

Please let us obtain Real ID compliant driver's licenses. It's too hard to get a passport and I want to be able to travel without any problems.

Francis McLaughlin

While it does not feel warm and fuzzy to comply with Federal regulations, this must be done immediately. Foot dragging has made this a crisis for Alaskans. As we have seen, any innocent traveler may face confrontations by officials, but not having the correct identification will put Alaskans at greater risk.

My passport has been renewed costing me \$110. It would be absurd for the State of Alaska to be remiss because of some peoples' beliefs or objections. Please just get this done.

Thank you for allowing my testimony.

Sincerely,
Rhonda Jeanne

Dear Members,

I will be addressing the information below in my testimony this evening during the committee. I understand that there is limited time, but I would be happy to answer any questions.

Alaska received a REAL ID grant of \$684,804 in 2011 - while under the REAL ID ban passed by the legislature.

I understand that the department argues that the grant was not related to REAL ID, but the 2011 DLSGP application mentions REAL ID seven times in the grant description and says that the money for the grants is appropriated from the federal REAL ID Act.

The attached documents are from the Department of Homeland Security.

Best,

Matt Flanders

Legislative Specialist
Citizens' Council for Health Freedom

Drivers License Security Grant Program Application 2011

The 2011 DLSGP mentions REAL ID SEVEN TIMES in the description of the grant.
(Page 5 Links the DLSGP to REAL ID) (See attached document and text below.)

On September 11, 2001, 18 of the 19 terrorists who committed attacks on the United States had been issued U.S. identification documents, including driver's licenses (DLs).¹ The FY 2011 DLSGP is designed to address a key recommendation of the 9/11 Commission to improve the integrity and security of State-issued DLs and identification cards (IDs). Meeting the minimum requirements of the FY 2011 DLSGP will help States² improve State driver's license and identification card issuance capabilities. In addition, the REAL ID Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-13) and the DHS REAL ID Final Rule published in January 2008 (6 CFR Part 37) are intended to encourage States to work collectively to develop more secure systems to verify an applicant's identity before issuing a driver's license or identification card that can be accepted for official purposes.

States must be in full compliance with the REAL ID Act of 2005 by January 15, 2013 (see Federal Register Volume 76, Number 44 (Monday, March 7, 2011)). This change will give States the time necessary to ensure that driver's licenses and identification cards issued by States meet the security requirements of the REAL ID Act.

The FY 2011 DLSGP provides the fourth round of funding available to all State Driver's License Agencies (SDLAs), also known as State Departments of Motor Vehicles (DMVs) or Motor Vehicle Administrations (MVAs), for FY 2011 DLSGP related projects. Previously, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) awarded \$48,000,000 to 52 States and territories under the FY 2010 DLSGP.

As appropriated under the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112-10) and authorized by Title II of the REAL ID Act of 2005, Division B of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109-13), States are invited to apply for funds under this solicitation. The FY 2011 DLSGP guidance is designed to encourage all States to apply for program funding. States are invited to submit proposals under this grant program that will further secure their DL/ID issuance processes and assist States in meeting the minimum requirements outlined in Federal law and DHS regulations.³ Specifically, DHS encourages States to submit proposals that:

1 DLs include all forms of driver's licenses to include Commercial Driver's Licenses as long as they meet the REAL ID requirements

2 For purposes of the REAL ID Act, "State" is defined at sec. 201(5) as "a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States." This package will refer to all 56 States, the District of Columbia and territories as "States."

3 See Federal Register, Vol. 73, No. 19, Tuesday, January 29, 2008, 6 CFR Part 37, Minimum Standards for Driver's Licenses and Identification Cards Acceptable by Federal Agencies for Official Purposes; Final Rule, pp. 5272-5340



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

FISCAL YEAR 2011

DRIVER'S LICENSE SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM

**GUIDANCE AND APPLICATION KIT
SECTION I – APPLICATION AND REVIEW
INFORMATION**

MAY 2011



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Title of Opportunity: Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP)

Regional Funding Opportunity Number:

Grant Program Name	Opportunity Number
Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP) – Region I	DHS-11-GPD-089-001-01
Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP) – Region II	DHS-11-GPD-089-002-01
Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP) – Region III	DHS-11-GPD-089-003-01
Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP) – Region IV	DHS-11-GPD-089-004-01
Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP) – Region V	DHS-11-GPD-089-005-01
Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP) – Region VI	DHS-11-GPD-089-006-01
Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP) – Region VII	DHS-11-GPD-089-007-01
Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP) – Region VIII	DHS-11-GPD-089-008-01
Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP) – Region IX	DHS-11-GPD-089-009-01
Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP) – Region X	DHS-11-GPD-089-010-01

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 97.089

Federal Agency Name: U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

Announcement Type: Initial

Dates: Completed applications must be submitted **no later than 11:59 p.m. EDT, June 20, 2011.**

Additional Overview Information:

- **Reformatted DLSGP Program Guidance Kit.** Due to continued stakeholder feedback and recommendations, Grant Programs Directorate (GPD) has reformatted its FY 2011 DLSGP Guidance and Application Kit. The Kit is now structured into two separate documents, referred to as *Section I* and *Section II*. While both are important documents for grantees to study and thoroughly familiarize themselves with, *Section I* is intended to help grantees during the application phase of DLSGP, whereas *Section II* is intended to help grantees in understanding the rules and regulations associated with administering federally-funded grant awards.
- **Enhanced Data Collection.** As part of the DHS Performance Management Initiatives, including the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR) Report, FEMA will enhance data collection processes and tools to assess the use and impact of FY 2011 DLSGP grant funds. Grantees will not be asked to provide

additional data, but may be required to modify existing data reporting processes to collect more useful performance information.

CONTENTS

Contents.....	4
Part I. FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION.....	5
Part II. AWARD INFORMATION	7
<i>Cost Match</i>	8
A. Funding Guidelines	8
Part III. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION	13
A. Eligible Applicants	13
B. Governance	13
Part IV. APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION	15
A. Address to Request Application Package	15
B. Content and Form of Application	15
C. Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation Compliance	18
D. Submission Dates and Times	19
Part V. APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION	20
A. Review Criteria	20
B. Review and Selection Process	20
C. Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates	21
D. Intergovernmental Review	21
Part VI. OTHER INFORMATION	22

PART I.

FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

On September 11, 2001, 18 of the 19 terrorists who committed attacks on the United States had been issued U.S. identification documents, including driver's licenses (DLs).¹ The FY 2011 DLSGP is designed to address a key recommendation of the 9/11 Commission to improve the integrity and security of State-issued DLs and identification cards (IDs). Meeting the minimum requirements of the FY 2011 DLSGP will help States² improve State driver's license and identification card issuance capabilities. In addition, the *REAL ID Act of 2005* (Public Law 109-13) and the DHS REAL ID Final Rule published in January 2008 (6 CFR Part 37) are intended to encourage States to work collectively to develop more secure systems to verify an applicant's identity before issuing a driver's license or identification card that can be accepted for official purposes.

States must be in full compliance with the REAL ID Act of 2005 by January 15, 2013 (see Federal Register Volume 76, Number 44 (Monday, March 7, 2011)). This change will give States the time necessary to ensure that driver's licenses and identification cards issued by States meet the security requirements of the REAL ID Act.

The FY 2011 DLSGP provides the fourth round of funding available to all State Driver's License Agencies (SDLAs), also known as State Departments of Motor Vehicles (DMVs) or Motor Vehicle Administrations (MVAs), for FY 2011 DLSGP related projects. Previously, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) awarded \$48,000,000 to 52 States and territories under the FY 2010 DLSGP.

As appropriated under the *Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011* (Public Law 112-10) and authorized by Title II of the *REAL ID Act of 2005*, Division B of the *Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005* (Public Law 109-13), States are invited to apply for funds under this solicitation. The FY 2011 DLSGP guidance is designed to encourage all States to apply for program funding. States are invited to submit proposals under this grant program that will further secure their DL/ID issuance processes and assist States in meeting the minimum requirements outlined in Federal law and DHS regulations.³ Specifically, DHS encourages States to submit proposals that:

¹ DLs include all forms of driver's licenses to include Commercial Driver's Licenses as long as they meet the REAL ID requirements

² For purposes of the *REAL ID Act*, "State" is defined at sec. 201(5) as "a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States." This package will refer to all 56 States, the District of Columbia and territories as "States."

³ See *Federal Register*, Vol. 73, No. 19, Tuesday, January 29, 2008, 6 CFR Part 37, Minimum Standards for Driver's Licenses and Identification Cards Acceptable by Federal Agencies for Official Purposes; Final Rule, pp. 5272-5340

- Have the greatest impact upon reducing the issuance and use of fraudulent DLs and IDs.
- Reduce the costs of program implementation for individuals, States, and the Federal Government
- Expedite State progress toward meeting minimum security standards
- Plan and expedite State-specific activities to support Federal data and document verification requirements and standards

DHS will award grants to State driver's licensing authorities to improve State DL/ID issuance processes, enhance security, and develop innovative solutions with broad applicability for FY 2011 DLSGP implementation. These solutions should improve business processes, IT, infrastructure and DL/ID document and issuance security. Grant award recipients may use grant dollars to meet the minimum issuance standards of Federal law in one of two ways:

1. Begin or continue State-specific process, security, infrastructure and IT improvements consistent with the Federal law and DHS regulations
2. Develop and implement policies, procedures, and protocols, following the uniform set of standards established by the States to capture, manage, and verify applicant data under the provisions of Federal law

PART II. AWARD INFORMATION

Authorizing Statutes

The *Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112-10)* and the *Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-53)* (hereafter "9/11 Act").

Period of Performance

The period of performance of this grant is 36 months. Extensions to the period of performance will be considered only through formal requests to FEMA with specific and compelling justifications as to why an extension is required. For more information on grant extensions, see *Section II, Part I.A.*

Available Funding

In FY 2011, the total amount of funds distributed under this grant program will be \$44,910,000. The FY 2011 DLSGP funds will be allocated based on the following: All 56 States and territories will receive a base amount with the balance of funds distributed based on the total number of DLs/IDs issued in each State. For the purposes of this grant, States are grouped into four categories based upon the number of DL/IDs issued. The available target funding allocations are summarized in Table 1. The amount of award may be adjusted from the allocations in Table 1 if:

1. Some States do not apply
2. Some States ask for less than the amount allocated
3. Individual State applications are inconsistent with program requirements

If the total of all State awards is less than \$44,910,000 for any of the above reasons, the remaining program funds will be redistributed to applicant States based on the formula.

**Table 1. FY 2011 Driver's License Security Grant Program
Target Funding Allocations**

Category	State	FY 2011 Award	Category	State	FY 2011 Award
Category 1	California	\$1,512,900	Category 3 (cont.)	Minnesota	\$701,062
	Florida	\$1,512,900		Missouri	\$701,062
	Illinois	\$1,512,900		Mississippi	\$701,062
	New York	\$1,512,900		Nebraska	\$701,063
	Texas	\$1,512,900		New Hampshire	\$701,063
Category 2	Alabama	\$979,269		New Mexico	\$701,063
	Arizona	\$979,269		Nevada	\$701,063
	Georgia	\$979,269		Oklahoma	\$701,063
	Indiana	\$979,269		Oregon	\$701,063
	Louisiana	\$979,269		South Carolina	\$701,063
	Massachusetts	\$979,269		Tennessee	\$701,063
	Michigan	\$979,269		Utah	\$701,063
	North Carolina	\$979,269		Wisconsin	\$701,063
	New Jersey	\$979,269		West Virginia	\$701,063
	Ohio	\$979,269		Alaska	\$556,393
	Pennsylvania	\$979,269		American Samoa	\$556,393
	Virginia	\$979,270		District of Columbia	\$556,393
	Washington	\$979,270		Delaware	\$556,393
Category 3	Arkansas	\$701,062		Guam	\$556,393
	Colorado	\$701,062		Northern Mariana Islands	\$556,393
	Connecticut	\$701,062	Montana	\$556,393	
	Hawaii	\$701,062	North Dakota	\$556,393	
	Iowa	\$701,062	Puerto Rico	\$556,393	
	Idaho	\$701,062	Rhode Island	\$556,393	
	Kansas	\$701,062	South Dakota	\$556,393	
	Kentucky	\$701,062	U.S. Virgin Islands	\$556,393	
	Maryland	\$701,062	Vermont	\$556,393	
	Maine	\$701,062	Wyoming	\$556,393	
Total					\$44,910,000

Cost Match

There is no cost match required with FY 2011 DLSGP.

A. Funding Guidelines

DHS grant funds may only be used for the purpose set forth in the grant, and must be consistent with the statutory authority for the award. Grant funds may not be used for matching funds for other Federal grants/cooperative agreements, lobbying, or intervention in Federal regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. In addition, Federal funds may not be used to sue the Federal government or any other government entity.

