

The top of the page features a blue background with a stylized American flag on the left and a bald eagle in flight on the right.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

# Overview: FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program Final Awards

UPDATED FOR May 10, 2007



**Homeland  
Security**

**Table of Contents**

**INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION PROGRAM BACKGROUND ..... 1**  
**RISK ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY ..... 3**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION PROGRAM DETAIL ..... 5**  
**TRANSIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM AWARDS ..... 11**  
**PORT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM AWARDS..... 14**  
**INTERCITY BUS SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM AWARDS ..... 25**  
**TRUCKING SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM AWARDS..... 31**  
**BUFFER ZONE PROTECTION PROGRAM AWARDS..... 33**

### **Infrastructure Protection Program Background**

The DHS Infrastructure Protection Program (IPP) is designed to strengthen the Nation's ability to protect critical infrastructure facilities and systems. IPP is comprised of five separate grant programs:

- Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP)
- Port Security Grant Program (PSGP)
- Intercity Bus Security Grant Program (IBSGP)
- Trucking Security Program (TSP)
- Buffer Zone Protection Program (BZPP)

Together, these grants fund a range of preparedness activities, including strengthening infrastructure against explosive attacks, preparedness, planning, equipment purchase, training, exercises, and security management and administration costs. IPP programs support objectives outlined in the interim National Preparedness Goal and related national preparedness doctrine, such as the National Incident Management System, National Response Plan, and the National Infrastructure Protection Plan.

The FY07 IPP contains significant improvements based on extensive outreach to stakeholders. In addition, the risk assessments that form the basis for eligibility under the IPP have been simplified, refined, and considerably strengthened.

This year's IPP grants affirm our commitment to risk-based funding and deepen our commitment to assisting with regional planning and security coordination. Transit agencies were provided greater flexibility to address high-risk threats by combining all intracity rail and bus funding so local authorities could more effectively implement local security initiatives.

Transit funding also extended eligibility to 19 ferry systems in 14 regions. In addition, Intercity Passenger Rail Security was incorporated into the Transit Security Grant Program to support security enhancements through Amtrak.

This year, the Department is releasing awards several months earlier than prior years and all applicants had more time to complete the application process. The Department of Homeland Security also created multiple opportunities for applicants to consult with the Department's grant program and subject matter experts during the review process and prior to the announcement of awards. Additionally, some IPP grants will be executed as cooperative agreements, which allows for more collaboration between DHS and the applicants in refining funding proposals.

This year's IPP grants strengthen DHS's ability to protect security and business-sensitive information that will be provided with grant applications from inappropriate public release. To increase program flexibility, the period for performance under IPP grants has been extended to 36 months.

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

---

### IPP Funding Distribution -- FY 2006 and FY 2007 Awards

IPP Program	FY 2006	FY 2007
Transit Security Grant Program	\$143,240,948*	\$171,180,207
Port Security Grant Program	\$168,052,500	\$202,269,793
Intercity Bus Security Grant Program	\$9,503,000	\$11,640,000
Trucking Security Program	\$4,801,500	\$11,640,000
Buffer Zone Protection Program	\$72,965,000**	\$48,500,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$398,562,948</b>	<b>\$445,230,000</b>

\*This includes the FY06 Intercity Passenger Rail Security Grant Program (\$7,242,855) that was awarded as a separate grant program.

\*\* FY06 included a one-time Chemical Sector Buffer Zone Protection Program (\$25,000,000).

### Key IPP Grant Process Milestones – FY 2006 and FY 2007

Milestone	FY 2006	FY 2007
Appropriation Enactment	18 Oct 05	4 Oct 06
Release of Grant Guidance	6 July 06	9 Jan 07
Application Deadline	4 Aug 06	6 March 07
Announcement of Award Determinations	25 Sept 06	10 May 07

### Risk Analysis Methodology

The risk methodology for the IPP programs is consistent across the modes and is linked to the risk methodology used to determine eligibility for the core DHS State and local grant programs. The risk formula for the IPP program is based on a 100 point scale comprised of **threat** (20 points) and **vulnerability/consequence** (80 points). The threat component of the formula is drawn from comprehensive analysis by the Intelligence Community of known threats from all data sources at its disposal. The vulnerability/consequence component considers passenger data and transportation system infrastructure data. Data elements for the IPP transportation programs are specific to each transportation mode. Further, for port security, economic factors pertaining to cargo were considered as well.

#### Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP)

TSGP basic eligibility is derived from the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI). As a result of changes to the participating UASI jurisdictions in FY07, and an updated analysis of annual ridership, transit agencies from five new cities are included in the FY07 TSGP program.

Within the TSGP, eligibility for Tier I (highest risk) and Tier II grant awards is predicated on a systematic risk analysis that aggregates all of the eligible transit agencies within a given metropolitan area, and then rates these clusters of eligible systems for comparative risk. The FY07 risk assessment formula was further strengthened and refined from last year's risk assessment formula.

The DHS formula incorporates multiple variables. Each variable set is assigned a weight as part of the overall formula, and all eligible jurisdictions are empirically ranked in each instance on a numerical scale from lowest to highest.

The DHS risk assessment methodology considers critical infrastructure system assets, and characteristics that might contribute to their risk, such as: Intelligence Community assessments of threat; potentially affected passenger populations; and the economic impact of attack. The relative weighting of variables reflects DHS's overall risk assessment and FY07 program priorities (for example, presence of underwater and underground systems). Specific variables include unlinked passenger trips for rail and bus systems, number of underground track miles, number of underwater tunnels, and location-specific intelligence community risk analysis. For ferry systems, annual ridership and number of vehicles carried annually were used for the risk analysis.

## **FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program**

---

### **Port Security Grant Program (PSGP)**

Within the PSGP, eligibility for all grant awards is first predicated on a systematic risk analysis that compares all of the eligible port areas and rates eligible ports in a given area for comparative risk. The FY07 risk assessment formula was further strengthened and refined from last year's risk assessment formula.

Risk data for eligible port areas is gathered individually and then aggregated by region. The DHS risk formula incorporates multiple normalized variables, meaning that for a given variable, all eligible port areas are empirically ranked on a relative scale from lowest to highest.

The DHS risk assessment methodology for PSPG considers critical infrastructure system assets, and characteristics that might contribute to their risk in four groupings: (1) intelligence community assessments of threat; (2) economic consequences of attack; (3) port assets; and (4) area risk (to people and physical infrastructure immediately surrounding the port). The relative weighting of variables reflects DHS's overall risk assessment and the FY07 program priorities described above. Specific variables include multiple data sets regarding: international cargo value and measures of cargo throughput (container, breakbulk, international, and domestic); length of port channel; military mission variables; adjacent critical asset inventories; and Coast Guard Maritime Security Risk Analysis Model (MSRAM) data.

### **Intercity Bus Security Grant Program**

Within the IBSGP, eligibility for Tier I (highest risk) and Tier II grant awards is predicated on a systematic analysis of fleet size and services to UASI jurisdictions.

The DHS formula incorporates multiple variables. Each variable set is assigned a weight as part of the overall formula, and all eligible companies are empirically ranked in each instance on a numerical scale from lowest to highest.

The DHS risk assessment methodology considers critical infrastructure system assets, and characteristics that might contribute to their risk, such as: intelligence community assessments of threat; potentially affected passenger populations; and the economic impact of attack. Specific variables included number of buses, service factor (fixed route vs. charter), routes passing through underwater tunnels, major intermodal junctions, multi-tenant infrastructure, and location-specific intelligence community risk analysis.

### IPP Program Detail

#### Port Security Grant Program (PSGP)

**Total Funding Awarded in FY 2007:** \$202,269,793

**Purpose:** The PSGP provides grant funding to port areas for the protection of critical port infrastructure from terrorism. The PSGP funds are primarily intended to assist ports in enhancing risk management capabilities, enhanced domain awareness, capabilities to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from attacks involving improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and other non-conventional weapons, as well as training and exercises.

**Eligibility:** Owners and operators of federally regulated terminals, facilities, U.S. inspected passenger vessels or ferries; port authorities or other State and local agencies providing layered security to federally regulated facilities; and, consortia composed of local stakeholder groups representing federally regulated ports, terminals, facilities, U.S. inspected passenger vessels or ferries. Eligible entities competed for a portion of the total funds set aside for their respective risk tier. Awards were based on an analysis of risk and the effectiveness of proposed investments by the applicants. Risk to port areas is assessed using a methodology consisting of threat, vulnerability, and consequence factors.

**Tiers and Awards:** In many cases, multiple port areas were grouped together to reflect geographic proximity, shared risk, and a common waterway. Eight of the highest risk port regions were grouped in Tier I and were eligible to apply for a fixed amount of funding. Port areas not in Tier I were eligible to compete for FY07 PSGP funding within their risk groupings of Tier II, III, and IV.

Tier I ports were eligible to receive a combined total of \$120 million, or roughly 60 percent of total Port Security Grant Program funding this year. The first three tiers were comprised of 102 specifically identified critical ports, representing approximately 95 percent of the foreign waterborne commerce of the United States. All remaining ports that comprised Tier IV were mandated by the SAFE Port Act for consideration of funding.

