
STATEMENT OF J. RICHARD BERMAN
ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AUDITS
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS,
SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY
U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
APRIL 12, 2005



Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to be here today to discuss our work on the Department of Homeland Security's (the Department's) first responder grant programs. My remarks will focus on our March 2004 report entitled, "Distributing and Spending "First Responder" Grant Funds," and the actions taken by the Department's Office for Domestic Preparedness (ODP), and its Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness (SLGCP), of which the ODP is now a part, to resolve recommendations made in that report. Our audit covered funds awarded under the FY 2002 State Domestic Preparedness Program (SDPP), the FY 2003 State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP), and the FY 2003 SHSGP Part II.

Generally, we found that states, local jurisdictions, and first responder organizations had been slow to receive and spend ODP first responder grant funds. For example, as of February 2004, of the \$882 million in FY 2002 SDPP and FY 2003 SHGP funds awarded by the ODP, 79% still remained in the U.S. Treasury. Because our report is a year old, we have updated a table showing more current draw down information and attached it to this statement as Attachment 1. As of April 2005, only 29% of the \$882 million has not been drawn down.

We identified numerous reasons for the delayed spending. In some instances, states and local jurisdictions had delayed spending funds pending the completion of state-wide risk assessments and homeland security strategies and the development of detailed spending plans. We also identified numerous other reasons for delayed spending -- some unavoidable but others that could be mitigated. For example, many states and jurisdictions complained of unclear federal guidance, inadequate staffing resulting from the economic downturn and budget shortages, and, in some instances, equipment backorders caused by the same equipment being purchased by our military.

Expenditures do not tell the whole story, however. We also found that while only a small percentage of the funds had been drawn down, much of the remainder had been committed or obligated. In addition, these are reimbursement programs, and some states and jurisdictions had already purchased equipment but had not yet requested reimbursement under the grants.

SLGCP responded positively to our report and agreed with most of our recommendations. In addition, the Department has made considerable progress in responding to state and local government officials' calls for the establishment of a "one-stop-shop" that would consolidate the various preparedness grants into a single, comprehensive program. The Department also created the Task Force on State and Local Homeland Security Funding. The Task Force report, published in June 2004, mirrored many of the findings of our audit. Further, the GAO published a report in

February 2005, *HOMELAND SECURITY – Management of First Responder Grant Programs Has Improved, but Challenges Remain*, that documents the Department’s progress in many of the areas identified in our report.

Following are the major findings and recommendations we made along with the status of the Department’s actions to address them.

Delayed Spending of Grant Funds

We found that state and local government administrative practices often delayed their spending of grant funds. Often, the ability of states and localities to spend grant funds expeditiously was complicated by the need to adhere to state and local legal and procurement requirements and approval processes.

We recommended that the ODP identify and publish best practices that result in faster and more efficient grant processing and spending. For example, identify state procurement practices that result in first responder equipment being supplied in a timely and cost effective manner.

Department efforts are under way to identify and disseminate best practices, including how states and localities manage legal and procurement issues that affect grant distribution. The Department’s Homeland Security Advisory Council Task Force stated in its June 2004 report that some jurisdictions have been “very innovative” in developing mechanisms to support the procurement and delivery of emergency-response-related equipment. The task force recommended that, among other things, the Department should, in coordination with state, county, and other governments, identify, compile, and disseminate best practices to help states address grant management issues. The ODP has established a new Homeland Security Preparedness Technical Assistance Program service to enhance the grant management capabilities of state administrative agencies. Also, the Department established a password protected web site, Lessons Learned Information Sharing, which allows states, local governments, and first responder organizations to share best practices.

Need for More Meaningful Reporting by States

Although only a small percentage of the funds had been drawn down, the amount States’ reported drawing down did not provide a clear picture of states’ actual progress for three reasons. First, some states had obligated and spent substantial amounts but had not yet drawn down the funds. Second, states were inconsistent in how they reported funds as being obligated. Third, 30 of the 56 states and territories reported on a cash basis and did not report obligations at all.