Pre-award costs are allowable only with the written consent of DHS and if they are included in the award agreement.

Federal employees are prohibited from serving in any capacity (paid or unpaid) on any proposal submitted under this program. Federal employees may not receive funds under this award.

1. Management and Administration (M&A). A maximum of 5 percent (5%) of funds awarded may be used for M&A purposes associated with this grant award, and must appear in the detailed budget and budget narrative.

- Hiring of full-time or part-time staff or contractors/consultants
- DHS travel-related expenses
- DHS meeting-related expenses (please refer to *Section II, Part I.B.1.1.1* for specific allowability relative to 44 CFR)
- Acquisition of authorized office equipment, including personal computers, laptop computers, printers, LCD projectors, and other equipment or software which may be required to implement FY 2011 DLSGP requirements
- Recurring fees/charges associated with certain equipment, such as cell phones, faxes, etc.
- Leasing and/or renting of space for newly hired personnel to administer FY 2011 DLSGP grant funding

2. Allowable Costs. This section provides guidance on allowable costs for the FY 2011 DLSGP.

Planning

FY 2011 DLSGP funds may be used for a variety of planning activities, and must appear in the detailed budget and budget narrative. These planning activities include the following:

- Establishing and participating in a State-to-State Verification Governance Body
- Developing personal identification system enhancements
- Developing project final reports
- Developing or enhancing plans and protocols
- Hiring full- or part-time staff or contract/consultant personnel to oversee planning and management activities as well as complying with reporting and data collection requirements, and requests for data by DHS Office of Policy or FEMA/GPD
- Hiring personnel to assist with the design and requirements development of the FY 2011 DLSGP

Equipment

FY 2011 DLSGP funding may be used for a variety of equipment purchases that must appear in the detailed budget and budget narrative.

- Purchasing software and hardware associated with systems integration
- Purchasing equipment related to information capture, storage, processing, and verification
- Purchasing hardware and software for communications and information technologies (IT)
- Purchasing upgrades to existing facilities to improve the security and capabilities of license production, issuance, and enrollment systems

Other Allowable Costs

- **Maintenance and Sustainment.** The use of FEMA preparedness grant funds for maintenance contracts, warranties, repair or replacement costs, upgrades, and user fees are allowable under all active and future grant awards, unless otherwise noted. Grantees are reminded to be sensitive to supplanting issues as supplanting is prohibited. Maintenance contracts and warranties, repair and replacement costs, upgrades, and/or user fees for equipment that was not originally purchased with preparedness grant funding (or provided by DHS components listed in Information Bulletin [IB] 336) may not be subsequently paid for with preparedness grant funding. Please refer to GPD's IBs 336 and 348, located at <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/bulletins/index.shtm>. Routine upkeep (i.e. gasoline, tire replacement, routine oil changes, monthly inspections, grounds and facility maintenance etc.) is the responsibility of the grantee and may not be funded with preparedness grant funding.
- **Maintenance Contracts and Warranties.** To increase the useful life of the equipment, maintenance contracts and warranties may be purchased using grant funding from one fiscal year to cover equipment purchased with funding from a different fiscal year. The use of grant funding for the purchase of maintenance contracts and warranties must meet the following conditions:
 - Maintenance contracts and warranties may only be purchased for equipment that has been purchased using FEMA preparedness grant funding
 - To avoid supplementing Congressional appropriations for specific programs, maintenance contracts and warranties must be purchased using funds from the same grant program used to purchase the original equipment
 - The term of the maintenance contract or warranty shall not exceed the period of performance of the grant to which the contract is being charged

- **Repair and Replacement Costs.** The cost of repair and replacement parts for equipment purchased using FEMA preparedness grant funding is an allowable expense.
 - Repair and replacement parts may only be purchased for equipment that has been purchased using FEMA preparedness grant funding
 - To avoid supplementing Congressional appropriations for specific programs, repair and replacement parts must be purchased using the same grant program used to purchase the original equipment

- **Upgrades.** FEMA preparedness grant funding may be used to upgrade previously purchased allowable equipment. For example, if the grantee purchased risk management software with Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) funds in FY 2005 and would like to use FY 2011 HSGP grant funding to upgrade the software, this is allowable.
 - Upgrades may only be purchased for equipment that has been purchased using FEMA preparedness grant funding
 - To avoid supplementing Congressional appropriations for specific programs, upgrades must be purchased using the same grant program used to purchase the original equipment

- **User fees.** User fees are viewed as costs for specific services required to maintain and provide continued operation of equipment or systems. An example would be the recurring service fees associated with handheld radios or mobile data computers.
 - User fees may only be paid for equipment that has been purchased using FEMA preparedness grant funding
 - To avoid supplementing Congressional appropriations for specific programs, user fees must be paid for using the same grant program used to purchase the original equipment. The service time purchased shall not exceed the period of performance of the grant to which the user fee is being charged.

- **Implementation.** Planned or actual expenditures for maintenance contracts and warranties, repair and replacement costs, upgrades and user fees must be reflected in the grantee's SAPR and budget detail worksheet.

Grantees must comply with all the requirements in 44 CFR Part 13 and 2 CFR Part 225.

3. **Unallowable Costs.** Costs such as using grant funds for the construction of new facilities or hiring of law enforcement personnel for activities unrelated to the FY 2011 DLSGP are unallowable under this program. For guidance and clarification

regarding these and any other unallowable costs, applicants should contact their FEMA Regional Program Manager; contact information is located in *Section II, Part II*.

For more guidance and clarification regarding these allowable and unallowable costs, applicants should review **2 CFR Part 225**, as the lists above are not comprehensive.

PART III.

ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

The 56 States and territories are eligible to apply for FY 2011 DLSGP funds. Eligible applicants under the FY 2011 DLSGP are SDLAs, also known as State DMVs or Motor MVAs. Other eligible applicants include State Public Safety Agencies or Departments with overall responsibility for DL/ID issuance in the State. These agencies may apply on behalf of the State DMV/MVA.

B. Governance

National Incident Management System (NIMS) Implementation

In accordance with Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD)-5, *Management of Domestic Incidents*, the adoption of the NIMS is a requirement to receive Federal preparedness assistance, through grants, contracts, and other activities. The NIMS provides a consistent nationwide template to enable all levels of government, Tribal nations, nongovernmental organizations including voluntary organizations, and private sector partners to work together to prevent, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate the effects of incidents, regardless of cause, size, location, or complexity.

Federal FY 2010 NIMS implementation must be considered prior to allocation of any Federal preparedness awards in FY 2011. Since FY 2007, the National Integration Center (NIC) has advised State, Tribal nation, and local governments to self assess their respective progress relating to NIMS implementation objectives in the NIMS Compliance Assistance Support Tool (NIMSCAST).⁴ The list of objectives against which progress and achievement are assessed and reported can be found at <http://www.fema.gov/emergency/nims/ImplementationGuidanceStakeholders.shtm#item2>.

All State, Tribal nation, and local government grantees should update their respective NIMSCAST assessments and, if necessary, submit a Corrective Action Plan via NIMSCAST for FY 2010. Corrective Action Plans are only required if a jurisdiction fails to meet one of the NIMS implementation activities. Comprehensive information concerning NIMS implementation for States, Tribal nations, local governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector is available through the NIC at FEMA's NIMS Resource Center at <http://www.fema.gov/nims>.

⁴ As defined in the *Homeland Security Act of 2002* (Public Law 107-296), the term "State" means "any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any possession of the United States" 6 U.S.C. 101 (14)

State, Tribal, and local governments should continue to implement NIMS training guidance (course curricula and instructor qualifications) contained in the *Five-Year NIMS Training Plan*, released in February 2008 and any successor guidance released by FEMA. [Note: Coursework and training developed and/or delivered by National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG) meet the course and instructor requirements of the *Five-Year NIMS Training Plan*]. NIMS training guidance is available on FEMA's NIMS Resource Center at <http://www.fema.gov/emergency/nims/NIMSTrainingCourses>.

The primary grantee/administrator of FY 2011 DLSGP award funds is responsible for determining if sub-awardees have demonstrated sufficient progress in NIMS implementation to disburse awards.

PART IV. APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. Address to Request Application Package

FEMA makes all funding opportunities available on the Internet at <http://www.grants.gov>. If you experience difficulties accessing information or have any questions please call the Grants.gov customer support hotline at (800) 518-4726.

Application forms and instructions are available at Grants.gov. To access these materials, go to <http://www.grants.gov>, select "Apply for Grants," and then select "Download Application Package." Enter the CFDA and/or the funding opportunity number located on the cover of this announcement. Select "Download Application Package," and then follow the prompts to download the application package. To download the instructions, go to "Download Application Package" and select "Instructions."

B. Content and Form of Application

- 1. Application via Grants.gov.** All applicants must file their applications using the Administration's common electronic "storefront" – <http://www.grants.gov>. Eligible grantees must apply for funding through this portal, accessible on the Internet at <http://www.grants.gov>.

The application must be started and submitted using Grants.gov after Central Contractor Registration (CCR) is confirmed. The on-line application includes the following required form:

- Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance

When applicants apply through <http://www.grants.gov>, the Standard Form 424 in the initial Grants.gov application will need to be submitted. The Standard Form 424 will be retrieved by ND Grants and the system will automatically populate the relevant data fields in the application. Because FEMA will need to conduct an initial review of the application prior to the submission deadline of June 20, 2011, grantees are encouraged to initiate and complete the Standard Form 424 submission within Grants.gov by **no later than June 13, 2011**. Upon the completion of the initial review, FEMA will determine whether an application should proceed further and the applicant will be notified to complete their submission by fulfilling additional

application requirements (e.g., budget, Investment Justification, Work Plan, etc.) listed below by **no later than June 20, 2011**.

The application must be completed and final submission made through the ND Grants system located at <https://portal.fema.gov>. If you need assistance registering for the ND Grants system, please contact FEMA's Enterprise Service Desk at (888) 457-3362. Applicants are encouraged to begin their ND Grants registration at the time of solicitation to ensure they have adequate time to start and complete their application submission. The ND Grants system includes the following required forms and submissions:

- Standard Form 424A, Budget Information (Non-construction)
- Standard Form 424B, Standard Assurances (Non-construction)
- Standard Form 424C, Budget Information (Construction)
- Standard Form 424D, Standard Assurances (Construction)
- Standard Form LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (if the grantee has engaged or intends to engage in lobbying activities)
- Grants.gov (GG) Lobbying Form, Certification Regarding Lobbying
- FEMA Form 20-16C, Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements
- Program Narrative
- Program Management Capabilities Work Plan
- Budget Narrative
- Confirmation from the applicant (if different from the State MVA or DMV) that the State MVA or DMV administrator agrees with the application package

The program title listed in the CFDA is "*Driver's License Security Grant Program*." The CFDA number is **97.089**.

2. **Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Number.** The applicant must provide a DUNS number with their application. This number is a required field within <http://www.grants.gov> and for CCR. Organizations should verify that they have a DUNS number, or take the steps necessary to obtain one, as soon as possible. Applicants can receive a DUNS number at no cost by calling the dedicated toll-free DUNS Number request line at (866) 705-5711.
3. **Valid CCR.** The application process also involves an updated and current registration by the applicant, which must be confirmed at <http://www.ccr.gov>.
4. **Program Narrative and Program Management Capabilities Work Plan (Parts A and B), and Budget and Budget Narrative Requirements.** The required Program Narrative, associated Program Management Capabilities Work Plan (*Parts I and II*), and Budget and Budget Narrative Requirements provides the State with a DLSGP implementation roadmap and tells DHS how grant funding will be used.

- 5. Submission and File Naming Convention.** The Program Narrative, Program Capabilities Work Plan (*Parts I and II*), Budget, and Budget Narrative requirements must be submitted with the grant application as a file attachment within <http://www.grants.gov>. Applicants must use the following file naming convention when submitting required documents as part of the FY 2011 DLSGP: “FY 2011 Driver’s License Security Grant Program <State Abbreviation>.”