#### **Application Process:**

- 1. Initial Screening.** The United States Coast Guard (USCG) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Preparedness Directorate (NPD) conducted an initial administrative review of all FY07 PSGP applications. Completed applications were grouped by port area and provided to the applicable Captain of the Port (COTP) for further review.
- 2. Field Review.** Field level reviews were managed by the applicable COTP in coordination with the U.S. Department of Transportation Maritime Administration's Region Director and appropriate personnel from the Area Maritime Security Committee (AMSC) and/or local law enforcement (as identified by the COTP). To support coordination of security grant application projects with State and Urban Area homeland security strategies, as well as other State and local security plans, the COTP coordinated the results of the field review with the applicable State Administrative Agency (SAA) or Agencies and State Homeland Security Advisor(s) (HSA).

## **FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program**

---

- 3. National Review.** Following the field review, a National Review Panel was convened with subject matter experts drawn from the USCG, Transportation Security Administration (TSA), FEMA/NPD, Customs and Border Protection (CBP), the DHS Office of Infrastructure Protection, the DHS Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, and the U.S. Department of Transportation's Maritime Administration (MARAD). The purpose of the National Review was to identify a final, prioritized list of projects for funding.

**Matching Requirements:** Matching requirements are 25 percent of total project cost for public sector applicants and 50 percent of total project cost for private sector applicants. There is no matching requirement for projects less than \$25,000.

**Period of Performance:** 36 months.



## **FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program**

---

### **Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP)**

**Total Funding Awarded in FY 2007:** \$171,180,207

**Purpose:** The TSGP provides grant funding to the Nation's key high-threat Urban Areas to enhance security measures for their critical transit infrastructure, including bus, rail, and ferry systems. In FY 2007, TSGP will also provide funding to Amtrak for continued security enhancements for its intercity rail operations between key, high-risk Urban Areas throughout the United States. In addition, the TSGP ferry grant program extends funding eligibility to help increase the security of 19 eligible ferry systems in 14 regions. Grant funding priorities included: securing underground and underwater systems; reducing the risks of improvised explosive devices and radiological; chemical and biological weapons; as well as training, exercises and public awareness campaigns.

In order to provide local transit agencies greater flexibility in allocating TSGP funds, DHS combined last year's separate transit rail grants and transit bus grants into a single pool of TSGP funds. These funds were available to be used by successful applicants for both types of transit systems with the intention of reducing grant application complexity and allowing local transit officials to propose how best to allocate their available TSGP resources to reduce overall risk.

**Eligibility and Awards:** TSGP basic eligibility was derived from the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI). As a result of changes to the participating UASI jurisdictions in FY07, and an updated analysis of annual ridership, transit agencies from five new cities were included in the FY07 TSGP program. The State Administrative Agency formally applied for TSGP funds.

The National Passenger Railroad Corporation (Amtrak) was the only intercity passenger rail service provider eligible to apply for and receive funding through the TSGP. Amtrak will receive a total award of over \$8.3 million this year.

Nineteen ferry systems in 14 regions were eligible to apply for awards totaling \$7.83 million under this program. A total of 17 ferry systems in 13 regions will receive funds totaling \$7,230,207 based on evaluation of the applications received.

Funds were awarded based on analysis of risk and the effectiveness of proposed investments by the applicants. Risk to transit systems was assessed using a methodology consisting of threat, vulnerability, and consequence factors.

**Tiers and Awards:** Eight major Urban Areas qualified for Tier I, or highest risk status, in fiscal year 2007. Transit systems within these areas were eligible to apply for a combined total of \$141.4 million, or roughly 90 percent of total Transit Security Grant funding available for rail and bus systems this year. Twenty-nine eligible Urban Areas competed for \$14.2 million in Tier II. Projects from 24 of those Tier II Urban Areas were selected for funding. Overall, 25 SAAs will receive awards for transit security investments in 32 Urban Areas.

## **FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program**

---

### **Application Process:**

#### Transit:

1. FEMA/NPD, in conjunction with TSA, verified compliance with each of the administrative and eligibility criteria identified in the application kit.
2. Eligible applications were reviewed and scored by a Federal interagency working group, including representatives from TSA, FEMA/NPD and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).
3. TSA and FEMA/NPD jointly reviewed the interagency recommendations and made recommendations for funding to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

#### Ferry:

1. FEMA/NPD, in conjunction with the USCG, verified compliance with each of the administrative and eligibility criteria identified in the application kit.
2. Eligible applications were reviewed and scored by an Executive Steering Committee of Maritime Security Grant Programs consisting of USCG, TSA, the Department of Transportation's MARAD, and FEMA/NPD.
3. The Executive Steering Committee made recommendations for funding to FEMA/NPD and the Secretary. DHS briefed all appropriate agencies on the final selections to ensure consensus and address any remaining issues.

**Matching Requirements:** None; however, for TSGP applicants the minimum amount that could be requested for projects focused on training and/or exercises was \$50,000 and the minimum amount that could be requested for other projects was \$250,000.

**Period of Performance:** 36 months.

## **FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program**

---

### **Intercity Bus Security Grant Program (IBSGP)**

**Total Funding Awarded in FY 2007:** \$11,640,000

**Purpose:** The IBSGP provides funding to create a sustainable program for the protection of intercity bus systems and the traveling public from terrorism. The FY07 IBSGP seeks to assist owners and operators of fixed-route intercity and charter bus services in obtaining the resources required to support security measures such as enhanced planning, facility security upgrades, and vehicle and driver protection.

**Eligibility:** Owners/operators of fixed route intercity bus transportation providing services to a defined Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) jurisdiction and owners/operators of a charter bus service using over-the-road buses and providing a minimum of 50 trips annually to one or more defined UASI jurisdictions were eligible to apply.

The following were deemed ineligible:

- School buses
- Fixed service routes under contract to transit authorities within UASI areas
- Fixed service routes not stopping in qualifying UASI areas

Funds were awarded based on an analysis of risk and the effectiveness of proposed investments by the applicants. Risk to intercity bus services was assessed using a consistent methodology of threat, vulnerability, and consequence factors.

**Tiers and Awards:** For the first time under the IBSGP, FY 2007 applicants were divided into two tiers based on risk. Six applicants with the largest fleets of over-the-road buses (at minimum, an operational fleet size of 250 buses) and the most extensive services to high-risk Urban Areas were placed in Tier I and competed for the \$8.16 million designated for that tier. All six companies received a portion of the Tier I funds. All other eligible applicants were placed in Tier II and competed for the remaining \$3.48 million in available funds.

#### **Application Process:**

1. FEMA/NPD, in conjunction with TSA, verified compliance with each of the administrative and eligibility criteria identified in the application kit.
2. Eligible applications were reviewed and scored by a Federal interagency working group, including representatives from TSA, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), and FEMA/NPD.
3. TSA and FEMA/NPD reviewed the interagency recommendations and made recommendations for funding to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

**Matching Requirements:** None; however, for Tier I applicants the minimum amount that could be requested for projects focused on training and/or exercises was \$50,000 and the minimum amount that could be requested for other projects was \$100,000. For Tier II applicants, the minimum amount that could be requested for projects focused on training and/or exercises was \$5,000 and the minimum amount that could be requested for other projects was \$25,000.

## **FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program**

---

**Period of Performance:** 36 months.

### **Trucking Security Program (TSP)**

**Total Funding Awarded in FY 2007:** \$11,640,000

**Purpose:** The TSP provides funding for the Highway Watch® Program in order to continue a sustainable national program to enhance security and overall preparedness on our Nation's highways.

**Eligibility and Award:** The FY 2007 TSP provided funding in the form of a cooperative agreement directly to the American Trucking Associations for the continued modernization and management of this program.

**Tiers:** None.

**Matching Requirements:** None.

**Period of Performance:** 36 months.

### **Buffer Zone Protection Program (BZPP)**

**Total Funding Awarded in FY 2007:** \$48,500,000

**Purpose:** BZPP provides grant funding to build security and risk-management capabilities at the State and local level to secure pre-designated Tier I and Tier II critical infrastructure sites, including chemical facilities, financial institutions, nuclear and electric power plants, dams, stadiums, and other high-risk/high-consequence facilities.

**Eligibility and Awards:** The SAA is the agency eligible to apply. Specific BZPP sites within 46 States were selected based on their level of risk and criticality. Each State with a BZPP site was eligible to submit applications for its local communities to participate in and receive funding under the FY07 BZPP. Therefore, BZPP funding allocated to any given State or territory was a function of the number, type, and character of the pre-identified sites within that State or territory. Each of the 46 eligible States has submitted an application and is receiving an award.

