Office of Grants and Training
Preparedness Directorate
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, DC 20531

Homeland Security

**G&T Information Bulletin**
**No. 215 August 04, 2006**

TO: All State Administrative Agency Heads
All State Administrative Points of Contact
All State Homeland Security Directors
All Urban Area Core City/Core County Points of Contact
All Protective Security Advisors

FROM: Tracy A. Henke
Assistant Secretary, Office of Grants and Training

SUBJECT: FY 2006 Risk Analysis for the Homeland Security Grant Program

On July 11th and 12th, the DHS Office of Grants and Training (G&T) hosted the FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) After Action Conference to solicit State and local feedback on the overall FY 2006 homeland security planning process. At this conference, participants made three recommendations with regard to risk analysis:

1. Provide detailed briefings to state and local partners on the core components of the risk methodology used in the FY 2006 process.

2. Involve state and local representatives in the data vetting process.

3. Establish/convene a working group of federal, state, and local representatives to provide additional input on the specific components of the risk analysis process

DHS is responding to this valuable feedback through a joint effort between G&T and the Infrastructure Protection Risk Management Division (RMD).

To meet the first recommendation, DHS will deliver a presentation of the FY 2006 HSGP Risk Analysis Methodology for Homeland Security Advisors and State Administrative Agencies via teleconference on **August 4th.** A more detailed explanation and facilitated discussion on the core components of the methodology will be provided at the Preparedness Directorate regional meetings in eight of the 10 FEMA regions this summer. For the two regions (4 & 5) where these regional meetings have already occurred, we are exploring other options for this outreach effort. A description of the DHS Risk-Based Approach is also available on the G&T website. (See http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/newsreleases/HSGP_risk_analysis.pdf)

To meet the second recommendation, DHS is providing all States and 90 candidate areas with immediate visibility of the asset data used in the FY 2006 HSGP risk calculation[1][2]. This will be done through a web-accessible system (iMapData). It is important to understand that only asset information used in the asset risk portion of the equation will appear, and that data does not represent all infrastructures in the jurisdiction, but those infrastructures that met the threshold values set in particular asset types. Attachment A lists the 90 candidate areas considered in the UASI risk analysis. Attachment B describes the asset data and the thresholds used.

Each State Administrative Agency (SAA) should coordinate the selection of **up to two designated individuals for each State, Territory, and candidate area** included in the risk analysis[3] to receive iMapData accounts. These individuals will also be able to provide corrections and additions through the iMapData system to DHS for consideration in the risk analysis. All feedback must be submitted by **August 18th** to be considered for the FY 2007 analysis.

The individuals must be State, Territory, or Urban Area employees, or contractors working directly for the agency[4]. In some cases, an individual may be granted access to multiple candidate areas. Ideally, people who already have iMapData accounts[5] will be designated as they are already familiar with the system. Attachment C provides a current list of active iMapData users.

Please email the following information for each designated individual to Lauren Fernandez at Lauren.Fernandez@dhs.gov

- Name (first, last)
- Organization
- Email address
- Address (street, city, state, zip)
- Phone number
- Specify if the individual already has a DHS iMapData account (see Attachment C)
- Specify what access should be granted: which state and/or candidate areas (see Attachment A)

Upon receipt of this information, each designated individual will be provided with a notice of account activation and instructions on the use of the iMapData system.

---

[1] The asset data used in the FY 2006 HSGP risk calculation was a snapshot taken in October 2005 and does not include any information provided to DHS since that time.

[2] Note that the asset data used in this risk analysis is not pulled exclusively from the National Asset Database (NADB). The NADB was one of many data sources queried to provide data for the analysis. Very limited infrastructure information was available on US Trust Territories.

[3] Urban Area Working Groups should identify individuals for access to the Urban Area risk data and communicate this to the SAA.

[4] Designated individuals cannot share their login information, and are responsible for maintaining the security of the For Official Use Only (FOUO) asset data to which they have access. They may display the data for others in their state or urban area who have a need to know.

[5] iMapData accounts have been provided by DHS to states free of charge since March of 2003.

To meet the third recommendation, DHS will open discussion on the specific components of the risk analysis process with dialogue at the regional meetings. DHS is also exploring how to establish additional channels for input over time.

Questions on this information bulletin may be directed to the G&T Centralized Scheduling and Information Desk at askcsid@dhs.gov or 1-800-368-6498.

