordination with the RTSS has occurred.

Up to **50 percent** of the funds available through the FY 2006 IPRSGP will be available at the time of award to assist Amtrak in meeting its most pressing security needs in the Northeast Corridor and Chicago (as identified through the previous G&T-facilitated risk assessment for these areas). Amtrak may also use these funds for high priority projects (as identified through previously conducted site-specific vulnerability assessments) in its West Coast Service Area prior to completion of a required risk assessment for this part of its system. However, in order to allocate these funds, Amtrak must provide written certification that it has coordinated these expenditures with the applicable regional planning efforts. The remaining 50 percent of these funds will be released upon submission of the risk assessment for the West Coast Service Area.

Program Coordination

The following entities were involved in developing the FY 2006 IPRSGP guidance:

- *Department of Homeland Security:* Office of Grants and Training; Transportation Security Administration; Office of Infrastructure Protection; Science and Technology Directorate; Office of the Chief Intelligence Officer
- *Department of Transportation:* Federal Transit Administration; Federal Railroad Administration
- *Industry:* Association of American Railroads; American Public Transportation Association; National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak)

This grant program was also informed by ongoing discussions with State and local law enforcement officials regarding infrastructure protection priorities.

Program Guidelines and Application Kit

The complete program guidelines and application kit for the Intercity Passenger Rail Security Grant Program are available at the following web link:

www.grants.gov.

FY 2006 Trucking Security Program (TSP)

Purpose

The purpose of the FY 2006 Trucking Security Program is to continue the Highway Watch[®] Program as a sustainable national program to enhance security and overall preparedness on our nation's highways.

The FY 2006 TSP also seeks to assist all professionals and operating entities throughout the entire highway sector in obtaining the skills and abilities required to support the Goal and the associated National Priorities. Through its focus on awareness training, reporting of suspicious incidents and information analysis, the FY 2006 TSP directly addresses six of the seven National Priorities:

1. Expanding regional collaboration;
2. Implementing the National Incident Management System and the National Response Plan;
3. Implementing the National Infrastructure Protection Plan;
4. Strengthening information sharing and collaboration capabilities;
5. Enhancing interoperable communications capabilities; and,
6. Strengthening chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive detection and response capabilities.

In addition, the FY 2006 TSP also supports strengthening emergency operations planning and citizen protection capabilities, and assists in addressing security priorities specific to the trucking industry.

The TSP was originally developed in the trucking industry with an emphasis on safety. It has undergone a dramatic expansion with the grant funds provided by DHS in the three years from FY 2003 to FY 2005, and its benefits and resources are now available to all professionals and operating entities throughout the highway sector, including private companies, public entities and governmental operations.

Funding

Provides **\$4,801,500** for the Highway Watch[®] Program.

Eligibility

As in prior years, eligibility for funding under this program will be limited to the American Trucking Associations as the program manager of Highway Watch[®].

Program Highlights

The Highway Watch[®] program provides resources and services, free of charge, to intercity commercial bus and motorcoach operators, and school bus owners and operators; governmental entities; the companies and entities that build and maintain the highways; highway cargo facility operators and brokers; support

operations such as visitors centers, truck and bus support, and maintenance operations; commercial driver training schools and facilities; operators of private truck fleets; and public safety personnel, including law enforcement agencies that respond to emergencies on the highways; and any and all additional entities or stakeholder segments identified by Highway Watch[®] or TSA.

Highway Watch[®] recruits and trains highway professional to identify and report security and safety situations on our Nation's roads. The program operates and maintains a Highway Watch[®] Call Center in London, Kentucky, and also operates and maintains a Highway Information Sharing and Analysis Center located at the Transportation Security Operations Center in Herndon, Virginia.

By continuing to expand the scope of the existing Highway Watch[®] Program to encompass additional motor carriers and drivers in every state, territory, and Federal district in the country, all segments of the commercial motor carrier and transportation community can contribute to the security of the Nation.