**Tiers:** None.

**Matching Requirements:** None.

**Period of Performance:** 36 months.

**Transit Security Grant Program Awards**

**Transit Security Grant Program Awards**

- **Intracity Rail and Bus**
- **Ferry**
- **Amtrak**

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

### Transit Security Grant Program FY 2007 Awards and Funding History

Tier	State	Urban Area/Grantee	TOTAL FY03-07	FY06	FY07
		Amtrak	\$21,926,122	\$7,242,855	\$8,309,537
		Ferry Systems*	\$16,117,368	\$5,000,000	\$7,230,207
I	GA	Atlanta Area	\$12,162,468	\$2,158,000	\$3,440,060
	CA	Bay Area	\$41,154,032	\$11,200,000	\$13,820,695
	MA	Boston Area	\$44,412,362	\$11,000,000	\$15,324,394
	IL/IN	Chicago Area	\$49,186,601	\$12,500,000	\$12,837,834
	CA	Greater Los Angeles Area (Los Angeles/Long Beach and Anaheim/Santa Ana UASI Areas)	\$27,578,026	\$6,200,000	\$7,059,035
	DC/MD/VA	Greater National Capital Region (National Capital Region and Baltimore UASI Area)	\$56,506,224	\$14,300,000	\$18,255,505
	NY/NJ/CT	New York City/Northern New Jersey Area (New York City and Jersey City/Newark UASI Areas)	\$210,962,894	\$53,800,000	\$61,000,000
	PA/NJ	Philadelphia Area	\$35,544,389	\$9,400,000	\$9,702,940
II	NY	Buffalo Area	\$1,458,185	\$174,305	\$758,880
	NC	Charlotte Area	\$578,788	\$0	\$578,788
	OH	Cincinnati Area	\$754,955	\$491,500	\$263,455
	OH	Cleveland Area	\$3,250,530	\$893,600	\$386,650
	TX	Dallas/Fort Worth/Arlington Area	\$3,555,515	\$0	\$910,235
	CO	Denver Area	\$3,200,119	\$1,150,000	\$0
	MI	Detroit Area	\$1,650,822	\$875,829	\$374,993
	HI	Honolulu Area	\$1,125,112	\$50,250	\$399,862
	TX	Houston Area	\$6,334,771	\$800,000	\$1,501,349
	FL	Jacksonville Area	\$416,481	\$0	\$116,481
	NV	Las Vegas Area	\$600,000	\$100,000	\$0
	TN	Memphis Area	\$350,176	\$0	\$50,176
	FL	Miami/Fort Lauderdale (Miami and Fort Lauderdale UASI Areas)	\$10,178,504	\$1,776,140	\$3,515,260
	WI	Milwaukee Area	\$600,000	\$0	\$0
	LA	New Orleans Area	\$2,247,157	\$656,426	\$293,000
	VA	Norfolk Area	\$591,081	\$0	\$591,081
	FL	Orlando Area	\$908,186	\$0	\$908,186
	AZ	Phoenix Area	\$546,800	\$300,000	\$246,800
	PA	Pittsburgh Area	\$4,325,037	\$898,530	\$928,520
	OR	Portland Area	\$4,436,394	\$950,000	\$560,000
	RI	Providence Area	\$721,367	\$0	\$721,367
	CA	Sacramento Area	\$1,101,897	\$476,897	\$0
	TX	San Antonio Area	\$377,067	\$0	\$377,067
	CA	San Diego Area	\$4,745,851	\$1,245,500	\$55,071
	WA	Seattle Area	\$7,694,768	\$2,931,196	\$166,052
	MO	St. Louis Area	\$2,147,239	\$1,154,920	\$292,319
FL	Tampa Area	\$163,179	\$0	\$163,179	
AZ	Tucson Area	\$0	\$0	\$0	
MN	Twin Cities Area	\$1,731,229	\$515,000	\$41,229	
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$572,454,535</b>	<b>\$143,240,948</b>	<b>\$171,180,207</b>

\*Ferry funding for FY05-FY06 is included in each urban area's historical funding amounts.

Indicates New Urban Area Eligible in FY 2007 for the Transit Security Grant Program.

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

### Transit Security Grant Program Ferry Security FY 2007 Awards and Funding History

State	Region	Eligible System	FY06	FY07*
AK/WA <sup>1</sup>	Juneau, Bellingham, Valdez	Alaska Marine Highway System	N/A	\$352,040
CA	Bay Area	Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District	\$700,000	\$586,714
		City of Alameda Ferry Services (Blue and Gold Lines Fleet) <sup>6</sup>		
		City of Vallejo Transportation Program		
	Greater Los Angeles Area (Los Angeles/Long Beach and Anaheim/Santa Ana UASI Areas)	Catalina Passenger Service	N/A	\$122,581
CT/NY <sup>2</sup>	Bridgeport, CT – Port Jefferson, NY	The Bridgeport & Port Jefferson Steamboat Company	N/A	\$414,350
	New London, CT – Orient Point, NY	Cross Sound Ferry		
DE/NJ <sup>3</sup>	Cape May – Lewes	Cape May Ferry System	N/A	\$155,807
LA	New Orleans Area	Crescent City Connection Division - Louisiana Department of Transportation	\$300,000	\$325,000
MA	Boston Area	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	\$400,000	\$400,960
	Woods Hole - Martha's Vineyard	Martha's Vineyard Ferry	N/A	\$274,120
NC	Cape Hatteras / Cherry Branch / Cedar Island / Ocracoke	North Carolina Ferry System	N/A	\$429,685
NY/NJ <sup>4</sup>	New York City/Jersey City/Newark	New York City Department of Transportation (Staten Island Ferry)	\$1,300,000	\$1,532,903
		New York Waterways		
		Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ)		
		SeaStreak		
TX <sup>5</sup>	Houston Area	Texas DOT (Bolivar Roads Ferry)	\$300,000	\$0
VA	Jamestown – Scotland	Jamestown Ferry	N/A	\$235,444
WA	Seattle Area	Washington State Ferries	\$2,000,000	\$2,400,603
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>\$7,230,207</b>

\*Eligible applicants can compete for these funds within their region.

<sup>1</sup>The AK SAA will administer these funds.

<sup>2</sup>The CT SAA will administer these funds.

<sup>3</sup>The DE SAA will administer these funds.

<sup>4</sup>The NY SAA will administer these funds.

<sup>5</sup>Texas DOT (Bolivar Roads Ferry) did not apply for funds in FY07.

<sup>6</sup>City of Alameda Ferry Services (Blue and Gold Lines Fleet) did not apply for funds in FY07.

**Port Security Grant Program Awards**

**Port Security Grant Program Awards**



## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

### Port Security Grant Program Award Comparison by Port Area

Tier	Port Area	TOTAL FY02-07	FY06	FY07
I	<b>Bay Area</b>			
	Oakland, CA	\$20,597,962	\$0	\$6,220,613
	Richmond, CA	\$7,103,254	\$1,185,716	\$2,311,138
	San Francisco, CA	\$12,152,383	\$0	\$2,434,486
	Stockton, CA	\$5,203,118	\$0	\$3,260,414
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$45,056,717</b>	<b>\$1,185,716</b>	<b>\$14,226,651</b>
	<b>Delaware Bay</b>			
	Camden, NJ	\$8,238,994	\$2,500,000	\$4,806,994
	Chester, PA	\$14,534	<i>No Funding Requested</i>	\$14,534
	Marcus Hook, NJ	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Paulsboro, NJ	\$2,950,000	\$2,500,000	\$0
	Penn Manor, PA	\$0	<i>No Funding Requested</i>	\$0
	Philadelphia, PA	\$28,720,283	\$5,099,375	\$5,653,032
	Wilmington, DE	\$3,276,965	\$0	\$2,776,965
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$43,200,776</b>	<b>\$10,099,375</b>	<b>\$13,251,525</b>
	<b>Houston-Galveston</b>			
	Galveston, TX	\$7,527,328	\$664,922	\$0
	Houston, TX	\$89,091,120	\$11,605,716	\$13,085,191
	Texas City, TX	\$12,594,438	\$0	\$2,042,805
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$109,212,886</b>	<b>\$12,270,638</b>	<b>\$15,127,996</b>
	<b>Los Angeles-Long Beach</b>	<b>\$107,205,958</b>	<b>\$12,002,769</b>	<b>\$15,403,041</b>
	<b>New Orleans</b>			
	Baton Rouge, LA	\$17,524,836	\$11,555,230	\$1,653,539
	New Orleans, LA	\$31,600,178	\$737,125	\$8,955,469
	Plaquemines, LA	\$110,200	<i>No Funding Requested</i>	\$110,200
	South Louisiana, LA	\$16,429,642	\$11,435,475	\$2,062,675
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$65,664,856</b>	<b>\$23,727,830</b>	<b>\$12,781,883</b>
	<b>New York/New Jersey</b>	<b>\$104,488,814</b>	<b>\$25,727,312</b>	<b>\$27,309,367</b>
	<b>Puget Sound</b>			
	Anacortes, WA	\$262,000	<i>No Funding Requested</i>	\$0
	Everett, WA	\$2,966,000	\$0	\$0
	Seattle, WA	\$50,175,373	\$7,416,539	\$5,573,887
	Tacoma, WA	\$15,987,020	\$2,500,000	\$11,760,272
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$69,390,393</b>	<b>\$9,916,539</b>	<b>\$17,334,159</b>
	<b>Sabine-Neches River</b>			
	Beaumont, TX	\$25,992,309	\$7,842,211	\$2,891,134
	Port Arthur, TX	\$14,323,915	\$3,062,942	\$2,381,416