We recommended that the ODP require more meaningful reporting by states so it can track progress more accurately and assist states when necessary. Specifically, we recommended they ensure that the definition of obligation is consistent for both programmatic and financial reporting purposes and require states using a “cash basis” accounting system to report the value of binding agreements to be funded by first

responder grant funds. The Task Force also recommended standardized terminology and real-time tracking capabilities.

The ODP has not changed its reporting requirements for obligations. However, starting in fiscal year 2004 and continuing in fiscal year 2005, states are required to submit Initial Strategy Implementation Plans that show how planned grant expenditures are linked to larger projects, which in turn support specific goals and objectives in the state homeland security strategy. In addition to these plans, the ODP requires states to submit biannual strategy implementation reports showing how the actual expenditure of grant funds is linked to strategy goals and objectives. While these changes should be helpful, we will continue to follow-up with the ODP on implementing our recommendation to report obligations.

Need for Clear Federal Guidance

State and local officials told us that planning efforts were often delayed because first responders and emergency officials did not have clear federal guidance on equipment, training, exercises, and preparedness levels, making it difficult for them to prioritize their needs.

We recommended that the ODP accelerate the development of federal guidelines for first responder capabilities, equipment, training, and exercises.

In responding to our recommendation, ODP's Executive Director said that, in addition to developing a standardized Weapons of Mass Destruction awareness training program, ODP was developing national performance standards for assessing domestic preparedness capabilities and identifying gaps in those capabilities. Homeland Security Presidential Directive-8 called for a new national preparedness goal and performance measures, standards for preparedness assessments and strategies, and a system for assessing the nation's overall preparedness. The Department issued an Interim National Preparedness Goal on April 1, 2005. . The goal is a product of a capabilities-based planning process that led to the identification of core capabilities that the Nation and its states, communities, and citizens need to possess. By mid-April 2005, the Department plans to issue detailed instructions on how communities can use the Goal and a description of how the Goal will be used in the future to manage Federal preparedness assistance. For FY 2006, states and urban areas are to update their Homeland Security Preparedness Strategies to reflect how they will address seven National Priorities in order to receive further Federal preparedness assistance. These priorities include: 1) implement the National Incident Management System and National Response Plan; 2) expanded regional collaboration; 3) implement the Interim National Infrastructure Protection Plan; 4) strengthen information sharing and collaboration capabilities; 5) strengthen interoperable communications capabilities; 6) strengthen capabilities for detection, response, and decontamination of chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or explosive materials; and 7) strengthen medical surge and mass prophylaxis capabilities. For FY 2007, states and urban areas will need to revise their Homeland Security Preparedness Strategies to align with the Final National Preparedness Goal in order to receive further

Federal preparedness assistance. The Department plans to issue the Final National Preparedness Goal and a Target Capabilities List, updated to include the target levels of capabilities, on October 1, 2005.

Need to revise the 45 day Transfer Rule

Fiscal year 2003 appropriation language required states to transfer grant funds within 45 days of the funds being awarded by the ODP. We found no evidence that the 45-day transfer rule sped up spending. States met the requirement by declaring funds obligated once they decided how they would distribute them to jurisdictions. The rule did not get the funds into the hands of the jurisdictions or streamline burdensome administrative processes.

We recommended that the ODP seek a legislative change to revise or eliminate the 45-day transfer rule to allow more time for planning.

The requirement was lengthened to 60 days by the fiscal year 2005 appropriation (House Conference Report 108-774).

Formal Grant Monitoring System Lacking

At the time of our audit, the ODP had not implemented a formal grant monitoring system, and ODP staff had not conducted frequent field visits to monitor grant recipients.

We recommended that the ODP publish program monitoring guidance and ensure that states report their progress in achieving program and performance goals and objectives. We also recommended that the ODP monitor state oversight of local jurisdictions' compliance with grant requirements, and develop performance standards that can be used to measure the overall success of the grant programs, including baselines against which to measure progress.