Program Coordination

In developing the FY 2006 TSP guidance, the following entities were involved:

- *Department Of Homeland Security:* Office of Grants and Training; Transportation Security Administration; Office of Chief Intelligence Officer
- *Department Of Transportation:* Federal Motor Carriers Safety Administration
- *Industry:* American Trucking Associations; Commercial Vehicle Safety Association; American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials; Owner Operator Independent Drivers Association; National School Bus Association

This grant program was also informed by ongoing discussions with State and local law enforcement officials regarding infrastructure protection priorities.

Program Guidelines and Application Kit

The complete program guidelines and application kit for the Trucking Security Program are available at the following web link: www.grants.gov.

FY 2006 Buffer Zone Protection Program (BZPP)

Purpose

The BZPP is a targeted infrastructure protection program that provides funds to build security and risk-management capabilities at the State and local levels that will help prevent and protect critical infrastructure from acts of terror. Specifically, the program helps to implement Buffer Zone Plans (BZPs) by providing funds to State and local agencies for planning and equipment acquisition. BZPs implement preventive and protective measures that make it more difficult for terrorists to conduct surveillance or launch attacks within the immediate vicinity of high-risk critical infrastructure assets. BZPs are developed through cooperation among DHS, State and local officials and help increase the preparedness capabilities of the local jurisdictions.

Funding

Total funding in FY 2006 is **\$48,015,000** for grants to help secure high-risk critical infrastructure sites in collaboration with State and local partners. The table below shows the state-by-state allocations of BZPP funding.

FY 2006 BZPP Funding Allocations

States / Territories	Total Funding
Alabama	\$378,000
Alaska	\$1,189,000
Arizona	\$567,000
Arkansas	\$378,000
California	\$5,835,000
Colorado	\$189,000
Connecticut	\$189,000
Delaware	\$189,000
District of Columbia	\$567,000
Florida	\$1,701,000
Georgia	\$567,000
Hawaii	\$189,000
Idaho	\$189,000
Illinois	\$2,079,000
Indiana	\$567,000
Iowa	\$189,000
Kansas	\$378,000
Kentucky	\$567,000
Louisiana	\$2,268,000
Maine	\$189,000
Maryland	\$756,000
Massachusetts	\$2,134,000

States / Territories	Total Funding
Michigan	\$1,945,000
Minnesota	\$567,000
Mississippi	\$189,000
Missouri	\$756,000
Montana	\$189,000
Nebraska	\$189,000
Nevada	\$1,189,000
New Hampshire	\$189,000
New Jersey	\$1,512,000
New Mexico	\$189,000
New York	\$6,591,000
North Carolina	\$378,000
North Dakota	\$500,000
Ohio	\$1,323,000
Oklahoma	\$189,000
Oregon	\$189,000
Pennsylvania	\$1,756,000
Puerto Rico	\$189,000
Rhode island	\$189,000
South Carolina	\$756,000
South Dakota	\$500,000
Tennessee	\$945,000
Texas	\$2,268,000
Utah	\$378,000
Vermont	\$189,000
Virginia	\$945,000
Virgin Islands	\$189,000
Washington	\$1,756,000
West Virginia	\$189,000
Wisconsin	\$189,000
Wyoming	\$189,000
Total	\$47,965,000

Eligibility

The Governor of each State has designated an SAA to apply for and administer the funds under BZPP. The SAA is the only agency eligible to apply for BZPP funds and is responsible for obligating BZPP funds to the appropriate local units of government or other designated recipients. The SAA must coordinate all BZPP activities with the respective State Homeland Security Advisor.

Project Selection

The FY 2006 BZPP site selection process is built upon the DHS risk methodology. Identifying the risks to the nation's critical infrastructure is an important component of the Department's overall risk reduction programs. The FY 2006 iteration of the methodology represents a significant step forward in the analysis of the risk of terrorism faced by our Nation's communities. Gains have been made in both the quality and specificity of information and analysis incorporated within the model, yielding the most accurate estimation possible of the *relative* risk of prospective grantees.

1. Critical Infrastructure/Key Resources (CI/KR) sites in the National Asset Database have been selected for participation in the FY 2006 BZPP using a risk-based analytic approach. The Department, working with its partners in each State and representatives of the 17 critical infrastructure sectors, has identified those sites in the United States that represent the most at risk critical infrastructures based on an analysis of consequence, and available vulnerability and threat data.
2. Asset-based risks were used to guide the allocation of funds to specific sites within the United States. This approach generates risk reduction benefits for the greater community as well as at each site.
3. State allocations were determined based on the number of higher-risk sites.