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

Tier	Port Area	TOTAL FY02-07	FY06	FY07	
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$40,316,224</b>	<b>\$10,905,153</b>	<b>\$5,272,550</b>	
II	Baltimore, MD	\$18,531,575	\$4,809,848	\$1,917,367	
	Boston, MA	\$8,859,651	\$147,750	\$358,428	
	Charleston, SC	\$33,366,076	\$9,021,591	\$4,251,464	
	Cincinnati, OH	\$138,460	\$0	\$138,460	
	<b>Columbia-Willamette River System</b>				
	Kalama, WA	\$935,400	<i>No Funding Requested</i>	\$0	
	Longview, WA	\$358,500	<i>No Funding Requested</i>	\$262,500	
	Portland, OR	\$6,202,248	\$0	\$281,763	
	Vancouver, WA	\$965,419	\$0	\$359,050	
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$8,461,567</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$903,313</b>	
	Corpus Christi, TX	\$30,595,598	\$8,807,225	\$3,409,475	
	Hampton Roads, VA	\$26,251,746	\$3,549,712	\$3,927,683	
	Huntington, WV	\$2,467,500	\$0	<i>No Funding Requested</i>	
	Jacksonville, FL	\$16,700,014	\$3,739,084	\$5,888,464	
	Lake Charles, LA	\$28,629,625	\$2,716,908	\$2,667,305	
	Louisville, KY	\$1,365,325	\$334,737	\$428,249	
	Memphis, TN	\$9,163,301	\$0	\$959,888	
	Mobile, AL	\$6,215,505	\$260,217	\$3,268,967	
	Pittsburgh, PA	\$3,350,579	\$111,379	\$2,699,639	
	Savannah, GA	\$13,473,524	\$17,550	\$3,914,120	
	<b>Southern Tip of Lake Michigan</b>				
	Burns Harbor, IN	\$445,452	\$284,526	\$27,166	
	Chicago, IL	\$20,413,683	\$11,496,456	\$6,967,777	
	Gary, IN	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Indiana Harbor, IN	\$220,000	<i>No Funding Requested</i>	\$0	
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$21,079,135</b>	<b>\$11,780,982</b>	<b>\$6,994,943</b>	
	St. Louis, MO	\$681,938	\$150,000	\$459,625	
III	Albany, NY	\$975,750	\$624,750	\$351,000	
	Anchorage, AK	\$1,785,548	\$0	\$969,429	
	Apra Harbor, GU	\$799,100	\$0	\$0	
	Brownsville, TX	\$4,101,850	\$0	\$3,610,950	
	Buffalo, NY	\$870,456	\$0	\$220,456	
	Chattanooga, TN	\$636,483	\$0	\$523,538	
	Cleveland, OH	\$1,465,825	\$0	<i>No Funding Requested</i>	
	Detroit, MI	\$4,699,373	\$1,024,815	\$2,139,540	
	Duluth-Superior, MN/WI	\$425,600	\$25,000	\$0	
	Freeport, TX	\$9,655,607	\$1,200,098	\$2,623,709	
	Green Bay, WI	\$643,263	\$222,380	\$369,158	

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

Tier	Port Area	TOTAL FY02-07	FY06	FY07
	Greenville, MS	\$0	No Funding Requested	\$0
	Gulfport, MS	\$3,515,934	\$2,500,000	\$0
	Guntersville, AL	\$10,913	No Funding Requested	\$0
	Helena, AR	\$0	No Funding Requested	No Funding Requested
	Honolulu, HI	\$13,011,102	\$1,070,290	\$1,616,527
	Kansas City, MO	\$221,540	No Funding Requested	\$0
	<b>Long Island Sound</b>			
	Bridgeport, CT	\$5,745,975	\$24,968	\$869,181
	New Haven, CT	\$2,343,467	No Funding Requested	\$45,703
	New London, CT	\$1,247,886	\$637,500	\$296,250
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$9,337,328</b>	<b>\$662,468</b>	<b>\$1,211,134</b>
	<b>Matagorda, TX</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	Miami, FL	\$29,242,117	\$2,250,000	\$54,350
	Milwaukee, WI	\$479,922	\$0	\$82,500
	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	\$4,330,935	\$2,218,650	\$1,699,785
	Morehead City, NC	\$144,500	\$0	\$19,500
	Mount Vernon, IN	\$948,318	\$931,518	\$0
	Nashville, TN	\$169,108	No Funding Requested	\$0
	Palm Beach, FL	\$2,316,072	\$0	\$1,500,000
	Panama City, FL	\$46,847	No Funding Requested	No Funding Requested
	Pascagoula, MS	\$1,796,000	\$0	\$408,750
	Pensacola, FL	\$527,107	No Funding Requested	\$0
	Ponce, PR	\$509,944	No Funding Requested	\$384,944
	Port Canaveral, FL	\$6,543,715	\$0	\$2,893,431
	Port Everglades, FL	\$3,389,500	\$1,455,125	\$270,000
	Port Fourchon/LOOP, LA	\$4,137,259	\$0	\$2,363,325
	Port Hueneme, CA	\$77,400	\$0	\$0
	Portland, ME	\$5,320,950	\$768,750	\$930,000
	Portsmouth, NH	\$2,940,838	\$1,180,536	\$111,302
	Providence, RI	\$4,985,803	\$0	\$482,091
	San Diego, CA	\$14,802,302	\$139,837	\$731,250
	San Juan, PR	\$11,997,193	\$0	\$4,787,161
	<b>Tampa Bay</b>			
	Port Manatee, FL	\$3,207,331	\$37,890	\$355,821
	Tampa, FL	\$12,075,489	\$0	\$475,783
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$15,282,820</b>	<b>\$37,890</b>	<b>\$831,604</b>
	Toledo, OH	\$1,521,527	\$0	No Funding Requested

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

Tier	Port Area	TOTAL FY02-07	FY06	FY07
	Tulsa, OK	\$725,000	<i>No Funding Requested</i>	\$0
	Two Harbors, MN	\$366,026	\$248,538	<i>No Funding Requested</i>
	Valdez, AK	\$2,583,310	\$209,540	<i>No Funding Requested</i>
	Vicksburg, MS	\$605,219	\$0	\$55,219
	Victoria, TX	\$344,080	\$0	<i>No Funding Requested</i>
	Wilmington, NC	\$9,474,270	\$0	\$416,799
IV	Beaufort County, SC	\$55,785	\$0	\$55,785
	Benicia, CA	\$679,625	\$0	\$659,625
	Brunswick, GA	\$546,888	\$0	\$286,388
	Crockett, CA	\$167,357	\$0	\$167,357
	Decatur, AL	\$22,658	\$0	\$15,000
	Dumfries, VA	\$67,994	\$0	\$67,994
	Dutch Harbor, AK	\$277,500	\$0	\$117,500
	Erie, PA	\$430,205	\$0	\$242,205
	Gloucester, MA	\$705,999	\$0	\$705,999
	Grand Haven, MI	\$125,623	\$0	\$125,623
	Grays Harbor, WA	\$313,342	\$0	\$313,342
	Harlingen, TX	\$111,263	\$0	\$111,263
	Hilo, HI	\$212,747	\$0	\$23,172
	Houma, LA	\$543,728	\$0	\$23,172
	Juneau, AK	\$1,453,265	\$0	\$219,000
	Kahului, HI	\$23,172	\$0	\$23,172
	Marietta, OH	\$97,645	\$0	\$22,945
	Marysville, MI	\$75,000	\$0	\$75,000
	Morgan City, LA	\$70,290	\$0	\$70,290
	Mulga, AL	\$24,675	\$0	\$24,675
	Nawiliwili, HI	\$23,172	\$0	\$23,172
	New Bedford, MA	\$968,256	\$0	\$918,256
	New Martinsville, WV	\$135,000	\$0	\$135,000
	Newell, WV	\$8,750	\$0	\$8,750
	Ogdensburg, NY	\$221,685	\$0	\$221,685
	Oswego, NY	\$9,883	\$0	\$9,883
	Quincy, MA	\$8,600	\$0	\$8,600
	Quonset Point, RI	\$27,803	\$0	\$27,803
	Redwood City, CA	\$256,527	\$0	\$181,527
	Rodeo, CA	\$625,000	\$0	\$625,000
	Sault Ste. Marie, MI	\$232,500	\$0	\$232,500
	Searsport, ME	\$572,532	\$0	\$88,132
	Seward, AK	\$452,000	\$0	\$15,000
	US Virgin Islands	\$2,474,179	\$0	\$1,688,979

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

---

Tier	Port Area	TOTAL FY02-07	FY06	FY07
	Whittier, AK	\$181,263	\$0	\$36,263
	Woods Hole, MA	\$48,975	\$0	\$48,975
	Wrangell, AK	\$275,000	\$0	\$75,000
	Yellow Creek, MS	\$23,750	\$0	\$23,750
	Other Port Areas*	\$74,264,137	\$0	\$0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,078,445,267</b>	<b>\$168,052,500</b>	<b>\$202,269,793</b>
*Represents port areas that received PSGP funds in the past, but were ineligible in FY05 and FY06 or did not apply for funding in FY07.				