FY 2011 Driver’s License Security Grant Program Application Template

Successful FY 2011 DLSGP applicants must comply with the following requirements:

A) Program Narrative. Applicants should ensure that their program narratives describe the following:

- The State’s progress in improving its credentials and licensing issuance processes consistent with Federal law and DHS regulations
- The State’s current driver’s licensing issuance processes and personal identification system capabilities
- State policies and procedures that will be changed to become consistent with the standards of DHS regulations; these may include business rules and processes for DL/ID card issuance and personal identification verification
- Measures States will take to protect the security and privacy of personal identifiable information
- Actual FY 2011 DLSGP requirements the State intends to meet with this grant funding

B) Program Management Capabilities Work Plan

Part I. Please provide a description of current resource management capabilities the State needs to develop, implement, and manage the programmatic requirements associated with implementing the FY 2011 DLSGP. When describing current management capabilities, consider including discussions and information such as the following:

- Major organizations in the State, committees, and other structures accountable for implementing the initiatives
- State staffing/resource levels within these core organizations responsible for program administration and oversight
- Initiatives to reduce fraud and improve the security of driver’s licensing issuance authorities and motor vehicle operations involved with issuing ID cards or driver’s licenses

Part II. The following basic goals and objectives for the FY 2011 DLSGP should be considered in the State’s Program Management Work Plan:

- Reduce the potential for fraudulent issuance and use of DLs and ID cards

- Reduce the costs of FY 2011 DLSGP implementation for individuals, States, and the Federal government
- Develop improvements to State-centric license issuance processes, policies, security, IT personal identification information security and verification capabilities
- Involve proven technology solutions
- Design solutions that can be used or adopted by other States
- Include privacy and security impact assessments and/or provisions
- Document how project activities will:
 1. Reduce the issuance and use of fraudulent DLs and identification cards.
 2. Reduce the costs of program implementation for individuals, States, and the Federal Government
 3. Expedite State progress toward enhanced security standards
 4. Upgrade state capabilities for verifying identity documentation and information presented by applicants
 5. Be successfully completed by the project period end date

C) Budget and Budget Narrative Requirements. All FY 2011 DLSGP award recipients are required to submit a detailed budget and budget narrative addressing related costs and expenses, as they relate to expenditures outlined in the SF 424A. This budget narrative should be detailed and should serve to: (1) explain how the costs were estimated, and (2) justify the need for the costs incurred to the measurable achievement outcomes as stated in the work plan. For clarification purposes, the narrative should include tables describing cost and expense elements (e.g. equipment list with unit costs/quantity). The budget must be complete, reasonable and cost-effective in relation to the proposed project. The budget should provide the basis of computation of all project-related costs and any appropriate narrative. Applicants will find a sample budget detail worksheet in Part VI. This worksheet may be used as a guide to assist applicants in the preparation of the budget and budget narrative.

Funds will not be made available for obligation, expenditure, or drawdown without an approved budget and budget narrative.

C. Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation (EHP) Compliance

FEMA is legally required to consider the potential impacts of all grant-funded projects on environmental resources and historic properties. For DLSGP and other preparedness grant programs, this is accomplished via FEMA's EHP Review.

Grantees must comply with all applicable EHP laws, regulations, and Executive Orders (EOs) in order to draw down their FY 2011 DLSGP grant funds. Any project with the potential to impact natural resources or historic properties cannot be initiated until FEMA has completed the required FEMA EHP review. Grantees that implement projects prior to receiving EHP approval from FEMA risk de-obligation of funds.

DLSGP projects that involve the installation of equipment or ground-disturbing activities must undergo a FEMA EHP review. For these types of projects, grantees must complete the FEMA EHP Screening Form (Office of Management and Budget [OMB] Number 1660-0115/FEMA Form 024-0-01) and submit it, with all supporting documentation, to the GPD EHP team at GPDEHPinfo@fema.gov for review. If you have any additional questions please contact CSID at (800) 368-6498, Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. EST. Grantees should submit the FEMA EHP Form for each project as soon as possible upon receiving their grant award. Refer to IBs 329, 345, and 356 (located at <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/bulletins/index.shtml>) and *Section II, Part I.B.5.5.6* for further details on EHP requirements.

The following activities would not require the submission of the FEMA EHP Screening Form: planning and development of policies or processes; management, administrative or personnel actions; classroom-based training; table top exercises; and, acquisition of mobile and portable equipment (not involving installation).

D. Submission Dates and Times

All submissions will be received by **no later than 11:59 p.m. EDT, June 20, 2011**. Late applications will neither be considered nor reviewed. Only applications started through <http://www.grants.gov> and completed through the ND Grants system located at <https://portal.fema.gov> will be accepted.

PART V.

APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION

A. Review Criteria

Applications will undergo a completeness and content review. Each FEMA Region will be responsible for reviewing the Program Narrative, Program Management Capabilities Work Plan (Parts I and II), Budget (SF 424A), and Budget Narrative of their respective States in order to ensure programmatic compliance and the applicant's potential to successfully improve the State's driver's license and identification card processes, security, IT, and infrastructure. Thereafter, the DHS Office of Policy, Screening Coordination Office will review each application to ensure proposed projects are consistent with Federal law and DHS regulations.

B. Review and Selection Process

The following process will be used to provide final approval to MVAs and DMVs:

- FEMA Regions will verify compliance with all administrative and eligibility criteria identified in the application kit
- FEMA Regions will evaluate the applicant's potential to successfully improve the States driver's license and identification card processes, security, IT, and infrastructure
- DHS Office of Policy will review each submitted application to ensure proposed projects are consistent with Federal law and DHS regulations
- FEMA Headquarters, in partnership with the FEMA Regions, will provide grant recipients with official notification of the grant award upon approval of the Program Narrative, Program Management Capabilities Work Plan (Parts I and II), Budget (SF 424A), and Budget Narrative

NOTE: Should an application be conditionally approved, it will be the grantee's responsibility to work directly with their respective FEMA Regional contact to ensure corrective action is taken in order for a full release of FY 2011 DLSGP funds to take place.

Funds will not be made available for obligation, expenditure, or drawdown until the applicant's budget and budget narrative have been approved by FEMA.

The applicant must provide a detailed budget for the funds requested. The detailed budget must be submitted with the grant application as a file attachment within <http://www.grants.gov>. The budget must be complete, reasonable, and cost-effective in relation to the proposed project. The budget should provide the basis of computation of

all project-related costs, any appropriate narrative, and a detailed justification of M&A costs.

C. Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates

FEMA will evaluate, act on applications, and make awards on or before September 30, 2011.

D. Intergovernmental Review

Executive Order 12372 requires applicants from State and local units of government or other organizations providing services within a State to submit a copy of the application to the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC), if one exists, and if this program has been selected for review by the State. Applicants must contact their State SPOC to determine if the program has been selected for State review. Executive Order 12372 can be referenced at <http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/codification/executive-order/12372.html>. The names and addresses of the SPOCs are listed on OMB's home page available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_spoc.

PART VI. OTHER INFORMATION

The following sample budget detail worksheet may be used as a guide to assist DLSGP applicants in the preparation of the budget and budget narrative. You may submit the budget and budget narrative using this form or in the format of your choice (plain sheets, your own form, or a variation of this form). However, all required information (including the budget narrative) must be provided. Any category of expense not applicable to your budget may be deleted.

Sample Budget Detail Worksheet

Purpose. The budget detail worksheet may be used as a guide to assist applicants in the preparation of the budget and budget narrative. You may submit the budget and budget narrative using this form or in the format of your choice (plain sheets, your own form, or a variation of this form). However, all required information (including the budget narrative) must be provided. Any category of expense not applicable to your budget may be deleted.

A. Personnel. List each position by title and name of employee, if available. Show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time to be devoted to the project. Compensation paid for employees engaged in grant activities must be consistent with that paid for similar work within the applicant organization.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
		\$
	Total Personnel	\$

B. Fringe Benefits. Fringe benefits should be based on actual known costs or an established formula. Fringe benefits are for the personnel listed in budget category (A) and only for the percentage of time devoted to the project.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
		\$
	Total Fringe Benefits	\$

C. Travel. Itemize travel expenses of project personnel by purpose (e.g., staff to training, field interviews, advisory group meeting, etc.). Show the basis of computation (e.g., six people to 3-day training at \$X airfare, \$X lodging, \$X subsistence). In training projects, travel and meals for trainees should be listed separately. Show the number of trainees and unit costs involved. Identify the location of travel, if known. Indicate source of Travel Policies applied, Applicant or Federal Travel Regulations.

Purpose of Travel	Location	Item	Computation	Cost
				\$
Total Travel				\$

D. Equipment. List non-expendable items that are to be purchased. Non-expendable equipment is tangible property having a useful life of more than one year. (Note: Organization’s own capitalization policy and threshold amount for classification of equipment may be used). Expendable items should be included either in the “Supplies” category or in the “Other” category. Applicants should analyze the cost benefits of purchasing versus leasing equipment, especially high cost items and those subject to rapid technical advances. Rented or leased equipment costs should be listed in the “Contractual” category. Explain how the equipment is necessary for the success of the project. Attach a narrative describing the procurement method to be used.

Budget Narrative: Provide a narrative budget justification for each of the budget items identified.

Item	Computation	Cost
		\$
Total Equipment		\$

E. Supplies. List items by type (e.g. office supplies, postage, training materials, copying paper, and other expendable items such as books, hand held tape recorders) and show the basis for computation. (Note: Organization’s own capitalization policy and threshold amount for classification of supplies may be used). Generally, supplies include any materials that are expendable or consumed during the course of the project.

Supply Items	Computation	Cost
		\$
Total Supplies		\$

F. Consultants/Contracts. Indicate whether applicant’s formal, written Procurement Policy or the Federal Acquisition Regulations are followed.

Consultant Fees: For each consultant enter the name, if known, service to be provided, hourly or daily fee (8-hour day), and estimated time on the project.

Budget Narrative: Provide a narrative budget justification for each of the budget items identified.

Name of Consultant	Service Provided	Computation	Cost
			\$
Subtotal – Consultant Fees			\$

Consultant Expenses: List all expenses to be paid from the grant to the individual consultant in addition to their fees (i.e., travel, meals, lodging, etc.)

Budget Narrative: Provide a narrative budget justification for each of the budget items identified.

Item	Location	Computation	Cost
			\$
Subtotal – Consultant Expenses			\$

Contracts: Provide a description of the product or services to be procured by contract and an estimate of the cost. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source contracts in excess of \$100,000.

Budget Narrative: Provide a narrative budget justification for each of the budget items identified.

Item	Cost
	\$
Subtotal – Contracts	
Total Consultants/Contracts	
	\$

G. Other Costs. List items (e.g., reproduction, janitorial or security services, and investigative or confidential funds) by major type and the basis of the computation. For example, provide the square footage and the cost per square foot for rent, and provide a monthly rental cost and how many months to rent.

Budget Narrative: Provide a narrative budget justification for each of the budget items identified.

Important Note: If applicable to the project, construction costs should be included in this section of the Budget Detail Worksheet.

Description	Computation	Cost
		\$
Total Other		\$

H. Indirect Costs. Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a Federally approved indirect cost rate. A copy of the rate approval, (a fully executed, negotiated agreement), must be attached. If the applicant does not have an approved rate, one can be requested by contacting the applicant’s cognizant Federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or if the applicant’s accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct costs categories.

Description	Computation	Cost
		\$
Total Indirect Costs		\$

Budget Summary - When you have completed the budget worksheet, transfer the totals for each category to the spaces below. Compute the total direct costs and the total project costs. Indicate the amount of Federal funds requested and the amount of non-Federal funds that will support the project.

Budget Category	Federal Amount	Non-Federal Amount ⁵
A. Personnel	\$	\$
B. Fringe Benefits	\$	\$
C. Travel	\$	\$
D. Equipment	\$	\$
E. Supplies	\$	\$
F. Consultants/Contracts	\$	\$
G. Other	\$	\$
H. Indirect Costs	\$	\$

Total Requested Federal Amount	Total Non-Federal Amount
\$	\$
Combined Total Project Costs	
\$	

⁵ FY 2011 DLSGP does not require matching funds; this section should be left blank for all FY 2011 DLSGP applications.



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

FY 2011 Preparedness Grant Programs Overview

**Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)
Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPG) Program
Tribal Homeland Security Grant Program (THSGP)
UASI Nonprofit Security Grant Program (UASI NSGP)
Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP)
Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Grant Program
Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP)
Freight Rail Security Grant Program (FRSGP)
Intercity Passenger Rail (IPR) - Amtrak
Port Security Grant Program (PSGP)
Intercity Bus Security Grant Program (IBSGP)
Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP)**

August 23, 2011



Grant Programs Directorate

Homeland Security Preparedness Grant Programs Overview

One of the core missions of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is to enhance the ability of state, territory, local, and tribal governments to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks and other disasters. DHS' comprehensive suite of homeland security preparedness grant programs are an important part of the Administration's larger, coordinated effort to strengthen homeland security preparedness. These programs implement objectives addressed in a series of post-9/11 laws, strategy documents, plans, and Homeland Security Presidential Directives (HSPDs).

DHS grant programs fund a wide range of preparedness activities including planning, organization, equipment purchase, training, exercises, and grant management and administration costs. These programs support key Administration priorities and objectives, as well as objectives outlined in the *National Preparedness Guidelines* and related national preparedness doctrine, such as the *National Incident Management System*, the *National Response Framework*, and the *National Infrastructure Protection Plan*.

Following is a summary of the DHS grant programs. The following pages outline greater details and background information with respect to these programs.