The ODP updated its grant-monitoring guidance in fiscal year 2004 and established new monitoring goals. According to the guidance, at least one office file review and one on-site visit should be completed for each state each fiscal year. In addition, the requirements for Initial Strategy Implementation Plans and biannual strategy implementation reports, discussed earlier, should improve monitoring. As of September 2004, the ODP had filled 138 staff positions, as compared with 63 filled positions at the end of fiscal year 2003. That should help alleviate the staffing shortages that contributed to ODP's inability to conduct frequent grantee monitoring.

Approved Equipment Lists Change Each Year

The approved equipment list changed each year, generally broadening the selection of equipment permitted. State and jurisdiction officials complained that keeping track of what could be purchased with each grant was confusing and time consuming. We agreed and saw no reason that a single list could not be applied to all years.

We recommended that the ODP allow states to use the most recent ODP-approved equipment list when purchasing equipment with prior-year grant funds.

However, the ODP did not agree with our recommendation, stating that “allowing grantees to use current or future equipment lists that may differ from those provided by ODP in previous years will ultimately have a negative impact upon accounting practices, vendor selection, equipment maintenance, and training and calibration programs managed by ODP grantees.” We will continue to look at this issue as we continue our audits of state and local spending of first responder grant funds.

Consolidation of Preparedness Grants Under SLGCP

The Department has made considerable progress in consolidating grant programs into a one-stop-shop for states and local jurisdictions. In developing and implementing a national program to enhance the capacity of state and local agencies to respond to incidents of terrorism, the Department has integrated numerous distinct, yet related, preparedness grant initiatives and programs into a single program under the auspices of SLGCP. Under the \$2.6 billion Fiscal Year 2005 Homeland Security Grant Program, SLGCP consolidated the application process and administration of six programs: State Homeland Security Program, Urban Areas Security Initiative, Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, Citizen Corps, Emergency Management Performance Grants, and Metropolitan Medical Response System Program Grants. Attachment 2 lists the Department’s major preparedness grant programs, including those still outside SLGCP.

Although SLGCP has program management and monitoring responsibility for grants awarded under the Fiscal Year 2005 Homeland Security Grant Program, it relies upon the Justice Department’s Office of the Comptroller for grant fund distribution and assistance with financial management support. In the Department’s 2004 financial statement audit report, the independent auditors noted that SLGCP management was not actively involved in the financial reporting of its activities and had not obtained a thorough understanding of the control activities over its financial reporting process performed by the Justice Department. As a result, SLGCP lacks assurance that the processing of its financial activities coincides with its business operations, are reported accurately, and controlled properly.

That concludes my prepared remarks, Mr. Chairman. I will be happy to answer any questions you or the members may have.

**Department of Homeland Security
Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness
First Responder Grants FYs 2002 - 2004**

Grants	Awarded (\$4.6B)	Drawn February 2004 (\$342M)	Drawn April 2005 (\$1.7B)	Percent Drawn (37%)
FY 2002 State Domestic Preparedness Program	\$315,841,000	\$114,637,167	\$278,058,077	88%
FY 2003 State Homeland Security Grant Program Part I	\$566,295,000	\$70,721,430	\$350,759,198	62%
FY 2003 State Homeland Security Grant Program Part II	\$1,500,000,000	\$156,409,171	\$759,595,402	51%
FY 2004 Homeland Security Grant Program	\$2,220,000,000	-	\$317,763,857	14%
GRAND TOTAL	\$4,602,136,000	\$341,767,768	\$1,706,176,534	37%

Note: The FY 2004 grant includes funds for State Homeland Security, Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention, and Citizen Corps Programs.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs

State	FY 2002 State Domestic Preparedness Program			
	Awarded (\$316M)	Drawn February 2004 (\$115M)	Drawn April 2005 (\$278M)	Percent Drawn (88%)
Alabama	\$5,317,000	\$2,866,889	3,415,121	64%
Alaska	2,783,000	71,600	2,661,315	96%
American Samoa	828,000	181,808	714,671	86%
Arizona	5,770,000	2,552,407	5,522,838	96%
Arkansas	4,141,000	1,409,372	3,945,997	95%
California	24,831,000	2,519,960	22,365,829	90%
Colorado	5,220,000	528,749	4,893,363	94%
Connecticut	4,626,000	1,245,655	4,227,554	91%
Delaware	2,887,000	0	2,887,000	100%
District of Columbia	2,747,000	2,558,690	2,558,690	93%
Florida	12,967,000	8,702,835	12,967,000	100%
Georgia	7,797,000	942,500	2,393,000	31%
Guam	892,000	753,037	782,786	88%
Hawaii	3,172,000	74,071	1,748,006	55%
Idaho	3,226,000	640,401	2,395,696	74%
Illinois	10,604,000	5,777,509	10,226,949	96%
Indiana	6,400,000	1,151,268	4,833,571	76%
Iowa	4,308,000	3,444,273	4,307,046	100%
Kansas	4,151,000	3,940,345	4,081,006	98%
Kentucky	5,048,000	759,630	4,723,981	94%
Louisiana	5,331,000	686,341	5,330,997	100%
Maine	3,213,000	2,657,172	3,213,000	100%
Maryland	5,881,000	4,244,702	5,881,000	100%
Massachusetts	6,579,000	5,929,733	6,559,646	100%
Michigan	8,958,000	5,875,820	8,841,855	99%
Minnesota	5,631,000	3,014,307	5,473,066	97%
Mississippi	4,255,000	107,619	3,145,484	74%
Missouri	6,079,000	4,225,100	6,051,500	100%
Montana	2,967,000	1,245,902	2,950,859	99%
Nebraska	3,502,000	1,865,113	3,445,584	98%
Nevada	3,693,000	2,874,192	3,498,038	95%
New Hampshire	3,328,000	424,849	2,238,692	67%
New Jersey	7,948,000	0	3,442,939	43%
New Mexico	3,574,000	106,091	3,125,886	87%
New York	14,953,000	0	14,400,000	96%
North Carolina	7,706,000	3,517,086	7,569,851	98%
North Dakota	2,794,000	1,240,166	2,794,000	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	835,000	545,917	631,603	76%
Ohio	9,897,000	5,435,537	9,894,773	100%
Oklahoma	4,656,000	0	1,729,388	37%
Oregon	4,637,000	682,682	3,404,254	73%
Pennsylvania	10,512,000	2,578,458	8,625,437	82%
Puerto Rico	4,894,000	182,426	989,817	20%
Rhode Island	3,063,000	1,170,550	2,371,377	77%
South Carolina	5,028,000	2,539,155	5,025,963	100%
South Dakota	2,868,000	1,362,448	2,868,000	100%
Tennessee	6,140,000	2,026,109	6,137,538	100%
Texas	16,196,000	1,587,327	14,505,713	90%
Utah	3,849,000	2,001,356	3,664,922	95%
Vermont	2,772,000	1,883,177	2,772,000	100%
Virginia	7,062,000	5,560,966	7,062,000	100%
Virgin Islands	861,000	125,923	299,010	35%
Washington	6,276,000	2,527,968	6,274,466	100%
West Virginia	3,567,000	3,567,000	3,567,000	100%
Wisconsin	5,925,000	2,724,977	5,925,000	100%
Wyoming	2,696,000	0	2,696,000	100%
GRAND TOTAL	\$315,841,000	\$114,637,167	\$278,058,077	88%