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

### Port Security Grant Program FY02-FY07 Award Comparison by Port Area

Tier	Port Area	FY02 Award (Round 1)	FY03 Award (Round 2 & UASI)	FY04 Award (Rounds 3&4)	FY05 Award (Round 5)	FY06 Award (Round 6)	FY07 Award (Round 7)	FY02-07 Award Total
I	<b>Bay Area</b>							
	Oakland, CA	\$4,867,071	\$3,754,526	\$2,868,500	\$2,887,252	\$0	\$6,220,613	\$20,597,962
	Richmond, CA	\$0	\$91,000	\$3,515,400	\$0	\$1,185,716	\$2,311,138	\$7,103,254
	San Francisco, CA	\$602,542	\$4,036,450	\$5,078,905	\$0	\$0	\$2,434,486	\$12,152,383
	Stockton, CA	\$0	\$486,204	\$1,456,500	\$0	\$0	\$3,260,414	\$5,203,118
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$5,469,613</b>	<b>\$8,368,180</b>	<b>\$12,919,305</b>	<b>\$2,887,252</b>	<b>\$1,185,716</b>	<b>\$14,226,651</b>	<b>\$45,056,717</b>
	<b>Delaware Bay</b>							
	Camden, NJ	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$932,000	\$2,500,000	\$4,806,994	\$8,238,994
	Chester, PA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$14,534	\$14,534
	Marcus Hook, NJ	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Paulsboro, NJ	\$0	\$450,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,500,000	\$0	\$2,950,000
	Penn Manor, PA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Philadelphia, PA	\$850,000	\$11,642,180	\$1,865,400	\$3,610,296	\$5,099,375	\$5,653,032	\$28,720,283
	Wilmington, DE	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,776,965	\$3,276,965
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$1,350,000</b>	<b>\$12,092,180</b>	<b>\$1,865,400</b>	<b>\$4,542,296</b>	<b>\$10,099,375</b>	<b>\$13,251,525</b>	<b>\$43,200,776</b>
	<b>Houston-Galveston</b>							
	Galveston, TX	\$1,611,206	\$2,121,000	\$3,130,200	\$0	\$664,922	\$0	\$7,527,328
	Houston, TX	\$2,002,000	\$11,867,534	\$15,205,563	\$35,325,116	\$11,605,716	\$13,085,191	\$89,091,120
	Texas City, TX	\$1,735,883	\$250,000	\$2,680,000	\$5,885,750	\$0	\$2,042,805	\$12,594,438
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$5,349,089</b>	<b>\$14,238,534</b>	<b>\$21,015,763</b>	<b>\$41,210,866</b>	<b>\$12,270,638</b>	<b>\$15,127,996</b>	<b>\$109,212,886</b>
	<b>Los Angeles-Long Beach</b>							
		<b>\$8,155,000</b>	<b>\$27,012,527</b>	<b>\$20,416,275</b>	<b>\$24,216,346</b>	<b>\$12,002,769</b>	<b>\$15,403,041</b>	<b>\$107,205,958</b>
	<b>New Orleans</b>							
	Baton Rouge, LA	\$0	\$430,137	\$3,723,900	\$162,030	\$11,555,230	\$1,653,539	\$17,524,836
	New Orleans, LA	\$3,764,450	\$9,095,433	\$7,041,672	\$2,006,029	\$737,125	\$8,955,469	\$31,600,178
	Plaquemines, LA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$110,200	\$110,200
	South Louisiana, LA	\$0	\$0	\$1,827,242	\$1,104,250	\$11,435,475	\$2,062,675	\$16,429,642
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$3,764,450</b>	<b>\$9,525,570</b>	<b>\$12,592,814</b>	<b>\$3,272,309</b>	<b>\$23,727,830</b>	<b>\$12,781,883</b>	<b>\$65,664,856</b>
	<b>New York/New Jersey</b>							
		<b>\$9,336,966</b>	<b>\$20,034,701</b>	<b>\$15,463,832</b>	<b>\$6,616,636</b>	<b>\$25,727,312</b>	<b>\$27,309,367</b>	<b>\$104,488,814</b>
	<b>Puget Sound</b>							
	Anacortes, WA	\$0	\$160,000	\$102,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$262,000
	Everett, WA	\$150,000	\$470,000	\$2,346,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,966,000
	Seattle, WA	\$5,006,724	\$20,158,548	\$4,721,417	\$7,298,258	\$7,416,539	\$5,573,887	\$50,175,373
	Tacoma, WA	\$0	\$491,734	\$1,235,014	\$0	\$2,500,000	\$11,760,272	\$15,987,020
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$5,156,724</b>	<b>\$21,280,282</b>	<b>\$8,404,431</b>	<b>\$7,298,258</b>	<b>\$9,916,539</b>	<b>\$17,334,159</b>	<b>\$69,390,393</b>
	<b>Sabine-Neches River</b>							
	Beaumont, TX	\$560,000	\$6,697,671	\$1,910,000	\$6,091,293	\$7,842,211	\$2,891,134	\$25,992,309

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

Tier	Port Area	FY02 Award (Round 1)	FY03 Award (Round 2 & UASI)	FY04 Award (Rounds 3&4)	FY05 Award (Round 5)	FY06 Award (Round 6)	FY07 Award (Round 7)	FY02-07 Award Total
	Port Arthur, TX	\$0	\$2,115,702	\$2,628,720	\$4,135,135	\$3,062,942	\$2,381,416	\$14,323,915
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$560,000</b>	<b>\$8,813,373</b>	<b>\$4,538,720</b>	<b>\$10,226,428</b>	<b>\$10,905,153</b>	<b>\$5,272,550</b>	<b>\$40,316,224</b>
II	<b>Baltimore, MD</b>	\$3,764,000	\$4,518,532	\$2,493,828	\$1,028,000	\$4,809,848	\$1,917,367	<b>\$18,531,575</b>
	<b>Boston, MA</b>	\$3,853,947	\$2,979,771	\$1,341,870	\$177,885	\$147,750	\$358,428	<b>\$8,859,651</b>
	<b>Charleston, SC</b>	\$1,936,750	\$6,969,943	\$5,322,643	\$5,863,685	\$9,021,591	\$4,251,464	<b>\$33,366,076</b>
	<b>Cincinnati, OH</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$138,460	<b>\$138,460</b>
	<b>Columbia-Willamette River System</b>							
	Kalama, WA	\$0	\$0	\$935,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$935,400
	Longview, WA	\$0	\$0	\$96,000	\$0	\$0	\$262,500	\$358,500
	Portland, OR	\$623,000	\$1,185,000	\$1,065,126	\$3,047,359	\$0	\$281,763	\$6,202,248
	Vancouver, WA	\$90,000	\$8,598	\$507,771	\$0	\$0	\$359,050	\$965,419
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$713,000</b>	<b>\$1,193,598</b>	<b>\$2,604,297</b>	<b>\$3,047,359</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$903,313</b>	<b>\$8,461,567</b>
	<b>Corpus Christi, TX</b>	\$2,273,277	\$5,176,281	\$10,929,340	\$0	\$8,807,225	\$3,409,475	<b>\$30,595,598</b>
	<b>Hampton Roads, VA</b>	\$5,902,730	\$10,219,160	\$2,652,461	\$0	\$3,549,712	\$3,927,683	<b>\$26,251,746</b>
	<b>Huntington, WV</b>	\$1,427,000	\$175,000	\$865,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$2,467,500</b>
	<b>Jacksonville, FL</b>	\$805,000	\$1,364,252	\$2,247,214	\$2,656,000	\$3,739,084	\$5,888,464	<b>\$16,700,014</b>
	<b>Lake Charles, LA</b>	\$1,025,757	\$13,467,015	\$7,702,640	\$1,050,000	\$2,716,908	\$2,667,305	<b>\$28,629,625</b>
	<b>Louisville, KY</b>	\$0	\$0	\$64,578	\$537,761	\$334,737	\$428,249	<b>\$1,365,325</b>
	<b>Memphis, TN</b>	\$200,000	\$639,655	\$799,260	\$6,564,498	\$0	\$959,888	<b>\$9,163,301</b>
	<b>Mobile, AL</b>	\$0	\$948,000	\$1,738,321	\$0	\$260,217	\$3,268,967	<b>\$6,215,505</b>
	<b>Pittsburgh, PA</b>	\$175,000	\$30,000	\$146,478	\$188,083	\$111,379	\$2,699,639	<b>\$3,350,579</b>
	<b>Savannah, GA</b>	\$2,305,400	\$2,629,643	\$4,586,061	\$20,750	\$17,550	\$3,914,120	<b>\$13,473,524</b>
	<b>Southern Tip of Lake Michigan</b>							
	Burns Harbor, IN	\$0	\$0	\$133,760	\$0	\$284,526	\$27,166	\$445,452
	Chicago, IL	\$0	\$297,250	\$1,652,200	\$0	\$11,496,456	\$6,967,777	\$20,413,683
	Gary, IN	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Indiana Harbor, IN	\$0	\$0	\$220,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$220,000
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$297,250</b>	<b>\$2,005,960</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$11,780,982</b>	<b>\$6,994,943</b>	<b>\$21,079,135</b>
	<b>St. Louis, MO</b>	\$0	\$0	\$72,313	\$0	\$150,000	\$459,625	<b>\$681,938</b>
III	<b>Albany, NY</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$624,750	\$351,000	<b>\$975,750</b>
	<b>Anchorage, AK</b>	\$458,200	\$301,819	\$0	\$56,100	\$0	\$969,429	<b>\$1,785,548</b>
	<b>Apra Harbor, GU</b>	\$0	\$518,900	\$280,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$799,100</b>
	<b>Brownsville, TX</b>	\$0	\$55,500	\$435,400	\$0	\$0	\$3,610,950	<b>\$4,101,850</b>
	<b>Buffalo, NY</b>	\$0	\$0	\$650,000	\$0	\$0	\$220,456	<b>\$870,456</b>
	<b>Chattanooga, TN</b>	\$0	\$0	\$112,945	\$0	\$0	\$523,538	<b>\$636,483</b>
	<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	\$0	\$400,000	\$1,065,825	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$1,465,825</b>
	<b>Detroit, MI</b>	\$135,000	\$248,000	\$1,152,018	\$0	\$1,024,815	\$2,139,540	<b>\$4,699,373</b>
	<b>Duluth-Superior, MN/WI</b>	\$0	\$0	\$400,600	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	<b>\$425,600</b>
	<b>Freeport, TX</b>	\$85,000	\$2,126,300	\$963,500	\$2,657,000	\$1,200,098	\$2,623,709	<b>\$9,655,607</b>