Site-Specific Analysis. DHS worked with SSAs, States, and the private sector to identify the top 100 sites for each sector and evaluated them to determine which could have significant effect if lost or disrupted, as well as those sites that could have a regional or cross-jurisdictional impact if lost or disrupted. DHS then conducted vulnerability and threat analysis to evaluate how likely an attacker would be to succeed in attacking these assets and how likely an attacker would be to attempt it. Based on the results of this analysis, DHS identified the list of the select high-risk sites for consideration in the FY 2006 BZPP by analyzing consequence, vulnerability, and threat.

Risk Analysis. In addition to site-specific risk analysis, an important component of the Buffer Zone process is its ancillary benefits to the surrounding community. Identification of high-risk jurisdictions helps ensure that the Buffer Zone Protection Program will reduce risk to a broader array of at-risk assets, as well as enhance the preparedness of State and local governments.

The Department's methodology to determine high-risk jurisdictions brings together two separate, but complementary, types of risk: **asset-based risk** and **geographically-based risk**. Considered together, these two calculations provide an estimate of total terrorism risk to a given region, evaluating both risks to assets within a State or territory, as well as risk related to the unique characteristics of the candidate States, territories, and the District of Columbia.

Program Highlights

- Resources are allocated to jurisdictions responsible for the selected CI/KR sites through the State Administrative Agency. The identified FY 2006 BZPP sites and their locations are considered sensitive, and therefore DHS provides each State with information regarding the identity and location of the assets. Jurisdictions who oversee these identified locations must complete Buffer Zone Plans for each of these identified sites.
- In developing the BZP, the responsible local jurisdiction(s) review and assess ways in which they can work with relevant Federal, State, local, tribal, and private sector agencies to coordinate their prevention and protection activities.
- The development of the BZP fosters a cooperative environment in which all relevant organizations can carry out their specific prevention and protection responsibilities more efficiently and effectively, while coordinating and leveraging existing programs and resources.
- In developing and implementing the BZPs, security and preparedness officials at all levels are encouraged to seek opportunities to coordinate and leverage funding from multiple sources, including Federal, State, and local resources.
- DHS provides a range of services to BZPP grantees and sub-grantees. This includes BZPP workshops, which train local law enforcement and homeland security personnel on the BZPP process, and on-site technical assistance for officials needing additional technical support in developing and/or implementing BZPs.

Program Coordination

In developing the FY 2006 BZPP guidance, the following entities were involved:

- *Department Of Homeland Security:* Office of Grants and Training; Office of Infrastructure Protection; Office of Chief Intelligence Officer
- *State and local:* Various local law enforcement, fire, and emergency response officials; State law enforcement officials, homeland security advisors, and emergency management officers.
- *Industry:* High-risk facility owners and operators.

Program Guidelines and Application Kit

The complete program guidelines and application kit for the Buffer Zone Protection Program are available at the following web link: www.grants.gov.

FY 2006 Chemical Sector Buffer Zone Protection Program (CHEM-BZPP)

Purpose

The CHEM-BZPP is a targeted infrastructure protection program that provides funds to build security and risk-management capabilities at the State and local levels that will help protect critical infrastructure in the national chemical sector from acts of terror. Specifically, the program helps to implement Buffer Zone Plans by providing funds to State and local agencies for planning and equipment acquisition. BZPs implement preventive and protective measures that make it more difficult for terrorists to conduct surveillance or launch attacks within the immediate vicinity of high-risk critical infrastructure assets. BZPs are developed through cooperation among DHS, State and local officials and help increase the preparedness capabilities of the local jurisdictions responsible for the security of surrounding communities.

CHEM-BZPP funding is focused on enhancing the protection of those critical infrastructures that, if attacked, could cause weapons of mass destruction-like effects, e.g., chemical storage and manufacturing facilities, refineries, etc. In light of several major new national planning priorities, which address such issues as the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, the allowable scope of CHEM-BZPP activities includes catastrophic events, provided that these activities also build capabilities that relate to terrorism.