Funding Distribution – FY 2010 and FY 2011

Program	FY 2010	FY 2011
Homeland Security Grant Program	\$1,786,359,956	\$1,289,296,132
State Homeland Security Program	\$842,000,000	\$526,874,100
Urban Areas Security Initiative	\$832,520,000	\$662,622,100
Operation Stonegarden	\$60,000,000	\$54,890,000
Metropolitan Medical Response System	\$39,359,956	\$34,929,932
Citizen Corps Program	\$12,480,000	\$9,980,000
Emergency Management Performance Grants Program	\$329,799,991	\$329,040,400
Tribal Homeland Security Grant Program	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
Nonprofit Security Grant Program	\$19,000,000	\$18,962,000
Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program	\$33,600,000	\$14,101,736
Buffer Zone Protection Program	\$48,000,000	\$0
Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program	\$48,000,000	\$0
Emergency Operations Center Grant Program	\$57,600,000	\$14,601,740
Driver's License Security Grant Program	\$48,000,000	\$45,188,000
Freight Rail Security Grant Program	\$14,562,403	\$7,745,544
Intercity Passenger Rail (Amtrak) Program	\$20,000,000	\$22,214,456
Port Security Grant Program	\$288,000,000	\$235,029,000
Intercity Bus Security Grant Program	\$11,520,000	\$4,990,000
Transit Security Grant Program	\$253,437,597	\$200,079,000
Total	\$2,967,879,947	\$2,191,248,008

Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) provides a primary funding mechanism for building and sustaining national preparedness capabilities. HSGP is comprised of five interconnected grant programs:

- State Homeland Security Program (SHSP)
- Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI)
- Operation Stonegarden (OPSG)
- Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS)
- Citizen Corps Program (CCP)

Homeland Security Grant Program Overview Funding Distribution – FY 2010 and FY 2011

Program	FY 2010	FY 2011
State Homeland Security Program	\$842,000,000	\$526,874,100
Urban Areas Security Initiative	\$832,520,000	\$662,622,100
Operation Stonegarden	\$60,000,000	\$54,890,000
Metropolitan Medical Response System	\$39,359,956	\$34,929,932
Citizen Corps Program	\$12,480,000	\$9,980,000
Total	\$1,786,359,956	\$1,289,296,132

Together, these grant programs fund a range of preparedness activities, including planning, organization, equipment purchase, training, exercises, and management and administration.

State Homeland Security Program (SHSP)

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$526,874,100

Purpose: SHSP provides funding to support the implementation of State Homeland Security Strategies to address the identified planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercise needs at the state and local levels to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism and other catastrophic events. Consistent with the *Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Act of 2007* (Public Law 110-53) (“hereafter “9/11 Act”), states are required to ensure that at least 25 percent (25%) of SHSP appropriated funds are dedicated towards law enforcement terrorism prevention-oriented planning, organization, training, exercise, and equipment activities, including those activities which support the development of fusion center capabilities.

Eligible Applicants: The State Administrative Agency (SAA) was the only entity eligible to apply to FEMA for SHSP funds. Recipients include all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Program Awards: FY 2011 SHSP allocations were made based on three factors: minimum amounts as legislatively mandated, DHS’ risk methodology, and effectiveness. Each state and territory received a minimum allocation under SHSP using the

thresholds established in the 9/11 Act. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico received 0.355 percent of the total funds allocated for grants under Section 2004 of the *Homeland Security Act of 2002* (6 U.S.C. §101 *et seq.*), as amended by the 9/11 Act. Four territories (American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands) received a minimum allocation of 0.08 percent of the total funds allocated for grants under Section 2004 of the *Homeland Security Act of 2002*, as amended by the 9/11 Act. Per the 9/11 Act, states were required to ensure that at least 25 percent (25%) of SHSP appropriated funds are dedicated towards law enforcement terrorism prevention activities.

Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) Program

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$662,622,100

Purpose: The UASI Program provides funding to address the unique planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercise needs of high-threat, high-density urban areas, and assists them in building an enhanced and sustainable capacity to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism. Per the 9/11 Act, states are required to ensure that at least 25 percent (25%) of UASI appropriated funds are dedicated towards law enforcement terrorism prevention activities.

Eligible Applicants: The SAA was the only entity eligible to apply to FEMA for UASI funds. The 31 high risk urban areas eligible for funding are the recipients under the FY 2011 UASI program.

Program Awards: The 11 highest risk urban areas, designated Tier I urban areas, were eligible for \$540,696,100. The remaining 20 high risk urban Areas, designated Tier II urban areas, were eligible for \$121,926,000. Funds were allocated based on DHS' risk methodology and effectiveness.

Operation Stonegarden (OPSG)

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$54,890,000

Purpose: The OPSG Program provides funding to enhance cooperation and coordination among local, tribal, territorial, state, and federal law enforcement agencies in a joint mission to secure the United States' borders along routes of ingress from international borders to include travel corridors in states bordering Mexico and Canada, as well as states and territories with international water borders.

Eligible Applicants: The SAA was the only entity eligible to apply to FEMA for OPSG funds. Local units of government at the county level and federally-recognized tribal governments in the states bordering Canada (including Alaska), southern states bordering Mexico, and states and territories with International water borders are the recipients of FY 2011 OPSG funds through their SAA.

Program Awards: FY 2011 OPSG allocations were made competitively to designated localities within U.S. border states based on risk analysis and the anticipated feasibility and effectiveness of proposed investments by the applicants.

Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS) Program

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$34,929,932

Purpose: The MMRS Program provides funding to support the integration of emergency management, health, and medical systems into a coordinated response to mass casualty incidents caused by any hazard. Successful MMRS grantees reduce the consequences of a mass casualty incident during the initial period of a response by having augmented existing local operational response systems before an incident occurs.

Eligible Applicants: The SAA was the only entity eligible to apply to FEMA for MMRS funds. The 124 MMRS jurisdictions eligible for funding are the recipients under the FY 2011 MMRS Program.

Program Awards: Each of the 124 MMRS jurisdictions received \$281,693 to establish or sustain local capabilities.

Citizen Corps Program (CCP)

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$9,980,000

Purpose: CCP provides funding to bring community and government leaders together to coordinate the involvement of community members and organizations in emergency preparedness, planning, mitigation, response, and recovery.

Eligible Applicants: The SAA was the only entity eligible to apply to FEMA for CCP funds. Recipients for the CCP include all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Program Awards: FY 2011 CCP allocations were determined using a formula, which specifies that all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico received a minimum of 0.75 percent (.75%) of the total available grant funding, and that four territories (American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands) received a minimum of 0.25 percent (.25%) of the total available grant funding. The balance of CCP funds were distributed on a population basis. In addition to CCP allocations, states and urban areas are encouraged to fully leverage HSGP resources to accomplish the Citizen Corps mission.

Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPG) Program

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$329,040,400

Purpose: The purpose of the FY 2011 EMPG Program is to make grants to states to assist state, local, tribal and territorial governments in preparing for all hazards, as authorized by the *Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act* (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.). Title VI of the *Stafford Act* authorizes FEMA to make grants for the purpose of providing a system of emergency preparedness for the protection of life

and property in the United States from hazards and to vest responsibility for emergency preparedness jointly in the federal government and the states and their political subdivisions. The federal government, through the EMPG Program, provides necessary direction, coordination, and guidance, and provides necessary assistance, as authorized in this title so that a comprehensive emergency preparedness system exists for all hazards.

Eligible Applicants: The SAA or the state's Emergency Management Agency (EMA) was the only entity eligible to apply to FEMA for EMPG Program funds on behalf of state and local emergency management agencies, however only one application was accepted from each state or territory. All 56 states and territories, as well as the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia, were eligible to apply for FY 2011 EMPG Program funds.

Program Awards: FY 2011 EMPG Program allocation methodology dictates that all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico received a base amount of 0.75 percent (.75%) of the total available grant funding. Four territories (American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands) received a base amount of 0.25 percent (.25%) of the total available grant funding. The balance of EMPG Program funds were distributed on a population-match basis. Pursuant to Article X of the Federal Programs and Services Agreement of the Compact of Free Association authorized by Public Law 108-188, funds were available for the Federated States of Micronesia, and for the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

EMPG has a 50 percent federal and 50 percent state cost share, cash or in-kind match requirement

Tribal Homeland Security Grant Program (THSGP)

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$10,000,000

Purpose: THSGP provides funding directly to eligible tribes to help strengthen the nation against risks associated with potential terrorist attacks and other hazards.

Eligible Applicants: Per the 9/11 Act, a "directly eligible tribe" is defined as —

(A) any Indian tribe—

- (i) that is located in the continental United States;
- (ii) that operates a law enforcement or emergency response agency with the capacity to respond to calls for law enforcement or emergency services;
- (iii)
 - (I) that is located on or near an international border or a coastline bordering an ocean (including the Gulf of Mexico) or international waters;
 - (II) that is located within 10 miles of a system or asset included on the prioritized critical infrastructure list established under section 210E(a)(2) or has such a system or asset within its territory;
 - (III) that is located within or contiguous to 1 of the 50 most populous metropolitan statistical areas in the United States; or

- (IV) the jurisdiction of which includes not less than 1,000 square miles of Indian country, as that term is defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code; and
- (iv) that certifies to the Secretary that a state has not provided funds under section 2003 or 2004 to the Indian tribe or consortium of Indian tribes for the purpose for which direct funding is sought; and

(B) a consortium of Indian tribes, if each tribe satisfies the requirements of subparagraph (A).

In summary, eligible tribes must meet the requirements set forth in (A) (i), and (A) (ii), and (A) (iv). Tribes must also meet one of the requirements set forth in (A) (iii); either (A) (iii) (I), or (A) (iii) (II), or (A) (iii) (III), or (A) (iii) (IV). Finally, (B) may also be satisfied, if each tribe satisfies the requirements of subparagraph (A).

Program Awards: FY 2011 THSGP funds were allocated based on two factors: tribal eligibility per the 9/11 Act (self-certified) and the effectiveness of the applicant's THSGP Investment Justification (as determined through a peer review process).

Nonprofit Security Grant Program (NSGP)

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$18,962,000

Purpose: NSGP provides funding support for target hardening activities to nonprofit organizations that are at high risk of a terrorist attack and located within one of the specific FY 2011 UASI-eligible urban areas.

Eligible Applicants: The SAA was the only entity eligible to apply to FEMA for NSGP funds. Eligible nonprofit organizations (as described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code) that are at high risk of a terrorist attack and are located within one of the specific FY 2011 UASI-eligible urban areas are eligible for funding through their SAA.

Program Awards: FY 2011 NSGP funds were allocated based on risk analysis, effectiveness, and integration with broader state and local preparedness efforts. Each nonprofit organization was able to apply through their SAA for up to a \$75,000 grant award.

Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP)

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$14,101,736

Purpose: RCPGP provides funding to enhance catastrophic incident preparedness in selected RCPGP sites. RCPGP is intended to support coordination of regional all-hazard planning for catastrophic events, including the development of integrated planning communities, plans, protocols, and procedures to manage a catastrophic event. In FY 2011, RCPGP focused on demonstrating the progress made by the 10 RCPGP sites, identifying remaining gaps, and implementing the Whole Community

Philosophy, which ensures the engagement of the entire community in the planning process. Grantees were also encouraged to focus on improving catastrophic plans already under development through the use of a “meta-scenario” that draws from the largest planning factors contained within the hazards previously identified by the site as the basis for their planning efforts. Finally, these funds will be used to complete efforts initiated under previous RCPGP awards. The program deliverables submitted from RCPGP grantees were made available throughout the country to enhance national resilience.

Eligible Applicants: The SAA was the only entity eligible to apply to FEMA for RCPGP funds. The Governor of each state and territory is required to designate a SAA to apply for and administer the funds allocated under RCPGP. Eligible recipients under the FY 2011 RCPGP include the existing Regional Catastrophic Planning Teams and associated sites.

Program Awards: FY 2011 RCPGP funds were allocated through a single non-competitive award to each of the existing Regional Catastrophic Planning Teams and associated sites, provided their applications meet the minimum standards specified for FY 2011.

RCPGP has a 75 percent (75%) Federal and 25 percent (25%) grantee cost share cash- or in-kind match requirement.

Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Grant Program

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$14,601,740

Purpose: EOC Grant Program provides funding to improve emergency management and preparedness capabilities by supporting flexible, sustainable, secure, strategically located, and fully interoperable EOCs with a focus on addressing identified deficiencies and needs. This program provides funding for construction or renovation of a state, local, or tribal government’s primary EOC. Fully capable emergency operations facilities at the state and local levels are an essential element of a comprehensive national emergency management system and are necessary to ensure continuity of operations and continuity of government in major disasters caused by any hazard.

Eligible Applicants: All 56 states and territories were eligible to apply for FY 2011 EOC Grant Program funds through their SAA. The Governor of each state and territory is required to designate a SAA to apply for and administer the funds awarded under the FY 2011 EOC Grant Program. The SAA was the only eligible entity able to apply for the available funding on behalf of each eligible state, local, and tribal government’s primary EOC.