State	FY 2003 State Homeland Security Grant Program Part I			
	Awarded (\$566M)	Drawn February 2004 (\$71M)	Drawn April 2005 (\$350M)	Percent Drawn (62%)
Alabama	\$9,457,000	\$98,821	1,392,304	15%
Alaska	4,995,000	25,255	1,716,783	34%
American Samoa	1,482,000	0	924,430	62%
Arizona	10,584,000	1,440,515	5,973,784	56%
Arkansas	7,394,000	2,521,666	4,599,720	62%
California	45,023,000	2,966,828	20,219,379	45%
Colorado	9,480,000	0	4,067,980	43%
Connecticut	8,265,000	0	3,189,322	39%
Delaware	5,185,000	0	3,544,671	68%
District of Columbia	4,910,000	0	2,767,903	56%
Florida	23,654,000	2,273,323	14,717,142	62%
Georgia	14,188,000	1,858,500	8,355,600	59%
Guam	1,596,000	75,566	477,945	30%
Hawaii	5,693,000	127,534	1,504,445	26%
Idaho	5,803,000	572,511	4,281,841	74%
Illinois	18,879,000	4,955,513	14,513,986	77%
Indiana	11,399,000	4,859,562	6,844,335	60%
Iowa	7,656,500	58,210	3,752,731	49%
Kansas	7,401,000	252,327	5,022,728	68%
Kentucky	9,001,000	1,655,413	5,679,514	63%
Louisiana	9,451,000	95,686	4,403,442	47%
Maine	5,751,000	1,009,281	2,920,002	51%
Maryland	10,585,000	275,912	7,358,991	70%
Massachusetts	11,711,000	40,803	6,662,261	57%
Michigan	15,918,000	574,941	10,143,155	64%
Minnesota	10,076,000	351,914	6,396,071	63%
Mississippi	7,582,000	724,245	4,372,455	58%
Missouri	10,834,000	1,815,200	8,187,100	76%
Montana	5,303,000	233,966	4,000,972	75%
Nebraska	6,254,500	551,663	5,052,655	81%
Nevada	6,771,000	1,259,919	5,028,183	74%
New Hampshire	5,727,000	334,006	2,851,128	50%
New Jersey	14,222,000	0	3,371,396	24%
New Mexico	6,401,000	73,673	3,268,846	51%
New York	26,492,000	13,000,000	23,400,000	88%
North Carolina	13,908,000	516,434	8,319,525	60%
North Dakota	4,983,000	565,640	3,496,377	70%
Northern Mariana Islands	1,496,000	0	1,221,848	82%
Ohio	17,510,000	2,652,971	14,598,963	83%
Oklahoma	8,304,000	0	3,209,367	39%
Oregon	8,336,000	199,478	3,967,113	48%
Pennsylvania	18,570,000	209,395	11,930,437	64%
Puerto Rico	8,727,000	0	372,770	4%
Rhode Island	5,489,000	1,899,312	2,926,272	53%
South Carolina	9,017,000	276,082	7,221,765	80%
South Dakota	5,131,000	1,011,363	3,476,128	68%
Tennessee	10,978,000	22,742	6,207,870	57%
Texas	29,538,000	1,652,929	25,295,231	86%
Utah	6,937,000	1,190,913	5,400,517	78%
Vermont	4,963,000	1,466,921	3,046,183	61%
Virginia	12,716,000	4,175,589	10,826,160	85%
Virgin Islands	1,542,000	14,173	1,374,337	89%
Washington	11,294,000	6,355,323	9,244,406	82%
West Virginia	6,340,000	1,319,768	6,318,501	100%
Wisconsin	10,565,000	3,109,642	8,967,750	85%
Wyoming	4,827,000	0	2,374,477	49%
GRAND TOTAL	\$566,295,000	\$70,721,430	\$350,759,198	62%