**Attachments B and C are For Official Use Only.**
**These attachments will not be posted on the G&T Website.**

**Attachment A**
**States and Candidate Areas included in the FY 2006 HSGP Risk Analysis**

As described in Information Bulletin #200, all cities with a population greater than 100,000 and any city with reported threat data during the past year were included in the risk calculation. Cities on the list with shared city boundaries were combined into a single entity for data count purposes. A 10-mile buffer was then drawn from the border of that city or combined entity to establish the geographical area in which data was evaluated. These areas are listed below. Each State may identify up to two individuals from each candidate area for access to the asset data.

| State | Candidate Area | State | Candidate Area | State | Candidate Area |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AK | Anchorage | IL | Aurora-IL Area | OH | Cincinnati |
| AL | Birmingham | IL | Chicago | OH | Cleveland |
| AL | Montgomery | IN | Fort Wayne | OH | Columbus |
| AZ | Phoenix Area | IN | Indianapolis | OH | Hebron |
| AZ | Tucson | KS | Wichita | OH | Oak Harbor |
| CA | Bakersfield | KSMO | Kansas City KS & MO Area | OH | Toledo Area |
| CA | Fresno | KY | Lexington-Fayette | OK | Oklahoma City Area |
| CA | Lancaster-CA Area | KY | Louisville | OK | Tulsa |
| CA | Lodi | LA | Baton Rouge | ORWA | Portland OR & Vancouver WA Area |
| CA | Los Angeles Area | LA | New Orleans | PA | Masontown |
| CA | Modesto | MA | Boston Area | PA | Philadelphia |
| CA | Ontario CA Area | MD | Annapolis | PA | Pittsburgh |
| CA | Orange-CA Area | MD | Baltimore | PR | Bayamon |
| CA | Riverside Area | MI | Detroit Area | PR | San Juan Area |
| CA | Sacramento Area | MN | Minneapolis-St.Paul Area | TN | Memphis |
| CA | San Diego Area | MO | St. Louis | TN | Nashville-Davidson |
| CA | San Francisco Area | NC | Charlotte | TX | Austin |
| CA | Stockton | NC | Greensboro | TX | Corpus Christi |
| CA | Ventura Area | NC | Raleigh Area | TX | Dallas Area |
| CO | Colorado Springs | NE | Lincoln | TX | El Paso |
| CO | Denver Area | NE | Omaha | TX | Houston Area |
| DC | National Capital Region | NJ | Atlantic City | TX | Laredo |
| FL | Daytona Beach | NJ | Newark Area | TX | Lubbock |
| FL | Fort Lauderdale Area | NM | Albuquerque | TX | San Antonio |
| FL | Jacksonville | NV | Henderson | UT | Salt Lake City Area |
| FL | Miami Area | NV | Las Vegas Area | VA | Norfolk Area |
| FL | Orlando | NY | Buffalo | VT | Burlington |
| FL | Tampa Area | NY | New York City Area | WA | Seattle Area |
| GA | Atlanta | NY | Rochester | WI | Madison |
| HI | Honolulu | OH | Akron | WI | Milwaukee |

## Attachment A
## States and Candidate Areas included in the FY 2006 HSGP Risk Analysis

### The following States and Territories were included in the FY 2006 HSGP Risk Analysis

| State | Urban Area | State | Urban Area |
|---|---|---|---|
| AK | Alaska | MS | Mississippi |
| AL | Alabama | MT | Montana |
| AR | Arkansas | NC | North Carolina |
| AS | American Samoa | ND | North Dakota |
| AZ | Arizona | NE | Nebraska |
| CA | California | NH | New Hampshire |
| CO | Colorado | NJ | New Jersey |
| CT | Connecticut | NM | New Mexico |
| DC | District of Columbia | NV | Nevada |
| DE | Delaware | NY | New York |
| FL | Florida | OH | Ohio |
| GA | Georgia | OK | Oklahoma |
| GU | Guam | OR | Oregon |
| HI | Hawaii | PA | Pennsylvania |
| IA | Iowa | PR | Puerto Rico |
| ID | Idaho | RI | Rhode Island |
| IL | Illinois | SC | South Carolina |
| IN | Indiana | SD | South Dakota |
| KS | Kansas | TN | Tennessee |
| KY | Kentucky | TX | Texas |
| LA | Louisiana | UT | Utah |
| MA | Massachusetts | VA | Virginia |
| MD | Maryland | VI | U.S. Virgin Islands |
| ME | Maine | VT | Vermont |
| MI | Michigan | WA | Washington |
| MN | Minnesota | WI | Wisconsin |
| MO | Missouri | WV | West Virginia |
| MP | Northern Mariana Islands | WY | Wyoming |