Program Awards: FY 2011 EOC Grant Program funds were allocated competitively for construction or renovation of a state, local or tribal government’s primary EOC.

The EOC Grant Program has a 75 percent (75%) Federal and 25 percent (25%) grantee cash- or in-kind cost match requirement.

Driver's License Security Grant Program (DLSGP)

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$45,188,000

Purpose: The DLSGP provides funding to prevent terrorism, reduce fraud and improve the reliability and accuracy of personal identification documents that states¹ issue. The DLSGP is intended to address a key recommendation of the 9/11 Commission to improve the integrity and security of state-issued driver's licenses (DLs) and identification cards (IDs). States are encouraged to work collectively to develop more secure systems to verify an applicant's identity before issuing a DL or ID that can be accepted for official purposes.

Eligible Applicants: Eligible applicants under the FY 2011 DLSGP were State Driver's License Agencies (SDLAs), also known as state Departments of Motor Vehicles (DMVs) or Motor Vehicle Administrations (MVAs). Other eligible applicants include state Public Safety Agencies or Departments with overall responsibility for drivers' license issuance in the state. These agencies were able to apply on behalf of the state DMV/MVA.

Program Awards: FY 2011 DLSGP funds were allocated to 48 states and territories that applied for funds. For the purposes of this grant, states were grouped into four categories based upon the number of DLs/IDs issued. Final determinations for awards were based upon applications received as well as the results of a FEMA Grant Programs Directorate and DHS Office of Policy review.

Freight Rail Security Grant Program (FRSGP)

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$7,745,544

Purpose: FRSGP provides funding to freight railroad carriers, owners and offerors of railroad cars, and owners of rail bridges to protect critical surface transportation infrastructure from acts of terrorism and to increase the resilience of the freight rail system.

Eligible Applicants: Eligible applicants for the FY 2011 FRSGP were determined by DHS as Class I, II, and III freight railroad carriers that transport Rail Security-Sensitive Materials (RSSM), owners and offerors of railroad cars that transport toxic inhalation hazardous (TIH) materials, and owners of rail bridges that have a volume exceeding 4.9 Million Gross Ton Miles (MGTM). For purposes of this grant program, "offerors" were entities that lease rail cars in order to ship TIH materials by railroad.

Program Awards: FY 2011 FRSGP funds were allocated competitively based on their ability to deliver protection to rail bridges and other high-risk assets, provide counter-terrorism training, or develop security plans and vulnerability assessments.

¹ For purposes of the *REAL ID Act*, "State" is defined at sec. 201(5) as "a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States." This package refers to all 56 States, the District of Columbia and territories as "States."

FRSGP has a 75 percent (75%) federal and 25 percent (25%) grantee cost match (cash- or in-kind) requirement. Vulnerability assessments and security plans were exempt from this cost match requirement.

Intercity Passenger Rail (IPR) - Amtrak

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$22,214,456

Purpose: The IPR Program creates a sustainable, risk-based effort to protect critical surface transportation infrastructure and the traveling public from acts of terrorism and increase the resilience of the Amtrak rail system.

Eligible Applicants: The eligible applicant under the FY 2011 IPR Program was the National Passenger Railroad Corporation (Amtrak). Amtrak was the only entity eligible to apply for funding under FY 2011 IPR. DHS partnered with Amtrak to develop security enhancements for eligible intercity passenger rail operations in all eligible UASI areas Amtrak passes through or services.

Port Security Grant Program (PSGP)

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$235,029,000

Purpose: PSGP provides funding for transportation infrastructure security activities to implement Area Maritime Transportation Security Plans and facility security plans among port authorities, facility operators, and state and local government agencies required to provide port security services. The purpose of the FY 2011 PSGP is to support increased port-wide risk management; enhanced domain awareness; training and exercises; expansion of port recovery and resiliency capabilities; and further capabilities to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from attacks involving improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and other non-conventional weapons.

Eligible Applicants: Seven port areas have been selected as Group I (highest risk) and 48 port areas have been selected as Group II. Ports not identified in Group I or II were eligible to apply as a Group III or "All Other Port Areas" applicant. Ferry Systems in Group I and II can apply through the designated Fiduciary Agent (FA). All other Ferry Systems should apply with the Group III and "All Other Port Areas." Ports that qualify under the "All Other Port Areas" category that were located within Group I, II or III areas were allowed to receive grant funds from their geographically proximate higher group if the project has regional impact across the entire port area, but not from both funding groups for the same project.

Certain ferry systems were eligible to participate in the FY 2011 PSGP and receive funds. However, any ferry system electing to participate and receive funds under the FY 2011 PSGP cannot participate in the FY 2011 Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP), and were not considered for funding under the FY 2011 TSGP. Likewise, any ferry system that participated in the TSGP cannot be considered for funding under the PSGP.

Program Awards: Each Group I and Group II port area has been designated a specific amount of money based upon the FY 2011 risk analysis. Group III and “All Other Port Areas” competed for the funding identified in their corresponding group.

Intercity Bus Security Grant Program (IBSGP)

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$4,990,000

Purpose: IBSGP provides funding to create a sustainable program for the protection of intercity bus systems and the traveling public from terrorism. The program seeks to assist 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.

Eligible Applicants: Eligible applicants under the FY 2011 IBSGP were operators of fixed route intercity and charter buses that serve FY 2011 UASI-eligible urban areas. Charter companies must make a minimum of 50 trips annually to one or more UASI jurisdictions to be eligible. The tier designations used in prior years were eliminated for FY 2011 applicants; all operators that meet the basic eligibility criteria were able to apply.

Program Awards: Bus companies competed for funds irrespective of their size and without the use of a tier system. Recipients were selected through a competitive process based on the ratings of the National Review Panel.

IBSGP has a 75 percent (75%) federal and 25 percent (25%) grantee cost match (cash- or in-kind) requirement.

Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP)

Total Funding Allocated in FY 2011: \$200,079,000

Purpose: TSGP provides funds to owners and operators of transit systems (which include intracity bus, commuter bus, ferries, and all forms of passenger rail) to protect critical surface transportation infrastructure and the traveling public from acts of terrorism and to increase the resilience of transit infrastructure.

Eligible Applicants: Eligible transit agencies were determined based on daily unlinked passenger trips (ridership) and transit systems that serve historically eligible Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) jurisdictions. Certain ferry systems were eligible to participate in the FY 2011 TSGP and receive funds. However, any ferry system electing to participate and receive funds under the FY 2011 TSGP cannot participate in the FY 2011 Port Security Grant Program (PSGP), and were not considered for funding under the FY 2011 PSGP. Likewise, any ferry system that participates in the PSGP cannot be considered for funding under the TSGP.

Program Awards: DHS focused available transit security grant dollars on the highest-risk systems through a competitive process.

DHS identified Operational Deterrence projects as the top funding priority for FY 2011 TSGP. In addition, DHS identified critical infrastructure assets of national concern through the Top Transit Asset List (TTAL). Critical infrastructure assets were those vital to the functionality and continuity of a major transit system and their incapacitation or destruction would have a debilitating effect on security, national economic security, public health or safety, or any combination thereof. With the creation of the TTAL, DHS can now target funding to the remediation of those assets on the list in an informed and risk-based approach.

DHS also identified priority project types and placed them into groups based on their effectiveness to reduce risk. These groups were prioritized based upon departmental priorities and their ability to strengthen security on a system-wide level, to strengthen security to critical infrastructure assets, and to reduce the risk of catastrophic events and consequences.

FY 2011 Funding Tables

Table 1. FY 2011 SHSP Final Allocations

State/Territory	Allocation	Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Activities Minimum
Alabama	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Alaska	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
American Samoa	\$1,157,680	\$391,964
Arizona	\$6,608,683	\$2,237,549
Arkansas	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
California	\$72,983,062	\$24,710,393
Colorado	\$5,489,930	\$1,858,764
Connecticut	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Delaware	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
District of Columbia	\$5,285,216	\$1,789,453
Florida	\$16,505,787	\$5,588,481
Georgia	\$9,614,953	\$3,255,403
Guam	\$1,157,680	\$391,964
Hawaii	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Idaho	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Illinois	\$20,212,506	\$6,843,491
Indiana	\$5,663,221	\$1,917,437
Iowa	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Kansas	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Kentucky	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Louisiana	\$6,902,499	\$2,337,028
Maine	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Maryland	\$7,909,769	\$2,678,066
Massachusetts	\$7,787,858	\$2,636,790
Michigan	\$9,652,690	\$3,268,180
Minnesota	\$5,394,708	\$1,826,524
Mississippi	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Missouri	\$5,528,978	\$1,871,985
Montana	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Nebraska	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Nevada	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
New Hampshire	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
New Jersey	\$11,902,274	\$4,029,837
New Mexico	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
New York	\$91,192,861	\$30,875,814
North Carolina	\$7,709,831	\$2,610,372
North Dakota	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Northern Mariana Islands	\$1,157,680	\$391,964
Ohio	\$10,775,036	\$3,648,180
Oklahoma	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Oregon	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Pennsylvania	\$13,545,257	\$4,586,114
Puerto Rico	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Rhode Island	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
South Carolina	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
South Dakota	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Tennessee	\$5,518,319	\$1,868,376

State/Territory	Allocation	Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Activities Minimum
Texas	\$28,562,145	\$9,670,488
U.S. Virgin Islands	\$1,157,680	\$391,964
Utah	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Vermont	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Virginia	\$9,340,306	\$3,162,414
Washington	\$9,178,546	\$3,107,645
West Virginia	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Wisconsin	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Wyoming	\$5,137,205	\$1,739,340
Total	\$526,874,100	\$178,387,500

Table 2. FY 2011 UASI Final Allocations

Tier	State/Territory	Urban Area	Allocation	Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Activities Minimum
Tier I	California	Los Angeles/Long Beach Area	\$69,922,146	\$19,087,867
		Bay Area	\$42,827,663	\$11,691,413
		San Diego Area	\$16,208,500	\$4,424,717
	District of Columbia	National Capital Region	\$59,392,477	\$16,213,399
	Illinois	Chicago Area	\$54,653,862	\$14,919,817
	Massachusetts	Boston Area	\$18,933,980	\$5,168,739
	New Jersey	Jersey City/Newark Area	\$37,292,205	\$10,180,303
	New York	New York City Area	\$151,579,096	\$41,379,187
	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Area	\$23,335,845	\$6,370,392
		Texas	Houston Area	\$41,452,916
		Dallas/Fort Worth/Arlington Area	\$25,097,410	\$6,851,277
Tier II	Arizona	Phoenix Area	\$7,755,447	\$2,117,140
	California	Anaheim/Santa Ana Area	\$8,941,135	\$2,440,817
		Riverside Area	\$3,700,465	\$1,010,180
	Colorado	Denver Area	\$4,968,954	\$1,356,462
	Florida	Miami/Fort Lauderdale Area	\$9,646,226	\$2,633,298
		Tampa Area	\$5,470,535	\$1,493,387
		Orlando Area	\$3,696,674	\$1,009,146
	Georgia	Atlanta Area	\$9,750,733	\$2,661,828
	Maryland	Baltimore Area	\$7,813,444	\$2,132,972
	Michigan	Detroit Area	\$9,437,120	\$2,576,215
	Minnesota	Twin Cities Area	\$6,116,913	\$1,669,840
	Missouri	St. Louis Area	\$5,973,100	\$1,630,581
	Nevada	Las Vegas Area	\$5,705,105	\$1,557,422
	North Carolina	Charlotte Area	\$3,244,400	\$885,680
	Ohio	Cleveland Area	\$3,590,432	\$980,143
		Cincinnati Area	\$3,491,256	\$953,069
	Oregon	Portland Area	\$5,025,160	\$1,371,806
	Pennsylvania	Pittsburgh Area	\$4,479,093	\$1,222,736
Virginia	Norfolk Area	\$5,160,470	\$1,408,743	
Washington	Seattle Area	\$7,959,338	\$2,172,799	
Total			\$662,622,100	\$ 180,887,500

Table 3. FY 2011 OPSG Final Allocations

State	Allocation
Arizona	\$12,378,728
California	\$10,326,313
Florida	\$250,000
Louisiana	\$319,102
Maine	\$1,008,082
Michigan	\$794,084
Minnesota	\$588,095
Montana	\$1,211,112
New Hampshire	\$95,000
New Mexico	\$3,841,538
New York	\$2,647,647
North Dakota	\$526,949
Ohio	\$657,593
Pennsylvania	\$95,000
Puerto Rico	\$218,063
Texas	\$17,770,977
Vermont	\$330,254
Washington	\$1,831,463
Total	\$54,890,000