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

Tier	Port Area	FY02 Award (Round 1)	FY03 Award (Round 2 & UASI)	FY04 Award (Rounds 3&4)	FY05 Award (Round 5)	FY06 Award (Round 6)	FY07 Award (Round 7)	FY02-07 Award Total
	Green Bay, WI	\$0	\$0	\$51,725	\$0	\$222,380	\$369,158	\$643,263
	Greenville, MS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Gulfport, MS	\$0	\$184,194	\$831,740	\$0	\$2,500,000	\$0	\$3,515,934
	Guntersville, AL	\$0	\$10,913	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,913
	Helena, AR	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Honolulu, HI	\$775,000	\$5,010,194	\$4,539,091	\$0	\$1,070,290	\$1,616,527	\$13,011,102
	Kansas City, MO	\$0	\$0	\$221,540	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$221,540
	<b>Long Island Sound</b>							
	Bridgeport, CT	\$0	\$282,736	\$3,191,090	\$1,378,000	\$24,968	\$869,181	\$5,745,975
	New Haven, CT	\$200,000	\$1,505,675	\$592,089	\$0	\$0	\$45,703	\$2,343,467
	New London, CT	\$96,636	\$17,500	\$200,000	\$0	\$637,500	\$296,250	\$1,247,886
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$296,636</b>	<b>\$1,805,911</b>	<b>\$3,983,179</b>	<b>\$1,378,000</b>	<b>\$662,468</b>	<b>\$1,211,134</b>	<b>\$9,337,328</b>
	Matagorda, TX	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Miami, FL	\$6,419,958	\$14,461,206	\$2,683,343	\$3,373,260	\$2,250,000	\$54,350	\$29,242,117
	Milwaukee, WI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$397,422	\$0	\$82,500	\$479,922
	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	\$0	\$0	\$412,500	\$0	\$2,218,650	\$1,699,785	\$4,330,935
	Morehead City, NC	\$125,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,500	\$144,500
	Mount Vernon, IN	\$0	\$16,800	\$0	\$0	\$931,518	\$0	\$948,318
	Nashville, TN	\$0	\$0	\$169,108	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$169,108
	Palm Beach, FL	\$0	\$261,072	\$555,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$2,316,072
	Panama City, FL	\$0	\$0	\$46,847	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$46,847
	Pascagoula, MS	\$0	\$521,250	\$866,000	\$0	\$0	\$408,750	\$1,796,000
	Pensacola, FL	\$0	\$0	\$527,107	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$527,107
	Ponce, PR	\$0	\$125,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$384,944	\$509,944
	Port Canaveral, FL	\$1,650,000	\$535,000	\$1,465,284	\$0	\$0	\$2,893,431	\$6,543,715
	Port Everglades, FL	\$0	\$1,064,059	\$0	\$600,316	\$1,455,125	\$270,000	\$3,389,500
	Port Fourchon/LOOP, LA	\$0	\$1,773,934	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,363,325	\$4,137,259
	Port Hueneme, CA	\$0	\$0	\$77,400	0	\$0	\$0	\$77,400
	Portland, ME	\$175,000	\$1,296,000	\$1,021,200	\$1,130,000	\$768,750	\$930,000	\$5,320,950
	Portsmouth, NH	\$200,000	\$0	\$1,449,000	\$0	\$1,180,536	\$111,302	\$2,940,838
	Providence, RI	\$261,500	\$389,000	\$1,956,600	\$1,896,612	\$0	\$482,091	\$4,985,803
	San Diego, CA	\$2,233,000	\$1,435,750	\$3,766,646	\$6,495,819	\$139,837	\$731,250	\$14,802,302
	San Juan, PR	\$3,000,000	\$490,000	\$3,720,032	\$0	\$0	\$4,787,161	\$11,997,193
	<b>Tampa Bay</b>							
	Port Manatee, FL	\$0	\$2,280,246	\$533,374	\$0	\$37,890	\$355,821	\$3,207,331
	Tampa, FL	\$3,500,000	\$4,000,000	\$2,422,936	\$1,676,770	\$0	\$475,783	\$12,075,489
	<b>Regional Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$3,500,000</b>	<b>\$6,280,246</b>	<b>\$2,956,310</b>	<b>\$1,676,770</b>	<b>\$37,890</b>	<b>\$831,604</b>	<b>\$15,282,820</b>
	Toledo, OH	\$0	\$202,000	\$1,319,527	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,521,527
	Tulsa, OK	\$0	\$725,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$725,000



## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

Tier	Port Area	FY02 Award (Round 1)	FY03 Award (Round 2 & UASI)	FY04 Award (Rounds 3&4)	FY05 Award (Round 5)	FY06 Award (Round 6)	FY07 Award (Round 7)	FY02-07 Award Total
	Two Harbors, MN	\$0	\$0	\$117,488	\$0	\$248,538	\$0	\$366,026
	Valdez, AK	\$764,000	\$763,500	\$278,870	\$567,400	\$209,540	\$0	\$2,583,310
	Vicksburg, MS	\$0	\$0	\$550,000	\$0	\$0	\$55,219	\$605,219
	Victoria, TX	\$0	\$344,080	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$344,080
	Wilmington, NC	\$125,000	\$4,870,000	\$3,725,614	\$336,857	\$0	\$416,799	\$9,474,270
IV	Beaufort County, SC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$55,785	\$55,785
	Benicia, CA	\$0	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$659,625	\$679,625
	Brunswick, GA	\$0	\$0	\$260,500	\$0	\$0	\$286,388	\$546,888
	Crockett, CA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$167,357	\$167,357
	Decatur, AL	\$0	\$0	\$7,658	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$22,658
	Dumfries, VA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$67,994	\$67,994
	Dutch Harbor, AK	\$0	\$0	\$160,000	\$0	\$0	\$117,500	\$277,500
	Erie, PA	\$0	\$0	\$188,000	\$0	\$0	\$242,205	\$430,205
	Gloucester, MA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$705,999	\$705,999
	Grand Haven, MI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$125,623	\$125,623
	Grays Harbor, WA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$313,342	\$313,342
	Harlingen, TX	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$111,263	\$111,263
	Hilo, HI	\$0	\$119,575	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	\$23,172	\$212,747
	Houma, LA	\$0	\$0	\$520,556	\$0	\$0	\$23,172	\$543,728
	Juneau, AK	\$0	\$951,265	\$283,000	\$0	\$0	\$219,000	\$1,453,265
	Kahului, HI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$23,172	\$23,172
	Marietta, OH	\$0	\$0	\$74,700	\$0	\$0	\$22,945	\$97,645
	Marysville, MI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$75,000
	Morgan City, LA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,290	\$70,290
	Mulga, AL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24,675	\$24,675
	Nawiliwili, HI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$23,172	\$23,172
	New Bedford, MA	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$918,256	\$968,256
	New Martinsville, WV	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$135,000	\$135,000
	Newell, WV	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,750	\$8,750
	Ogdensburg, NY	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$221,685	\$221,685
	Oswego, NY	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,883	\$9,883
	Quincy, MA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,600	\$8,600
	Quonset Point, RI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,803	\$27,803
	Redwood City, CA	\$0	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$181,527	\$256,527
	Rodeo, CA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$625,000	\$625,000
	Sault Ste. Marie, MI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$232,500	\$232,500
	Searsport, ME	\$0	\$374,400	\$110,000	\$0	\$0	\$88,132	\$572,532
Seward, AK	\$0	\$437,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$452,000	
US Virgin Islands	\$0	\$0	\$785,200	\$0	\$0	\$1,688,979	\$2,474,179	
Whittier, AK	\$0	\$145,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,263	\$181,263	

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

---

Tier	Port Area	FY02 Award (Round 1)	FY03 Award (Round 2 & UASI)	FY04 Award (Rounds 3&4)	FY05 Award (Round 5)	FY06 Award (Round 6)	FY07 Award (Round 7)	FY02-07 Award Total
	Woods Hole, MA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$48,975	\$48,975
	Wrangell, AK	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$275,000
	Yellow Creek, MS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$23,750	\$23,750
	Other Port Areas	\$10,146,751	\$23,612,821	\$40,504,565	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$74,264,137
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$93,873,748</b>	<b>\$243,924,136</b>	<b>\$228,355,122</b>	<b>\$141,969,968</b>	<b>\$168,052,500</b>	<b>\$202,269,793</b>	<b>\$1,078,445,267</b>

**Intercity Bus Security Grant Program Awards**

**Intercity Bus Security Grant Program  
Awards**

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

---

### Intercity Bus Security Grant Program FY03-FY07 Award Comparison by Bus Company

Grantee	Total FY03-FY07	FY 06	FY07
Academy	\$2,211,147	\$136,476	\$854,575
Greyhound	\$24,537,388	\$5,105,000	\$3,283,584
Peter Pan	\$2,154,609	\$261,250	\$174,234
All Others	\$31,622,533	\$4,000,274	\$7,327,607
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$60,525,677</b>	<b>\$9,503,000</b>	<b>\$11,640,000</b>

For the first time, FY 2007 Intercity Bus Security Grant Program (IBSGP) applicants were divided into two tiers. Eligibility for Tier I (highest risk) and Tier II grant awards was predicated on a systematic analysis of fleet size and service to UASI jurisdictions. In FY 2007, bus companies with fleets of more than 250 over-the-road buses qualified for Tier I. Six bus companies, **Academy Express, Greyhound, Peter Pan, Coach American, Coach USA** and **Trailways**, chose to apply under Tier I and were approved by DHS as Tier I entities. Of the six applicants, Academy Express, Greyhound and Peter Pan had received funding as single entities since 2003. Components of the other three companies, Coach America, Coach USA and Trailways, received funding in the past but not as single entities.