Funding

CHEM-BZPP provides **\$25,000,000** to secure critical sites in the nation's chemical sector identified in collaboration with state and local partners. Through a partnership between the Preparedness Directorate's Office of Grants and Training and the Office of Infrastructure Protection, this targeted funding is available to responsible State and local jurisdictions to enhance their ability to protect and secure specific sites within the sector.

FY 2006 CHEM-BZPP Funding Allocations

States	Total Funding
Michigan	\$1,553,000
California	\$6,597,100
Illinois	\$3,128,500
Indiana	\$552,100
Texas	\$5,109,700
New York	\$654,000
New Jersey	\$5,508,400
Pennsylvania	\$1,266,900
Delaware	\$630,300
Total	\$25,000,000

Eligibility

The Governor of each State has designated an SAA to apply for and administer the funds under CHEM-BZPP. The SAA is the only agency eligible to apply for CHEM-BZPP funds and is responsible for obligating CHEM-BZPP funds to the appropriate local units of government or other designated recipients. The SAA must coordinate all CHEM-BZPP activities with the respective State HSA.

Project Selection

The FY 2006 CHEM-BZPP selection process is built upon the DHS risk methodology. The FY 2006 iteration of the methodology represents a significant step forward in the analysis of the risk of terrorism faced by our Nation's communities. Gains have been made in both the quality and specificity of information and analysis incorporated within the model, yielding DHS' current best estimate of the *relative* risk of prospective grantees.

Site-Specific Analysis. The Department, working with its partners in each State and representatives of the 17 critical infrastructure sectors, has identified those sites in the United States that represent the most at risk critical infrastructures based on an analysis of consequence, and available vulnerability and threat data. Based on the results of this analysis, DHS identified the list of the select high-risk chemical sites for consideration in the FY 2006 CHEM-BZPP by analyzing consequence, vulnerability, and threat.

Community Preparedness. In addition to site-specific risk analysis, a primary component of the CHEM-BZPP process is its ancillary benefits to the surrounding community. This process helps ensure that the CHEM-BZPP will reduce risk to a broader array of at-risk chemical sector assets, as well as enhance the preparedness of State and local governments to deal with risks specific to the location of chemical infrastructure in their jurisdiction.

Defining the Regions. The chemical industry has tended to co-locate facilities in proximate geographical areas to reduce the costs and risks involved in transporting chemicals over long distances. This dense clustering of chemical facilities characterizes a Chemical Region, which is further defined by the identification of the primary focus sites (those DHS has determined have the highest risk potential) and the counties and or states in which they are located.

Assessing Off-Site Release Potential within Regions. Additionally, the number of chemical facilities having the potential for off-site impacts located in the Chemical Regions was determined, and weighted in direct proportion to the number of people potentially impacted. This created an off-site impact potential for each of the regions regardless of jurisdiction affected.

Assessing Overall Density of the Chemical Sector in the Regions. A third consideration was the overall number of chemical sector facilities in the region, without regard to off-site impact. This allowed the density of chemical

manufacturing in the region to be considered. The analysis of the potential for off-site impacts for the chemical sector facilities and the number of chemical plants in the counties augmented the Urban Area risk analysis to prioritize the Chemical Regions.

Promoting Collaborative Risk Management for Multi-State Risks. Potential off-site impacts are not constrained to the jurisdiction in which a chemical facility or cluster of facilities is located. While SAAs can assure that collaborative risk management takes place within their states, this distribution of funds also may require multi-state collaborative risk management. Those states where consequence management planning activities are interdependent in and around a chemical cluster will engage with the state and local authorities developing Chemical BZPs in neighboring jurisdictions to include multi-state planning.

Program Coordination

In developing the FY 2006 CHEM-BZPP guidance, the following entities were involved:

- *Department Of Homeland Security:* Office of Grants and Training; Office of Infrastructure Protection; Office of Chief Intelligence Officer
- *State and local:* Various local law enforcement, fire, and emergency response officials; State law enforcement officials, homeland security advisors, and emergency management officers.
- *Industry:* High-risk chemical facility owners and operators.

Program Guidelines and Application Kit

The complete program guidelines and application kit for the Chemical Sector Buffer Zone Protection Program are available at the following web link:

www.grants.gov.