Table 4. FY 2011 MMRS Final Allocations

State	MMRS Jurisdictions	Allocation
Alabama	Birmingham, Huntsville, Mobile, and Montgomery	\$1,126,772
Alaska	Anchorage and Juneau	\$563,386
Arizona	Glendale, Mesa, Phoenix, and Tucson	\$1,126,772
Arkansas	Little Rock	\$281,693
California	Anaheim, Bakersfield, Fremont, Fresno, Glendale, Huntington Beach, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Modesto, Oakland, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, Santa Ana, and Stockton	\$5,070,474
Colorado	Aurora, Colorado Springs, and Denver	\$845,079
Connecticut	Hartford	\$281,693
Florida	Fort Lauderdale, Hialeah, Jacksonville, Miami, Orlando, St. Petersburg, and Tampa	\$1,971,851
Georgia	Atlanta and Columbus	\$563,386
Hawaii	Honolulu	\$281,693
Illinois	Chicago	\$281,693
Indiana	Ft. Wayne and Indianapolis	\$563,386
Iowa	Des Moines	\$281,693
Kansas	Kansas City and Wichita	\$563,386
Kentucky	Lexington/Fayette and Louisville	\$563,386
Louisiana	Baton Rouge, Jefferson Parish, New Orleans, and Shreveport	\$1,126,772
Maryland	Baltimore	\$281,693
Massachusetts	Boston, Springfield, and Worcester	\$845,079
Michigan	Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Warren	\$845,079
Minnesota	Minneapolis and St. Paul	\$563,386
Mississippi	Jackson	\$281,693
Missouri	Kansas City and St. Louis	\$563,386
Nebraska	Lincoln and Omaha	\$563,386
Nevada	Las Vegas	\$281,693
New Hampshire	Northern New England MMRS	\$281,693
New Jersey	Jersey City and Newark	\$563,386
New Mexico	Albuquerque	\$281,693
New York	Buffalo, New York City, Rochester, Syracuse, and Yonkers	\$1,408,465
North Carolina	Charlotte, Greensboro, and Raleigh	\$845,079
Ohio	Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, and Toledo	\$1,690,158
Oklahoma	Oklahoma City and Tulsa	\$563,386
Oregon	Portland	\$281,693
Pennsylvania	Allegheny County and Philadelphia	\$563,386
Rhode Island	Providence	\$281,693
South Carolina	Columbia	\$281,693
Tennessee	Chattanooga, Knoxville, Memphis, and Nashville	\$1,126,772
Texas	Amarillo, Arlington, Austin, Corpus Christi, Dallas, El Paso, Fort Worth, Garland, Houston, Irving, Lubbock, San Antonio, and Southern Rio Grande	\$3,662,009
Utah	Salt Lake City	\$281,693
Virginia	Arlington County, Chesapeake, Newport News, Norfolk, Richmond, and Virginia Beach	\$1,690,158
Washington	Seattle, Spokane, and Tacoma	\$845,079
Wisconsin	Madison and Milwaukee	\$563,386
Total		\$34,929,932

Table 5. FY 2011 CCP Final Allocations

State/Territory	Allocation	State/Territory	Allocation
Alabama	\$165,261	Nevada	\$125,598
Alaska	\$88,400	New Hampshire	\$100,150
Arizona	\$202,479	New Jersey	\$241,785
Arkansas	\$130,482	New Mexico	\$113,729
California	\$787,232	New York	\$449,095
Colorado	\$172,251	North Carolina	\$255,665
Connecticut	\$142,270	North Dakota	\$87,348
Delaware	\$91,891	Ohio	\$295,296
District of Columbia	\$86,522	Oklahoma	\$146,046
Florida	\$431,897	Oregon	\$148,552
Georgia	\$264,257	Pennsylvania	\$316,336
Hawaii	\$99,702	Rhode Island	\$95,053
Idaho	\$104,667	South Carolina	\$162,725
Illinois	\$322,293	South Dakota	\$90,526
Indiana	\$198,057	Tennessee	\$196,008
Iowa	\$132,639	Texas	\$556,826
Kansas	\$129,160	Utah	\$128,962
Kentucky	\$157,802	Vermont	\$86,748
Louisiana	\$161,434	Virginia	\$226,861
Maine	\$99,948	Washington	\$203,809
Maryland	\$184,523	West Virginia	\$109,746
Massachusetts	\$201,612	Wisconsin	\$183,208
Michigan	\$264,694	Wyoming	\$85,319
Minnesota	\$175,981	Puerto Rico	\$147,336
Mississippi	\$131,442	U.S. Virgin Islands	\$27,048
Missouri	\$189,769	American Samoa	\$26,220
Montana	\$93,586	Guam	\$28,407
Nebraska	\$109,470	Northern Mariana Islands	\$25,877
Total			\$9,980,000

Table 6. FY 2011 EMPG Final Allocations

State/Territory	Allocation	State/Territory	Allocation
Alabama	\$5,448,809	Montana	\$3,086,167
Alaska	\$2,915,222	Nebraska	\$3,609,748
American Samoa	\$864,711	Nevada	\$4,141,368
Arizona	\$6,675,637	New Hampshire	\$3,302,538
Arkansas	\$4,302,354	New Jersey	\$7,971,282
California	\$25,951,025	New Mexico	\$3,750,141
Colorado	\$5,679,215	New York	\$14,804,894
Connecticut	\$4,690,951	North Carolina	\$8,428,798
Delaware	\$3,030,283	North Dakota	\$2,880,512
District of Columbia	\$2,853,298	Northern Mariana Islands	\$853,295
Florida	\$14,237,986	Ohio	\$9,735,180
Georgia	\$8,712,018	Oklahoma	\$4,815,406
Guam	\$936,818	Oregon	\$4,898,008
Hawaii	\$3,287,765	Pennsylvania	\$10,428,735
Idaho	\$3,451,413	Puerto Rico	\$4,857,917
Illinois	\$10,625,099	Rhode Island	\$3,134,509
Indiana	\$6,529,870	South Carolina	\$5,365,193
Iowa	\$4,373,460	South Dakota	\$2,985,301
Kansas	\$4,258,803	Tennessee	\$6,462,331
Kentucky	\$5,202,923	Texas	\$18,356,077
Louisiana	\$5,322,640	U.S. Virgin Islands	\$892,007
Maine	\$3,295,864	Utah	\$4,252,270
Maryland	\$6,083,731	Vermont	\$2,860,761
Massachusetts	\$6,647,063	Virginia	\$7,479,351
Michigan	\$8,726,434	Washington	\$6,719,475
Minnesota	\$5,802,175	West Virginia	\$3,618,847
Mississippi	\$4,334,006	Wisconsin	\$6,040,407
Missouri	\$6,256,678	Wyoming	\$2,813,631
Total			\$329,040,400

Note: The Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia chose not to apply for FY 2011 EMPG Program funding.

Table 7. FY 2011 THSGP Final Allocations

State	Tribe	Allocation
Alabama	Poarch Band of Creek Indians	\$786,368
Arizona	Pascua Yaqui Tribe	\$460,000
	San Carlos Apache Tribe	\$452,550
California	Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians	\$198,884
	Blue Lake Rancheria	\$175,246
	Fort Mojave Indian Tribe of Arizona, California and Nevada	\$1,537,985
Michigan	Sault Ste. Marie of Chippewa Indians of Michigan	\$1,071,319
Minnesota	Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	\$413,830
Nevada	Reno-Sparks Indian Colony	\$418,329
New York	Seneca Nation of Indians	\$535,000
Oklahoma	Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma	\$431,790
	Tonkawa Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	\$400,000
Oregon	Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	\$899,275
Texas	Ysleta del Sur Pueblo	\$450,000
Washington	Lummi Nation	\$4,649
	Makah Tribe	\$49,740
	Puyallup Tribal Council	\$588,913
	Quileute Tribe	\$160,122
	Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe	\$399,000
	The Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation	\$430,000
	Tulalip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation, Washington	\$137,000
Total		\$10,000,000

Table 8. FY 2011 NSGP Final Allocations

State	Urban Area	Allocation by Urban Area	Allocation by State
Arizona	Phoenix Area	\$225,000	\$225,000
California	Anaheim/Santa Ana Area	\$75,000	\$2,835,532
	Bay Area	\$673,883	
	Los Angeles/Long Beach Area	\$1,712,575	
	Riverside Area	\$150,000	
	San Diego Area	\$224,074	
Colorado	Denver Area	\$150,000	\$150,000
District of Columbia	National Capital Region	\$1,093,487	\$1,093,487
Florida	Miami/Ft. Lauderdale Area	\$1,717,129	\$2,092,099
	Orlando Area	\$75,000	
	Tampa Area	\$299,970	
Georgia	Atlanta Area	\$150,000	\$150,000
Illinois	Chicago Area	\$2,174,320	\$2,174,320
Maryland	Baltimore Area	\$453,867	\$453,867
Massachusetts	Boston Area	\$298,500	\$298,500
Michigan	Detroit Area	\$622,329	\$622,329
Minnesota	Twin Cities Area	\$28,943	\$28,943
Missouri	St. Louis Area	\$205,500	\$205,500
Nevada	Las Vegas Area	\$141,000	\$141,000
New Jersey	Jersey City/Newark Area	\$1,864,160	\$1,864,160
New York	New York City Area	\$5,115,585	\$5,115,585
North Carolina	Charlotte Area	\$75,000	\$75,000
Ohio	Cleveland Area	\$183,000	\$183,000
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Area	\$290,000	\$371,100
	Pittsburgh Area	\$81,100	
Texas	Dallas/Fort Worth/Arlington Area	\$75,000	\$366,905
	Houston Area	\$291,905	
Virginia	Norfolk Area	\$66,323	\$66,323
Washington	Seattle Area	\$449,350	\$449,350
Total		\$18,962,000	\$18,962,000

Table 9. FY 2011 RCPGP Final Allocations

RCPGP Site	Allocation
Bay Area (to include 11 counties and 23 principal cities spanning central western CA)	\$1,281,976
Boston Area (to include 17 counties and 17 principal cities spanning most of eastern MA, southern NH, and all of RI)	\$1,281,976
Chicago Area (to include 16 counties and 15 principal cities spanning northeastern IL, northwestern IN, and southeastern WI)	\$1,281,976
Houston Area (to include 13 counties and six principal cities in eastern, TX as defined for the FY 2008 grant cycle)	\$1,281,976
Los Angeles / Long Beach Area (to include five counties and 38 principal cities spanning southwestern CA)	\$1,281,976
National Capital Region (to include 26 counties and 16 principal cities spanning Washington, D.C., northern VA, central and southern MD, eastern WV, and representatives from DE and PA)	\$1,281,976
New York City / Northern New Jersey Area (to include 30 counties and 21 principal cities that span eastern CT, northern NJ, southeastern NY and northeastern PA)	\$2,563,952 ²
Honolulu Area (to include the four counties of HI, including the principal city of Honolulu)	\$1,281,976
Norfolk Area (to include 15 counties and nine principal cities, as defined for the FY 2008 grant cycle, spanning central eastern and southeastern VA as well as northeastern NC)	\$1,281,976
Seattle Area (to include eight counties and 12 principal cities spanning central WA)	\$1,281,976
Total	\$14,101,736

² Two sites elected to combine financials to form one Regional Catastrophic Planning Team. New York City and Jersey City/Newark are expected to continue to work together as the New York/Northern New Jersey Area RCPGP Site to carry out the program goals and objectives

Table 10. FY 2011 EOC Grant Program Final Allocations

State/Territory	Entity Name	FY 2011 Allocation
Alabama	Elmore County	\$1,000,000
Arizona	City of Phoenix	\$1,000,000
California	Marin County	\$198,324
	Morongo Band of Mission Indians	\$29,250
Connecticut	City of Norwalk	\$1,000,000
Georgia	Fayette County	\$1,000,000
Guam	Territory of Guam	\$250,000
Illinois	City of Palatine	\$250,000
Massachusetts	City of Boston	\$1,000,000
Michigan	State of Michigan	\$1,000,000
Mississippi	City of Oxford	\$750,000
Missouri	City of Perryville	\$26,310
Nebraska	Region 26 Council	\$450,000
New York	Chautauqua County	\$42,200
North Carolina	Onslow County	\$115,014
North Dakota	Griggs County	\$988,500
Ohio	Trumbull County	\$740,625
Oklahoma	Durant Regional	\$1,000,000
Pennsylvania	State of Pennsylvania	\$1,000,000
Puerto Rico	Territory of Puerto Rico	\$143,319
Texas	Ark-Tex Council of Governments	\$310,000
	Hood County	\$750,000
Utah	Salt Lake City	\$999,750
Washington	City of Mountlake Terrace	\$250,000
	Pierce County/Tacoma	\$58,448
Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin - Madison	\$250,000
Total		\$14,601,740*

*This figure reflects an additional \$500,000 due to the recovery of previous years' funding.

