



Claire McCaskill

Missouri State Auditor

---

May 2006

## PUBLIC SAFETY

# Homeland Security Program



Office Of The  
State Auditor Of Missouri  
Claire McCaskill

May 2006

**The following findings were included in our audit report on the Department of Public Safety, Homeland Security Program.**

---

Missouri has lagged behind several neighboring states in establishing an intelligence fusion center and may have increased the state's vulnerability to acts of terrorism. An intelligence fusion center is needed to provide resources, expertise, and information to help detect, prevent, and monitor terrorism within the state. This center will be threat-driven, operational 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Future federal funding may be contingent on the establishment of such a center. The idea of an intelligence fusion center has been discussed since January 2003 with various projected costs and funding sources. Finally, in December 2005, staffing began on a Missouri fusion center and it was officially named the Missouri Information Analysis Center (MIAC). Department personnel indicated that it may take another two years to fully staff the MIAC.

The state distributed almost 19,000 individual personal protective equipment (PPE) complements to emergency medical services (EMS) and law enforcement agencies (LEA) statewide. The PPE included breathing masks, chemical suits, gloves, boots, and related accessories. PPE was distributed to some local agencies that did not need or want the equipment. We visited 43 EMS, fire, and LEA agencies and noted several different levels of effective use of the PPE. Some agencies claimed they were waiting to obtain training. One agency supervisor indicated he and his staff did not even know how to assemble the PPE components. At the police departments for the cities of Kansas City and St. Louis, as well as other locations, PPE remained unopened and stored in its original boxes. Furthermore, SEMA did not adequately monitor the distribution of the PPE and does not have accurate records of the various agencies that received equipment.

Also, a lack of information exists regarding the proper storage and/or issuance of the PPE. We noted that some local agencies required that PPE be stored, ready for use, in official vehicles, while other local agencies stored the PPE at their headquarters to be issued in the event of an emergency. In addition, there are no statewide use restrictions to guide local agencies. Personnel at some agencies that we visited claimed they did not know usage requirements and limitations for the PPE. The lack of such restrictions may result in improper usage occurring. One local official informed us that part of the PPE may be used for personal hunting.

Missouri's progress has been slow towards achieving its goal of communications interoperability. Communications interoperability enables responders to effectively communicate with one another through a common language and a common system during an emergency. In 2004, a contractor hired to review the state's interoperability reported

YELLOW SHEET

that Missouri had not achieved interoperability across many areas of the state, emergency responders were not properly trained or equipped to communicate in a unified environment, and that communications equipment was old and costly to maintain. The same contractor was again hired the next year to assess and monitor Missouri's 28 Homeland Security Response Teams (HSRT's). In their monitoring report, the contractor found communications interoperability problems, along with several other response weaknesses, existed with 46 percent of teams, including the HSRT's in the high risk areas of the cities of St. Louis and Kansas City. Common issues reported by the contractor included a lack of radios and cellular telephones, age of the equipment, and a lack of towers and repeaters.

As of July 2005, statewide expenditures for communications interoperability had accumulated to \$2.05 million, or approximately 26 percent of the amount budgeted to accomplish this goal. The contractor's initial communications interoperability study found no formal leadership authority for communication issues in Missouri and that the state needed coordinated and integrated planning to shape its communications future. Also, SEMA did not conduct a formal needs assessment prior to contracting for the communications interoperability study and it appears state officials were already aware of the statewide interoperability problems. As a result, the state may have unnecessarily paid approximately \$247,000 for the 2004 study.

Also included in the report are recommendations related to the strategic plan, program monitoring and oversight, federal compliance issues, and response team issues.

**All reports are available on our website: [www.auditor.mo.gov](http://www.auditor.mo.gov)**

STATE AUDITOR'S REPORT



**CLAIRE C. McCASKILL**  
**Missouri State Auditor**

Honorable Matt Blunt, Governor  
and  
Mark James, Director  
Department of Public Safety  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
and  
Ronald M. Reynolds, Director  
State Emergency Management Agency  
2302 Militia Drive  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

We have audited the Homeland Security Program administered by the Department of Public Safety, State Emergency Management Agency. The scope of this audit included, but was not necessarily limited to, the years ended June 30, 2005 and 2004. The scope of this audit did not include bioterrorism funds received by the Department of Health and Senior Services from the Centers for Disease Controls, or funds spent by the departments of Agriculture and Natural Resources in their efforts against terrorism. These programs may be the subject of a future audit. The objectives of this audit were to:

1. Review the receipt and expenditure of federal Department of Homeland Security monies by the Department of Public Safety.
2. Review internal controls over significant management and financial functions related to the state's Homeland Security Program.
3. Review compliance with certain legal provisions, including compliance with federal grant and contract requirements related to funds received from the federal Department of Homeland Security.
4. Evaluate the economy and efficiency of certain management practices and operations related to the state's Homeland Security Program.

Our methodology to accomplish these objectives included reviewing minutes of meetings, written policies, financial records, and other pertinent documents; interviewing various

personnel of the department, as well as certain external parties; and testing selected transactions. We also conducted site visits to various program subrecipients of the State Emergency Management Agency.

In addition, we obtained an understanding of internal controls significant to the audit objectives and considered whether specific controls have been properly designed and placed in operation. We also performed tests of certain controls to obtain evidence regarding the effectiveness of their design and operation. However, providing an opinion on internal controls was not an objective of our audit and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

We also obtained an understanding of legal provisions significant to the audit objectives, and we assessed the risk that illegal acts, including fraud, and violations of contract, grant agreement, or other legal provisions could occur. Based on that risk assessment, we designed and performed procedures to provide reasonable assurance of detecting significant instances of noncompliance with the provisions. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

Our audit was conducted in accordance with applicable standards contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and included such procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

The accompanying History, Organization, and Statistical Information is presented for informational purposes. This information was obtained from the department's management and was not subjected to the procedures applied in the audit of the program.