State	FY 2003 State Homeland Security Grant Program Part II			
	Awarded (\$1,500M)	Drawn February 2004 (\$156M)	Drawn April 2005 (\$759M)	Percent Drawn (51%)
Alabama	\$25,049,000	\$1,622,255	8,322,439	33%
Alaska	13,230,000	42,651	5,992,365	45%
American Samoa	3,926,000	214,152	1,287,923	33%
Arizona	28,033,000	1,268,220	14,939,062	53%
Arkansas	19,585,000	3,241,401	10,603,463	54%
California	119,256,000	19,071,957	54,682,765	46%
Colorado	25,111,000	36,388	5,024,511	20%
Connecticut	21,893,000	0	4,004,009	18%
Delaware	13,733,000	0	5,402,463	39%
District of Columbia	13,006,000	1,734,000	4,416,788	34%
Florida	62,655,000	5,871,373	20,782,841	33%
Georgia	37,579,000	2,171,100	18,652,100	50%
Guam	4,226,000	0	516,940	12%
Hawaii	15,079,000	1,144,242	3,046,943	20%
Idaho	15,375,000	890,469	7,984,990	52%
Illinois	50,005,000	0	13,695,463	27%
Indiana	30,194,000	9,763,354	23,326,932	77%
Iowa	20,282,000	267,648	7,375,994	36%
Kansas	19,603,000	18,143	11,165,231	57%
Kentucky	23,838,000	728,915	10,744,098	45%
Louisiana	25,037,000	543,563	12,093,956	48%
Maine	15,232,000	672,150	10,434,854	69%
Maryland	28,037,000	379,785	16,665,648	59%
Massachusetts	31,020,000	3,020,181	17,888,354	58%
Michigan	42,162,000	194,246	12,329,274	29%
Minnesota	26,690,000	494,163	16,031,381	60%
Mississippi	20,083,000	391,420	8,010,850	40%
Missouri	28,697,000	3,092,700	13,957,000	49%
Montana	14,047,000	86,157	10,220,280	73%
Nebraska	16,568,000	1,503,965	12,300,789	74%
Nevada	17,935,000	845,534	14,437,350	80%
New Hampshire	15,172,000	61,911	8,488,729	56%
New Jersey	37,671,000	2,318,265	10,142,511	27%
New Mexico	16,956,000	0	4,055,589	24%
New York	70,172,000	60,000,000	63,000,000	90%
North Carolina	36,840,000	250,620	17,575,785	48%
North Dakota	13,200,000	148,962	7,688,381	58%
Northern Mariana Islands	3,963,000	0	1,006,511	25%
Ohio	46,378,000	1,500,277	28,437,748	61%
Oklahoma	21,996,000	183,362	3,189,827	15%
Oregon	22,081,000	675,958	11,729,706	53%
Pennsylvania	49,189,000	866,720	18,318,697	37%
Puerto Rico	23,118,000	0	0	0%
Rhode Island	14,540,000	9,285,838	10,647,548	73%
South Carolina	23,882,000	262,375	15,127,185	63%
South Dakota	13,591,000	0	11,230,930	83%
Tennessee	29,080,000	0	8,261,025	28%
Texas	78,238,000	649,310	50,318,015	64%
Utah	18,374,000	3,388,303	13,904,574	76%
Vermont	13,147,000	559,084	8,922,639	68%
Virginia	33,683,000	11,140,543	31,434,282	93%
Virgin Islands	4,085,000	0	3,523,107	86%
Washington	29,917,000	1,211,789	12,773,364	43%
West Virginia	16,792,000	0	12,565,609	75%
Wisconsin	27,985,000	4,595,725	24,491,538	88%
Wyoming	12,784,000	0	6,425,046	50%
GRAND TOTAL	\$1,500,000,000	\$156,409,171	\$759,595,402	51%