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

### Intercity Bus Security Grant Program FY 2007 Awards and Funding History

Grantee	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	Total FY03-FY07
A.C. Coach Operations Inc., dba Anderson Coach and Travel	\$161,792	\$0	\$0	\$15,569	\$18,922	\$196,283
ABA - American Bus Association, Inc.	\$773,614	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$773,614
ABA - UMA Joint Venture	\$0	\$920,364	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$920,364
Academy Express, LLC.	\$582,386	\$370,431	\$267,279	\$136,476	\$854,575	\$2,211,147
Adirondack Transit Lines, Inc.	\$0	\$339,657	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$339,657
Allen AME Transportation	\$0	\$20,588	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,588
Amador Stage Lines Inc., dba Sierra Trailways of California	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$158,500	\$0	\$158,500
American Coach	\$0	\$59,711	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$59,711
American Coach Lines of Jacksonville, Inc.	\$0	\$23,765	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$23,765
American Coach Lines, Inc.	\$265,003	\$25,560	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$290,563
American Tours Inc. (Coach USA - South Central Region)	\$123,375	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$123,375
Antelope Valley Bus, Inc.	\$25,473	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,473
Atlantic Express Coachways	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$178,905	\$0	\$178,905
Bloom's Bus Lines, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,592	\$25,592
Blue Star Charters & Tours, Inc.	\$9,900	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,900
Boise-Winnemucca Stages, Inc.	\$15,748	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,748
Bonanza Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$22,500	\$0	\$0	\$22,500
Burlington Stage Lines, Ltd., dba Burlington Trailways	\$172,815	\$0	\$117,254	\$93,500	\$0	\$383,569
Busco, Inc., dba Arrow Stage Lines	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$34,944	\$298,406	\$333,350
Cape Transit Corp. (Coach USA)	\$27,164	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,164
Capital Bus Lines, Inc., dba Capitol Bus Tours	\$12,840	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,840
Capitol Bus Company, dba Capitol Trailways	\$120,738	\$132,076	\$98,275	\$0	\$0	\$351,089
Carl R. Bieber, Inc.	\$0	\$138,776	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$138,776
Carolina Coach Company, dba Carolina Trailways	\$241,731	\$80,427	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$322,158
Celebrity Coaches of America, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$175,293	\$175,293
Central Texas Trails, Inc.	\$0	\$29,415	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$29,415
Chenango Valley Bus	\$12,908	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,908
City of McAllen	\$0	\$36,850	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,850
Coach America*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$550,443	\$550,443
Coach USA*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,641,671	\$1,641,671
Coach USA, Inc.	\$0	\$1,261,400	\$0	\$592,500	\$0	\$1,853,900
Coach USA, Inc. (Northeast Region)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$630,191	\$0	\$630,191
Community Coach (Coach USA)	\$15,891	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,891
Concord Coach Lines, Inc.	\$73,182	\$40,508	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$113,690
Cougar Bus Lines, Ltd.	\$0	\$10,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,500
Cowtown Bus Charters, Inc.	\$0	\$18,208	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,208
CUSA AT, LLC., dba Americoach Tours	\$0	\$19,773	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,773
CUSA AWC, LLC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$42,642	\$42,642
CUSA BCCA, LLC., dba Black Hawk Central City Ace Express	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$69,670	\$0	\$69,670

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

Grantee	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	Total FY03-FY07
CUSA EE, LLC., dba El Expreso	\$0	\$0	\$61,725	\$0	\$0	\$61,725
CUSA FL, LLC., dba Franciscan Lines	\$0	\$65,232	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$65,232
CUSA GCBS, LLC.	\$0	\$0	\$68,612	\$0	\$0	\$68,612
CUSA GCT, LLC., dba Gulf Coast Transportation	\$0	\$0	\$107,153	\$0	\$0	\$107,153
CUSA KBC, LLC., dba Kerrville Bus Company	\$593,659	\$0	\$21,752	\$109,503	\$0	\$724,914
CUSA K-TCS, LLC., dba K-T Contract Services	\$95,868	\$34,931	\$18,175	\$0	\$0	\$148,974
DATTCO, Inc.	\$0	\$103,486	\$0	\$0	\$129,892	\$233,378
David Thomas Tours, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,758	\$0	\$20,758
Dillion's Bus Service, Inc. (Coach USA)	\$135,950	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$135,950
Donna Kay Brooks, dba Three Rivers Travel	\$0	\$39,462	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$39,462
Double A Charter, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$14,163	\$14,163
El Expreso Bus Company (Coach USA - South Central Region)	\$146,540	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$146,540
Escot Bus Lines, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,740	\$0	\$12,740
Evergreen Trails, Inc.	\$0	\$212,139	\$0	\$146,442	\$0	\$358,581
Excellent Adventures, Inc.	\$0	\$15,292	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,292
Eyre Bus Service, Inc.	\$202,532	\$0	\$0	\$160,669	\$0	\$363,201
First Class Coach Company, Inc.	\$0	\$68,625	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$68,625
First Priority Tours, Inc.	\$0	\$42,075	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$42,075
Frank Martz Coach Co., Inc., dba Martz Trailways	\$60,235	\$0	\$131,300	\$0	\$0	\$191,535
Fun Time Tours (Coach USA - South Central Region)	\$29,863	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$29,863
G & L Transit, Inc.	\$0	\$21,283	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,283
Gold Line, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$193,500	\$0	\$193,500
Golden State Coaches, dba Frontier Tours	\$224,923	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$224,923
Gotta Go Express Trailways, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$152,000	\$0	\$152,000
Great Lakes Motorcoach, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,547	\$0	\$8,547
Greyhound Lines, Inc.	\$9,074,355	\$1,603,084	\$5,471,365	\$5,105,000	\$3,283,584	\$24,537,388
Grovesnor Bus Lines, Inc. (Coach USA)	\$76,004	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$76,004
Gulf Coast Transportation Company (Coach USA)	\$378,315	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$378,315
Gunther Charters, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,227	\$44,167	\$61,394
H & L Charter Co., Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,214	\$26,214
Hagey Coach, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$119,763	\$119,763
Hampton Jitney, Inc.	\$47,905	\$36,050	\$46,908	\$0	\$0	\$130,863
Haymarket Transportation, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$61,150	\$61,150
HME Executive Coach, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$28,840	\$28,840
Hotard Coaches, Inc.	\$0	\$203,772	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$203,772
Hudson Transit (Coach USA)	\$56,026	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$56,026
Indian Trails, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$180,346	\$180,346
Industrial Bus Lines	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$123,427	\$123,427
International Bus Service, Inc. (Coach USA)	\$22,319	\$0	\$491,795	\$0	\$0	\$514,114
J&R Tours	\$96,317	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$96,317
Jalbert Leasing, Inc., dba C&J Trailways	\$0	\$84,623	\$0	\$0	\$64,216	\$148,839
James River Bus Lines	\$0	\$83,094	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$83,094
Jefferson Partners, LP, dba Jefferson Lines	\$335,102	\$0	\$353,439	\$0	\$0	\$688,541
Keeshin Charter Service, Inc. (Coach USA)	\$51,278	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$51,278