Table 11. FY 2011 DLSGP Final Allocations

State/Territory	Allocation	State/Territory	Allocation
Alabama	\$1,107,680	Mississippi	\$921,858
Alaska	\$684,804	Missouri	\$1,015,088
American Samoa	\$684,804	Nebraska	\$669,697
Arizona	\$1,107,680	Nevada	\$829,474
Arkansas	\$829,473	New Jersey	\$1,107,680
California	\$1,641,311	New Mexico	\$829,474
Colorado	\$829,473	New York	\$1,641,311
Connecticut	\$829,473	North Carolina	\$1,107,680
Delaware	\$684,840	Northern Mariana Islands	\$684,804
District of Columbia	\$684,804	Ohio	\$1,107,680
Florida	\$1,641,311	Pennsylvania	\$1,107,680
Georgia	\$1,107,680	Puerto Rico	\$684,804
Guam	\$684,804	Rhode Island	\$684,804
Hawaii	\$829,473	South Carolina	\$829,474
Illinois	\$1,641,311	South Dakota	\$684,804
Indiana	\$1,107,680	Tennessee	\$829,474
Iowa	\$701,062	Texas	\$1,641,311
Kansas	\$829,473	Utah	\$829,474
Kentucky	\$829,473	Vermont	\$684,804
Louisiana	\$1,107,680	Virgin Islands	\$684,804
Maine	\$829,473	Washington	\$1,107,681
Maryland	\$829,473	West Virginia	\$829,474
Massachusetts	\$1,107,680	Wisconsin	\$829,474
Minnesota	\$829,473	Wyoming	\$684,804
Total			\$45,188,000*

*Through the recovery of previous years' funding, an additional \$92,385 was provided to Mississippi and an additional \$185,615 was provided to Missouri.

Note: Idaho, Michigan, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Virginia chose not to apply for FY 2011 DLSGP funding.

Table 12. FY 2011 FRS GP Final Allocations

State	Railroad/Company	Allocation
Florida	CSX Transportation, Inc.	\$5,262,077
Illinois	The Belt Railway Company of Chicago	\$333,750
Indiana	Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad	\$283,500
Missouri	Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis	\$176,275
Nebraska	Union Pacific Railroad	\$88,878
Pennsylvania	PPG Industries	\$1,199,814
Virginia	Norfolk Southern Railway Company	\$401,250
Total		\$7,745,544

Table 13. FY 2011 IPR Program Final Allocation

Entity	Allocation
National Passenger Railroad Corporation (Amtrak)	\$22,214,456
Total	\$22,214,456

Table 14. FY 2011 PSGP Final Allocations

Group	State	Port Area	Entity	Allocation
I	CA	Los Angeles - Long Beach	Marine Exchange of Los Angeles Long Beach Harbor, Inc.	\$24,538,191
		San Francisco Bay	Marine Exchange of the San Francisco Bay Region	\$16,989,439
	LA	New Orleans	Lower Mississippi River Port-Wide Strategic Security Council	\$17,116,755
	NJ/PA/DE	Delaware Bay	Maritime Exchange for the Delaware River and Bay, Inc.	\$11,986,983
	NY/NJ	NY/NJ	The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey	\$30,195,052
	TX	Houston-Galveston	County of Harris, Texas	\$25,051,457
	WA	Puget Sound	Northwest Maritime Advisory Services DBA Marine Exchange	\$15,154,410
Group I Total				\$141,032,287
II	AK	Anchorage	Municipality of Anchorage/Port of Anchorage	\$1,000,149
	AL	Mobile	Alabama Department of Homeland Security	\$1,000,151
	CA	Port Hueneme	Oxnard Harbor District (Port of Hueneme)	\$1,000,100
		San Diego	San Diego Unified Port District	\$3,063,888
	CT	Long Island Sound	Connecticut Department of Emergency Management & Homeland Security	\$1,402,710
	FL	Jacksonville	Jacksonville Marine Transportation Exchange, Inc.	\$1,577,067
		Miami	Miami River Marine Group	\$2,176,924
		Panama City	City of Panama City	\$1,000,041
		Pensacola	Pensacola Bay Area Chamber of Commerce, Inc.	\$1,000,045
		Port Canaveral	Canaveral Port Authority	\$1,000,063
		Port Everglades	Broward County Board of County Commissioners	\$1,241,746
		Tampa Bay	Manatee County Port Authority	\$2,576,493
	GA	Savannah	Georgia Tech Research Corporation	\$1,430,380
	HI	Honolulu	Hawaii Civil Defense Division	\$2,763,021
	IN/IL	Southern Tip of Lake Michigan	Inland Rivers Ports & Terminals, Inc.	\$3,454,069
	KY	Louisville	Larry D Allen, LLC	\$1,000,102
	LA	Lake Charles	Trahan Consulting, LLC	\$1,130,506
		Morgan City	Morgan City Harbor and Terminal District	\$1,000,101
		Port Fourchon/The LOOP	Greater Lafourche Port Commission	\$1,000,033
	MA	Boston	Executive Office of Public Safety and Security	\$2,609,221
	MD	Baltimore	Maryland Emergency Management Agency	\$1,611,356
	ME	Portland	City of Portland, Maine	\$1,000,077
	MI	Detroit	Detroit/Wayne County Port Authority	\$1,000,152
	MN	Minneapolis-St. Paul	Minnesota Department of Public Safety Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management	\$1,368,029
	MN/WI	Duluth-Superior	Minnesota Department of Public Safety Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management	\$1,000,083
	MO	Kansas City	Mid America Regional Council	\$1,246,359
	MO/IL	St. Louis	East-West Gateway Council of Government	\$1,774,426
MS	Pascagoula	Mississippi Department of Public Safety	\$1,000,075	
NC	Wilmington	North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety	\$1,416,956	
	Morehead City	North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety	\$1,000,089	

II	NY	Albany	The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey	\$1,000,010
		Buffalo	Grantmakers Advantage, Inc.	\$1,455,820
	OH	Cincinnati	Larry D Allen,LLC	\$1,000,152
		Cleveland	Cuyahoga County Justice Services	\$1,000,140
		Toledo	Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority	\$1,026,965
	PA	Pittsburgh	Port of Pittsburgh Commission	\$1,000,135
	PR	Ponce	Autonomous Municipality of Ponce	\$1,000,038
		San Juan	Puerto Rico Ports Authority	\$1,102,545
	SC	Charleston	South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SLED)	\$1,398,355
	TN	Memphis	Inland Rivers Ports and Terminals, Inc.	\$1,682,178
		Nashville	Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County	\$1,000,046
	TX	Corpus Christi	WJ Wagner, Inc	\$2,113,034
		Freeport	Port Freeport	\$1,354,831
		Sabine-Neches	Jefferson County, Texas	\$2,765,949
VA	Hampton Roads	Virginia Department Emergency Management	\$3,102,866	
WA/OR/ID	Columbia-Snake River System	Merchants Exchange of Portland	\$1,543,943	
WV	Huntington - Tristate	West Virginia Public Port Authority	\$1,000,070	
Group II Total				\$69,391,489
III	FL	Palm Beach	Port of Palm Beach District	\$1,825,812
	GA	Brunswick	Georgia Ports Authority	\$103,800
	GU	Port of Guam	Port Authority of Guam	\$2,392,941
	IL	Peoria	Illinois State Police Special Operations Command (SOCOM)	\$58,000
	IN	Mount Vernon	Indiana State Police	\$42,500
	MA/RI	Narragansett/Mt. Hope Bays	City of Cranston, Rhode Island Fire Department	\$58,000
			City of Fall River Police Department	\$90,758
			East Providence Fire Department	\$798,000
			Interstate Navigation Company	\$37,800
			Massachusetts Environmental Police	\$1,030,746
			North Kingstown Fire Department	\$832,000
			Providence Emergency Management Agency	\$367,800
			Providence Police Department	\$1,151,342
			Prudence Island Volunteer Fire Department	\$51,000
			Quonset Development Corporation	\$204,950
			Rhode Island Division of Enforcement (DEM)	\$26,000
			Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority	\$225,000
			Sprague Providence	\$8,000
	Town of Narragansett	\$600,000		
	MS	Vicksburg	Kinder Morgan Liquids Terminals, LLC	\$380,928
OK	Tulsa, Port of Catoosa	Oklahoma Highway Patrol	\$634,295	
TN	Chattanooga	Hamilton County TN / Hamilton County Sheriff's Office	\$124,945	
WI	Green Bay	Green Bay Police Department	\$1,473,224	
	Milwaukee	City of Milwaukee	\$337,344	
Group III Total				\$12,855,185
All Others	AK	Seward	Alaska Railroad Corporation	\$295,000
	AL	Port of Florence	Murphy Oil Corporation Sheffield Terminal	\$148,000
	AR	Dardanelle	Pope County Sheriff's Office	\$1,098,958

All Others	CT	Mystic/Stonington	Mystic Fire Department	\$700,000
		Norwalk	City of Norwalk	\$79,980
		Stamford	City of Stamford	\$610,000
		Stratford	Town of Stratford	\$13,163
	FL	Freeport	Murphy Oil USA Freeport Terminal	\$47,000
	IA	Bettendorf	Bettendorf Fire Department	\$250,000
		LeClaire	Scott County Iowa	\$175,000
	IL	Moline	City of Moline Fire Department	\$195,000
	IN/KY	Evansville	Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources	\$221,718
	KY	Port of Hickman-Fulton	Hickman-Fulton County Riverport Authority	\$67,756
	MA	Cape Cod Canal	Town of Sandwich	\$900,000
		Falmouth	Town of Falmouth, MA	\$194,206
		Hyannis	Town of Barnstable Harbormaster	\$61,200
			Hy-Line Cruises	\$119,999
		Northeastern MA Ports	Massachusetts Environmental Police	\$108,499
		Woods Hole	Woods Hole, Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket Steamship Authority	\$267,500
		Yarmouth	Town of Yarmouth Harbormaster	\$340,489
	MD/VA	National Capital Region	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	\$40,000
	ME	Bar Harbor	BHWW, LLC	\$46,058
	MI	Holland & Grand Haven Ports	Ottawa County Sheriff's Office	\$507,490
		Port of Marquette	State of Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR)	\$371,258
	MO	Ste. Genevieve County	Ste. Genevieve County Sheriff's Office	\$393,396
	MP	Northern Mariana Islands	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	\$680,000
			Commonwealth Ports Authority	\$290,823
	NY	Latham	NYS Division of Military and Naval Affairs	\$37,608
		Oswego	Port of Oswego Authority	\$160,400
		Port Jefferson	Bridgeport and Port Jefferson Steamboat Co	\$288,591
		Rochester	Monroe County	\$350,000
		Suffolk County	County of Suffolk-Suffolk County Police Department	\$196,747
	OH	Port Clinton, South and North Bass Islands, Sandusky	Miller Boat Line	\$22,805
			Ohio Department of Natural Resources/Division of Watercraft	\$220,000
	SC	Hilton Head Island	Town of Hilton Head Island	\$292,045
	TX	Fernandina	Kinder Morgan Liquids Terminals, LLC	\$311,085
Harlingen		Port of Harlingen Authority	\$176,300	
VT	Lake Champlain	Vermont Department of Public Safety	\$55,000	
WA	Grays Harbor	Port of Grays Harbor	\$135,600	
WI	Marinette	Marinette County Emergency Management	\$120,201	
		Marinette Fuel & Dock Co.	\$71,092	
		Marinette Marine Corporation	\$852,348	
	Sheboygan Harbor	Sheboygan County	\$237,724	
All Others Total				\$11,750,039