State	FY 2004 Homeland Security Program		
	Awarded (\$2.2B)	Drawn April 2005 (\$317M)	Percent Drawn (14%)
Alabama	36,853,000	2,714,470	7%
Alaska	19,465,000	1,558,172	8%
American Samoa	5,776,000	345,872	6%
Arizona	41,243,000	4,516,940	11%
Arkansas	28,815,000	4,907,162	17%
California	175,457,000	6,853,827	4%
Colorado	36,944,000	9,369,112	25%
Connecticut	32,403,000	0	0%
Delaware	20,206,000	36,042	0%
District of Columbia	19,248,000	0	0%
Florida	92,182,000	4,201,648	5%
Georgia	55,288,000	4,462,400	8%
Guam	6,217,000	0	0%
Hawaii	22,186,000	363,684	2%
Idaho	22,621,000	1,648,342	7%
Illinois	73,571,000	20,142,691	27%
Indiana	44,422,000	4,719,597	11%
Iowa	29,841,000	1,863,059	6%
Kansas	28,842,000	765,145	3%
Kentucky	35,073,000	1,086,071	3%
Louisiana	36,836,000	1,334,610	4%
Maine	22,409,000	4,575,818	20%
Maryland	41,251,000	1,158,382	3%
Massachusetts	45,638,500	2,199,964	5%
Michigan	62,032,000	3,944,784	6%
Minnesota	39,267,000	5,347,176	14%
Mississippi	29,547,000	1,829,395	6%
Missouri	42,221,000	10,413,200	25%
Montana	20,668,000	1,075,630	5%
Nebraska	24,376,000	4,234,831	17%
Nevada	26,387,000	3,886,240	15%
New Hampshire	22,321,000	189,655	1%
New Jersey	55,424,000	3,518,168	6%
New Mexico	24,946,000	307,972	1%
New York	103,243,000	88,671,000	86%
North Carolina	54,203,000	88,960	0%
North Dakota	19,421,000	5,753,980	30%
Northern Mariana Islands	5,830,000	0	0%
Ohio	68,235,000	21,261,300	31%
Oklahoma	32,362,000	319,486	1%
Oregon	32,487,000	7,552,711	23%
Pennsylvania	72,370,500	1,055,308	1%
Puerto Rico	34,014,000	0	0%
Rhode Island	21,392,000	1,631,709	8%
South Carolina	35,138,000	1,796,420	5%
South Dakota	19,996,000	4,946,423	25%
Tennessee	42,786,000	1,316,749	3%
Texas	115,110,000	17,806,205	15%
Utah	27,033,000	9,691,504	36%
Vermont	19,342,000	3,912,941	20%
Virginia	49,556,000	14,257,501	29%
Virgin Islands	6,009,000	153,185	3%
Washington	44,015,000	884,477	2%
West Virginia	24,705,000	9,279,040	38%
Wisconsin	41,173,000	13,814,902	34%
Wyoming	18,809,000	0	0%
GRAND TOTAL	\$2,207,206,000	\$317,763,857	14%

MIGRATION OF DHS GRANT PROGRAMS

Administering Office	Program	Appropriation		Migration Year
		FY 2004	FY 2005	
DHS/SLGCP	Homeland Security Grant Program	\$3,195,000,000	\$2,610,000,000	2004
	- Formula-Based Grants/State Homeland Security Grant Program (ODP)	1,700,000,000	1,100,000,000	2004
	- Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Grants (ODP)	500,000,000	400,000,000	2004
	- Citizen Corps (EP&R)	40,000,000	15,000,000	2004
	- High-Threat, High-Density Urban Areas Grants/Urban Areas Security Initiative (ODP)	725,000,000	885,000,000	2005
	- Emergency Management Performance Grants (EP&R)	180,000,000	180,000,000	2005
	- Metropolitan Medical Response System (EP&R)	50,000,000	30,000,000	2005
	Demonstration/Continuing/Competitive Training Grants (ODP)	\$60,000,000	\$55,000,000	2005
	Firefighter Assistance Grants (EP&R)	\$750,000,000	\$715,000,000	2004
	Rail, Freight, and Transit Security Grants	N/A	\$150,000,000	N/A
	Port Security Grants (TSA)	\$125,000,000	\$150,000,000	2005
Intercity Bus Security Grants (TSA)	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	2005	
Trucking Industry Security Grants (TSA)	\$22,000,000	\$5,000,000	2005	
DHS/EP&R	Urban Search and Rescue	\$60,000,000	\$30,000,000	N/A
	National Disaster Medical System	\$34,000,000	\$34,000,000	N/A

Sources: House Report 108-774; House Report 108-280; DHS Fiscal Year 2005 Homeland Security Grant Program - Program Guidelines and Application Kit; and DHS/SLGCP A-133 Audit Supplement, Attachment VI.