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

Grantee	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	Total FY03-FY07
Keller Transportation, Inc.	\$0	\$9,693	\$0	\$0	\$77,877	\$87,570
Lakefront Lines, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$249,492	\$0	\$0	\$249,492
Lakeland Bus Lines, Inc.	\$185,406	\$0	\$88,610	\$0	\$59,776	\$333,792
Lamiolle Valley Transportation, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24,360	\$76,530	\$100,890
Lancaster Tours, Inc.	\$22,423	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,423
Leisure Line (Coach USA)	\$42,572	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$42,572
Leprechaun Lines, Inc.	\$0	\$38,803	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$38,803
Lion Corporation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$101,000	\$0	\$101,000
M and L Transit Systems, Inc.	\$0	\$142,637	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$142,637
MCT Charter Tours, Inc.	\$0	\$20,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,600
MGR Travel, Ltd., dba Elite Coach	\$0	\$33,759	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$33,759
Miller Transportation, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$214,750	\$0	\$214,750
Monroe Bus Corporation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$178,559	\$97,843	\$276,402
Monsey New Square Trails Corp.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$263,767	\$263,767
National Coach Works, Inc. of Virginia	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$226,000	\$0	\$226,000
New Jersey Transit Corporation	\$1,342,223	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,342,223
Northwest Iowa Transportation, Inc.	\$0	\$25,682	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,682
Northwest Motorcoach Association	\$0	\$61,955	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$61,955
O'Hare Wisconsin Limousine Service, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$46,500	\$0	\$46,500
Olympia Trails Bus Company, Inc. (Coach USA)	\$33,032	\$0	\$494,945	\$0	\$0	\$527,977
Orange Belt Stages	\$31,205	\$0	\$0	\$3,000	\$0	\$34,205
P & S Transportation, Inc. (Coach USA)	\$141,580	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$141,580
Pacific Coachways Charter Services, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$127,000	\$0	\$127,000
Passaic Valley Coach Lines	\$0	\$26,237	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,237
Peter Pan Bus Lines, Inc.	\$1,173,875	\$402,750	\$142,500	\$261,250	\$174,234	\$2,154,609
Plymouth & Brockton Street Railway	\$0	\$0	\$140,949	\$0	\$0	\$140,949
Post Road Stages, Inc.	\$0	\$26,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,200
Premier Coach Company, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$81,855	\$0	\$81,855
Private One of New York LLC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$116,508	\$116,508
Project Exploration, Inc., dba American Explorer Motorcoach	\$99,950	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$99,950
Ramblin Express, Inc.	\$0	\$43,484	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$43,484
Raz Transportation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$88,076	\$88,076
Ready Bus Line Company	\$0	\$48,993	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$48,993
Red & Tan Tours (Coach USA)	\$40,155	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,155
Riteway Bus Service, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$252,637	\$254,300	\$506,937
Rockland Coaches (Coach USA)	\$29,461	\$0	\$305,939	\$0	\$0	\$335,400
Ryan's Express Transportation Services, Inc.	\$0	\$304,915	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$304,915
Sam Van Galder Bus Company (Coach USA)	\$74,535	\$0	\$112,500	\$0	\$0	\$187,035
Schoolman Transportation System, Inc.	\$0	\$47,795	\$0	\$0	\$164,461	\$212,256
September Winds Motor Coach, Inc.	\$11,250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,250
Silver State Coach, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,251	\$0	\$32,251
Sodrel Truck Lines, Inc., dba Free Enterprise System	\$0	\$143,775	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$143,775
Southeastern Stages, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$80,271	\$80,271
Southeastern Trailways, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$45,000	\$0	\$45,000

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

Grantee	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	Total FY03-FY07
Southern Coach Company	\$324,860	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$301,901	\$626,761
Southern Tier Stages, Inc.	\$0	\$60,186	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,186
Southwestern Coaches, dba Arrow Trailways of Texas	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$15,000
Spirit Tours, LLC.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,109	\$0	\$7,109
Star Shuttle and Tour, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50,088	\$191,370	\$241,458
Starr Transit Company, Inc.	\$0	\$86,457	\$0	\$0	\$66,585	\$153,042
Storer Transportation Service	\$44,434	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$44,434
Suburban Transit Corp. (Coach USA)	\$77,589	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$77,589
Sun Coach Lines LLC / David Sunstein	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$63,000	\$63,000
Sunrise Coach Lines, Inc.	\$15,000	\$12,041	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,041
The Branson Corporation dba Brewster Charters	\$33,158	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$33,158
Time Lines, LLC		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,126	\$30,126
TNM&O Coaches, Inc.	\$380,183	\$196,867	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$577,050
Tonche Transit, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$57,115	\$57,115
Trailways*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,654,830	\$1,654,830
Trailways Transportation System, Inc.	\$0	\$1,535,111	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,535,111
Trans-Bridge Lines, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$466,611	\$0	\$97,439	\$564,050
Travel Lynx of Brevard, Inc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,685	\$40,685
Tri-state Coach Lines (Coach USA)	\$37,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$37,000
Turner Coaches, Inc.	\$76,813	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$76,813
UMA - United Motorcoach Association	\$841,330	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$841,330
Valley Transit Company, Inc.	\$152,226	\$236,529	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$388,755
Vermont Transit Company, Inc.	\$217,542	\$279,906	\$125,000	\$0	\$0	\$622,448
Wickiser International Companies, Inc.	\$10,659	\$0	\$123,060	\$0	\$0	\$133,719
Windstar Lines Inc.	\$53,457	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$53,457
Wisconsin Coach Lines Group (Coach USA)	\$46,338	\$0	\$130,000	\$0	\$0	\$176,338
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$19,800,007</b>	<b>\$9,925,532</b>	<b>\$9,657,138</b>	<b>\$9,503,000</b>	<b>\$11,640,000</b>	<b>\$60,525,677</b>

FY 2007 Tier I Grantees

\*Grantee's application represents multiple bus companies to qualify for Tier I. No legacy comparison available.



**Trucking Security Grant Program Awards**

**Trucking Security Grant Program Awards**

## **FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program**

---

### **Trucking Security Program FY 2007 Award and Funding History**

<b>Grantee</b>	<b>Total FY03-FY07</b>	<b>FY06</b>	<b>FY07</b>
American Trucking Associations	\$62,350,069	\$4,801,500	\$11,640,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$62,350,069</b>	<b>\$4,801,500</b>	<b>\$11,640,000</b>

**Buffer Zone Protection Program Awards**

**Buffer Zone Protection Program Awards**

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

### Buffer Zone Protection Program FY 2007 Awards and Funding History by State

States / Territories	Total FY05-07	FY06*	FY07
Alabama	\$2,548,000	\$378,000	\$770,000
Alaska	\$1,739,000	\$1,189,000	\$0
American Samoa	\$0	\$0	\$0
Arizona	\$4,244,500	\$567,000	\$2,077,500
Arkansas	\$1,655,500	\$378,000	\$577,500
California	\$23,480,000	\$5,835,000	\$4,695,000
Colorado	\$1,639,000	\$189,000	\$0
Connecticut	\$1,231,500	\$189,000	\$192,500
Delaware	\$781,500	\$189,000	\$192,500
District of Columbia	\$3,267,000	\$567,000	\$1,500,000
Federated States of Mirconesia	\$0	\$0	\$0
Florida	\$8,861,000	\$1,701,000	\$2,310,000
Georgia	\$3,852,133	\$567,000	\$962,500
Guam	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hawaii	\$824,000	\$189,000	\$385,000
Idaho	\$874,000	\$189,000	\$385,000
Illinois	\$7,967,120	\$2,079,000	\$1,540,000
Indiana	\$3,364,500	\$567,000	\$1,347,500
Iowa	\$902,112	\$189,000	\$192,500
Kansas	\$1,763,000	\$378,000	\$385,000
Kentucky	\$3,359,609	\$567,000	\$962,500
Louisiana	\$7,858,779	\$2,268,000	\$3,080,000
Maine	\$585,611	\$189,000	\$192,500
Marshall Islands	\$0	\$0	\$0
Maryland	\$4,726,000	\$756,000	\$770,000
Massachusetts	\$3,761,500	\$2,134,000	\$577,500
Michigan	\$4,844,636	\$1,945,000	\$1,155,000
Minnesota	\$2,928,585	\$567,000	\$962,500
Mississippi	\$981,500	\$189,000	\$192,500
Missouri	\$4,358,211	\$756,000	\$1,155,000
Montana	\$681,500	\$189,000	\$192,500
Nebraska	\$1,174,000	\$189,000	\$385,000
Nevada	\$2,524,000	\$1,189,000	\$385,000
New Hampshire	\$1,074,000	\$189,000	\$385,000
New Jersey	\$5,783,219	\$1,512,000	\$1,540,000
New Mexico	\$589,000	\$189,000	\$0
New York	\$16,796,775	\$6,591,000	\$4,425,000
North Carolina	\$3,298,000	\$378,000	\$770,000
North Dakota	\$800,000	\$500,000	\$0
Northern Mariana Islands	\$50,000	\$0	\$0
Ohio	\$6,884,609	\$1,323,000	\$2,310,000

## FY 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program

---

States / Territories	Total FY05-07	FY06*	FY07
Oklahoma	\$1,674,000	\$189,000	\$385,000
Oregon	\$1,033,481	\$189,000	\$192,500
Pennsylvania	\$6,311,000	\$1,756,000	\$1,655,000
Puerto Rico	\$631,500	\$189,000	\$192,500
Rhode Island	\$1,331,500	\$189,000	\$692,500
South Carolina	\$2,626,000	\$756,000	\$770,000
South Dakota	\$650,000	\$500,000	\$0
Tennessee	\$5,492,500	\$945,000	\$1,847,500
Texas	\$11,628,000	\$2,268,000	\$2,810,000
Utah	\$1,987,159	\$378,000	\$577,500
Vermont	\$539,000	\$189,000	\$0
Virginia	\$3,803,648	\$945,000	\$770,000
Virgin Islands	\$389,000	\$189,000	\$0
Washington	\$4,683,500	\$1,756,000	\$577,500
West Virginia	\$889,000	\$189,000	\$500,000
Wisconsin	\$1,626,606	\$189,000	\$385,000
Wyoming	\$431,500	\$189,000	\$192,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$187,780,793</b>	<b>\$47,965,000</b>	<b>\$48,500,000</b>

\* FY06 included a one-time Chemical Buffer Zone Protection Program (\$25,000,000).