Table 15. FY 2011 IBSGP Final Allocations

State	Agency	Allocation
AL	HTRC, Inc DBA Camelot Limousine Charters & Tours	\$12,000
	JAT Inc dba Thrasher Brothers Trailways	\$61,144
	Kelton Tours Unlimited	\$50,885
	Kingdom Coach, LLC.	\$30,375
	Southern Coaches Inc	\$48,510
AR	Eventure America, Inc. dba Little Rock Tours	\$17,955
AZ	Industrial Bus Lines, Inc. dba All Aboard America	\$37,103
	Tour West America	\$16,935
CA	Silver State Coach Inc	\$40,548
	Silverado Stages	\$38,220
CT	DATTCO, Inc.	\$148,504
FL	A Candies Coachworks, Inc.	\$5,250
	AAA Limo, Inc.	\$6,705
	Astro Travel and Tours, Inc.	\$28,575
	Empire Coach Line, Inc.	\$30,825
	Express Transportation, Inc.	\$50,566
	Space Tours LLC	\$12,000
	Travel Lovers Tours & Cruises, Inc.	\$12,000
	Treasure Coast Motor Coach, Inc. dba Magic Carpet Ride	\$17,325
GA	Samson Tours Inc. dba Samson Trailways	\$39,825
IA	Burlington Stage Lines LTD.	\$127,811
	Royal Charters Inc.	\$9,000
IL	Chicago Classic Coach, LLC	\$20,000
	Midamerica Charter Lines Inc.	\$115,653
	O'Hare Wisconsin Limousine Service	\$86,766
IN	Kaser Enterprises, Inc. dba Royal Excursions Chauffeur	\$38,700
KY	Miller Transportation Inc.	\$37,044
	Toby Travel and Tours, Inc. dba Toby Tours	\$32,625
LA	American International Travel Inc. DBA Dixieland Tours	\$42,072
	Gaten's Adventures Unlimited, LLC	\$15,382
	Louisiana Motor Coach Inc.	\$11,550
	Tri City Charter of Bossier Inc. dba Tri City Charter	\$17,325
MA	Cavalier Coach Trailways	\$78,742
	Peter Pan Bus Lines, Inc.	\$52,800
MD	1 EBT Corp	\$9,241
	A.S. Tours Inc.	\$11,550
	Arthur Peterson dba AP Xpress	\$7,230
	BK Charter Inc.	\$5,077
	Woodlawn Motor Coach, Inc.	\$30,411
ME	Northeast Charter and Tour Co., Inc.	\$31,802
	VIP Tour & Charter Bus Company	\$4,500

State	Agency	Allocation
MI	Blue Lakes Charters and Tours, Inc.	\$5,000
	Compass Coach Inc.	\$44,183
	Indian Trails Inc.	\$61,468
MN	Northfield Lines Inc.	\$38,700
	Tourco Travel, Inc.	\$15,000
	Trobec's Bus Service	\$34,470
MO	USA Tours, Inc.	\$13,012
	White Knight Limousine, Inc. dba White Knight Coaches	\$42,360
MT	Rimrock Stages Inc.	\$35,168
NC	Burke International Tours, Inc	\$64,367
	Trolleys Inc. dba Sunway Charters	\$35,325
NE	Busco, Inc. dba Arrow Stage Lines	\$55,528
NH	Jalbert Leasing, Inc. DBA C & J Trailways	\$21,625
NJ	Academy Express, LLC	\$108,780
	Coach USA Inc	\$197,100
	Panorama Tours, Inc.	\$13,500
NV	Celebrity Coaches of America	\$29,887
NY	Coastal Charter Service Corp.	\$20,250
	Great Escapes Tours & Travel Ltd.	\$104,587
	Yankee Trails World Travel	\$43,977
PA	David Thomas Tours, Inc.	\$115,189
	Frank Martz Coach Co., Inc.	\$159,137
	Fullington Auto Bus Co.	\$164,711
	Myers Coach Lines Inc.	\$10,418
	Susquehanna Transit Company DBA Susquehanna Trailways	\$11,550
RI	Flagship Trailways	\$15,627
SC	June Bus Tours LLC	\$12,000
TX	Autobuses Ejecutivos LLC	\$90,465
	CUSA, LLC dba Coach America	\$415,563
	Eagle Tours Inc.	\$11,550
	Gotta Go Express Trailways	\$23,376
	Greyhound Lines, Inc.	\$1,075,000
	HME Executive Coach Inc	\$60,075
	Sierra Stage Coaches Inc.	\$24,413
	Southwestern Coaches DBA Arrow Trailways of TX	\$11,550
VA	James River Bus Lines	\$62,325
	Venture Tours, Inc	\$38,700
	Winn Bus Lines, Inc.	\$19,194
VT	Premier Coach Company, Inc.	\$69,750
WI	Badger Coaches, Inc	\$84,150
	Kobussen Buses Ltd.	\$23,626
	Riteway Bus Service Inc.	\$16,813
Total		\$4,990,000

Table 16. FY 2011 TSGP Final Allocations

State	Agency	Allocation
Arizona	City of Phoenix Public Transit Department	\$52,193
	City of Tucson - Sun Tran	\$306,264
California	Altamont Commuter Express	\$150,000
	San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)	\$20,780,000
	Golden Gate Bridge District	\$251,900
	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority	\$5,744,329
	Orange County Transportation Authority	\$487,030
	Sacramento Regional Transit District	\$384,912
	San Francisco Metropolitan Transit Authority	\$927,184
Colorado	Regional Transportation District	\$267,750
Connecticut	Connecticut Department of Transportation	\$4,648,909
District of Columbia	Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority (WMATA)	\$12,714,496
Florida	Broward County Transit	\$197,400
	Pinellas Sun Coast Transit Authority (PSTA)	\$439,500
Georgia	Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA)	\$2,009,359
Hawaii	City & County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services	\$254,000
Illinois	Chicago Transit Authority (CTA)	\$21,046,924
	Northeast Illinois Commuter Railroad Corporation (METRA)	\$6,140,827
Massachusetts	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	\$8,105,101
Maryland	Maryland Transit Administration (MTA)	\$9,096,938
Minnesota	Metropolitan Council	\$1,036,600
Missouri	Bi-State Development Agency	\$28,360
North Carolina	Charlotte Area Transit System	\$130,128
New Jersey	Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA/PATCO)	\$6,677,135
	New Jersey Transit	\$16,430,983
New Mexico	Sun Tran of Albuquerque/ABQ Ride - City of Albuquerque	\$76,716
New York	New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA)	\$42,946,775
	Niagara Frontier Transit Authority	\$455,766
	Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ)	\$28,600,000
	Rochester Genesee Regional Transportation Authority	\$177,132
Ohio	Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority	\$1,124,571
	Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority	\$411,048
Oregon	Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District (Tri-Met)	\$1,744,775
Pennsylvania	Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA)	\$1,873,975
Texas	Dallas Area Rapid Transit	\$589,135
	Houston Metro	\$343,424
Virginia	Arlington Rapid Transit	\$235,522
Washington	King County Metro	\$2,810,939
Wisconsin	Milwaukee County, Wisconsin	\$381,000
Total		\$200,079,000

April 25, 2017
HB 74 Real ID Act
House Finance Committee
The Alaska State House of Representatives
Juneau, Alaska

Thank you, Co-Chairs Seaton and Foster, I am Aves Thompson, Executive Director of the Alaska Trucking Association. The Alaska Trucking Association is a state wide organization representing the interests of our nearly 200 member companies from Barrow to Ketchikan. Freight movement is an essential element of our economy and impacts all of us each and every day.

- HB34 Real ID Act and its companion bill in the other body provides for a compliant Federal Real ID driver's license in addition to Alaska's current non-compliant Federal Real ID driver's license.
- These changes include the Commercial Driver's License (CDL).
- DMV's web page shows a total of nearly 33,000 Alaska CDL holders and there are thousands of commercial vehicle drivers who are not required to hold a CDL because of the weight of the truck.
- Many commercial vehicle drivers, both CDL and non CDL have need to enter military installations in the course of their daily deliveries.
- As you can see from the numbers, the impact of a non-compliant CDL or other driver's license would be considerable.
- Military installations are governed by Federal rules and after June 6, 2017, will no longer accept an Alaska issued driver's license as a form of acceptable identification.
- Drivers will need to obtain a Federally recognized (Real ID Act compliant) form of identification in order to gain access to military installations.
- Commodities delivered include, food, fuel, consumer goods, military material, all things necessary to supply a small city while providing for the national defense.

On behalf of the members of the Alaska Trucking Association, I urge you to move House Bill 74 forward toward passage.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aves Thompson
Executive Director

Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury

TO ALL DISTRICT DIRECTORS
APRIL 4, 1985.

On March 5, 1985, a charge of tax evasion was filed in U.S. District Court in Indianapolis, Indiana by U.S. Attorney George Duncan. The charges were dismissed! The defense attorney, Lowell Becraft of Huntsville, Alabama presented irrefutable evidence that the 16th Amendment to the *U.S. Constitution* was never properly ratified. This amendment which established the "income tax", was signed into law despite serious defects. In reality only two States ratified the amendment and ratification requires 36 states to be valid. The effect of this is such that every tax paid into the Treasury since 1913, is due and refundable to every citizen and business.

The official position of the service is, as it has always been to aid and assist the citizens of the United States. We will not publish or advertise this finding as a total immediate refund would cause a serious drain on the resources of the Treasury. For those citizens who become aware of this finding and apply for a total refund, expedite their refund documents as quickly and as quietly as possible.

A simple 1040X form will suffice until a new form is designed and printed. Advise each of your managers that they are not to discuss this situation with anyone. There will be no written communications and you are to destroy this memorandum.

The Secretary of the Treasury assures me that there will be no reduction in the workforce as this refunding activity will take a minimum of 5 years to complete. Further directions will be forwarded as the need arises.

Roscoe L. Egger, Jr.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue

4/25/17
Charles M. Kee
HB 74

Claim your Account(s), cestui que trust, etc.

I am sending you five attachments. (**Security Agreement and Schedule 'A' Property List**. These first two are for you to modify and file with your UCC-1. (This cost \$20 for me to file here in Anchorage.)

Here are "templates" for your Private Indemnity Bond, Set Off Bond, Bonded Promissory Note, with info. (I valued mine at: "unlimited credit" and \$900B respectively. The third is a Private Registered Bonded Promissory Note – "RBPN".)

1 - Do a "banker's acceptance" on a COLB: On the front at a 45 degree angle, write: "Accepted by Drawee". sign "by:" and date;
On Back, write, "Pay to the Order of the United States of America, U.S. Treasury. All Rights Reserved, Without Recourse". sign "by:" and date.
(Notice: this does NOT need to be authenticated. If one does not have a COLB, a BC endorsed in the same manner will do.)

2 - Send COLB w/ assignment, UCC-1 filing, Private Indemnity Bond, and Set Off Bond to the U.S. Treasury.
Request that the Treas. open your new account using the Registered Mail number you used to mail this package. (This will be your new Treasury account number because you have claimed your cestui que trust/estate, using the IRS form 1099 A, and 1096, (cover 'letter' form*).
(On Private Indemnity Bond, I would include a statement: "I WAIVE any/all State/Fed. limited liability benefits, as I am fully indemnified by this Bond".)
(This removes their subrogation over you and/or your "ACCOUNT". Look up "subrogation". Subrogation is key.)

3 - Then, I used IRS form 56 "fiduciary appointment". And I appointed the Sec. of the Treas. and the Commissioner of the IRS, as my fiduciary/Trustees - "or to their assigns".

~ * ~ *

Claim your cestui que trust

I used the 1099 A to "Claim the cestui que trust, located at 31 USC 1321, and states at 1322: "Whereabouts is unknown". I gave notice to the IRS and claimed my cestui que trust account using form 1099 A. They know where I am now. Alive and well.

And then I told the fiduciary to "execute a deed of conveyance" - to convey my Indemnity Bonds, UCC-1 filing, Liens, court cases, etc. into the new private trust (estate) account - using the Registered Mail number.

Now I have control over this private trust as general executor/co-beneficiary and, very important, read all the things which are indemnified on the Private Indemnity Bond.

We need a real id compliant drivers license. I'm a big advocate for privacy but not everyone can afford a passport to fly.

Steve Bentley

adopt the real ID standard.
Michael Kreger

ALASKA AFL-CIO

3333 Denali Street, Suite 125 · Anchorage, Alaska 99503 · 907-258-6284 · Fax 777-7276

VINCE BELTRAMI
Executive President



JIM DUNCAN
Secretary / Treasurer

May 8, 2017

Dear Representative Neal Foster ,

We are writing to ask for House Leadership's assistance in getting HB 74, the Real ID bill passed in the House on behalf of the members of the Alaska AFL-CIO, and all working Alaskans. HB 74 is a legislative priority of the Alaska AFL-CIO that needs to pass both houses and be ready for the governor to sign by May 17, 2017. The timing is critical to assure enough time to get in the request for the extension from Homeland Security for a seamless transition to the Real ID program.

We have testified to and written letters about how the lacking Capital Budget will create a shortfall of work for our building trades members throughout the state. The bright spot of up and coming construction work will be on the military bases, creating many building trade jobs. We need the Real ID Bill passed to make it easier for Alaskans to access these jobs. As you are aware after June 8, 2017 our members will not be able to use their current Alaska Drivers License to enter our bases. Without the passage of HB74 or SB 34, an unnecessary obstacle for getting to work will be created. Then, as of January 22, 2018 none of our members will be able to fly to or for work in so many parts of the state with their Alaska Drivers License, providing another barrier, and making it more difficult to board the plane.

Yes, many of our members can get a passport, but some can't. Why would the legislature force us to send all that money out of state to the Feds for a passport when we can keep it in state and get a Real ID?

Finally, this is a totally **voluntary option**. You don't have to get the Real ID if you don't want one, but we should at least give those that want one the option to get one.

Once again HB 74 and SB 34 Real ID is a **PRIORITY** of the Alaska AFL-CIO. Please pass this bill **NOW!**

###