The accompanying Management Advisory Report presents our findings arising from our audit of the Homeland Security Program administered by the Department of Public Safety, State Emergency Management Agency.



Claire McCaskill  
State Auditor

December 1, 2005 (fieldwork completion date)

The following auditors participated in the preparation of this report:

Director of Audits: Kenneth W. Kuster, CPA  
Audit Manager: Alice M. Fast, CPA  
In-Charge Auditor: Dan Vandersteen, CPA  
Audit Staff: Cliff Lewton, CPA  
Jennifer Martin  
Jonathan Edwards

MANAGEMENT ADVISORY REPORT -  
STATE AUDITOR'S FINDINGS

HOMELAND SECURITY PROGRAM  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY  
MANAGEMENT ADVISORY REPORT -  
STATE AUDITOR'S FINDINGS

1.

**Intelligence Fusion Center**

Missouri lagged behind several neighboring states in establishing an intelligence fusion center. Of the seven neighboring states that responded to our inquiry, we noted that Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, and Tennessee all currently had working intelligence fusion centers. Missouri began staffing an intelligence fusion center in December 2005.

Missouri's intelligence fusion center is planned to be a cooperative effort of several agencies who provide resources, expertise, and information for the ability to detect, prevent, and monitor terrorism within the state of Missouri. The intelligence fusion center will be operational 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

The Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP) has maintained an intelligence center, currently known as the Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN), since prior to September 11, 2001. The HSIN is only monitored five days a week from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. and thus, is not monitored nights and weekends. Missouri also has a State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC) and several local emergency operations centers to deal with responses to all disasters. Once implemented, the intelligence fusion center will differ from the HSIN and other emergency centers as intelligence fusion centers are threat-driven and act as a prevention method. The HSIN is generally specific to investigative case support and the emergency centers focus on disaster recovery efforts. Currently, it is planned to eventually incorporate the HSIN into the intelligence fusion center.

Since January 2003, the idea of an intelligence fusion center has been discussed with various projected costs and names. The state's former Homeland Security Director initially estimated a \$10 million start-up cost, with an estimated \$2 to \$3 million annual cost. The initial goal was to have the center operational by October 1, 2004. By May 2004, costs over the next four years were projected to be \$50 million with a workforce of 33 personnel. Due to the high projected cost, the state's former Homeland Security Director sought, but was unable to obtain, federal Department of Justice (DOJ) funding. Progress on the fusion center stalled as no funding sources could be identified. In July 2005, the new state Homeland Security Director renewed planning discussions for the fusion center. In December 2005, staffing began on the fusion center and it was officially named the Missouri Information Analysis Center (MIAC). State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) personnel have indicated that it may take another two years for full staffing of the MIAC. The state's slow pace toward implementation of an intelligence fusion center may have increased Missouri's vulnerability.

According to a 2005 federal Department of Justice report entitled Recommended Fusion Center Standards – Recommended Minimum Standards for Establishing and Operating



*the Intelligence Component of Fusion Centers for Local, State, Tribal, and Federal Law Enforcement*, "HSPD-5 (Homeland Security Presidential Directive #5), requires the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to coordinate with other federal departments and state, local, and tribal governments to establish a National Response Plan (NRP) and a National Incident Management System (NIMS). Each of these items plays a role in the establishment of fusion centers and lays a foundation for enhanced information and intelligence sharing among all levels of law enforcement, public safety, and the private sector." SEMA personnel have indicated they believe that Missouri's future federal funding may be contingent on the establishment of a working intelligence fusion center. To increase Missouri's ability to detect, prevent, and monitor terrorism within the state, and to ensure Missouri remains eligible for future federal homeland security funding, efforts should continue towards implementing an intelligence fusion center.

**WE RECOMMEND** the Department of Public Safety implement a working intelligence fusion center.

### **AUDITEE'S RESPONSE**

*We agree with the auditor's recommendation. The Missouri Department of Public Safety established an intelligence fusion center, hereafter called the Missouri Information Analysis Center (MIAC), in September 2005. The MIAC was established by the newly formed Homeland Security Advisory Council (HSAC). This administration identified that as a priority which was overlooked by the previous administration. Additionally, it was determined the location of the present staff, that was located at an adjunct Missouri Highway State Highway (MSHP) facility, was not compliant with the newly enacted National Incident Management System (NIMS) that suggests a Fusion Center (MIAC) would be more appropriately co-located with the State Emergency Operations Center. This resulted with the core group analysts being transferred to the Ike Skelton Training Center in a work center adjacent to SEMA. We are committed to ensuring MIAC will be adequately staffed to meet public safety needs.*

***Anticipated completion date: July 2007***

<b>2. Communications Interoperability</b>
---

Missouri has not achieved its goal of communications interoperability. Communications interoperability enables responders to effectively communicate with one another through a common language and a common system during an emergency. Incidents such as the 9/11 terrorist attacks and various natural disasters have repeatedly demonstrated the vital importance of communications interoperability.

The Missouri State Homeland Security Strategy Plan contained an objective to establish statewide interoperable communications plans by August 2005; however, this date has been revised to May 2006. The Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC) is currently working on writing a state-wide communications plan. Once the state-wide

plan is written, the state's individual highway patrol regions will write plans specific to their region.

- A. Missouri's progress has been slow towards achieving its goal of communications interoperability. In 2004, a contractor hired to review the states interoperability reported that Missouri had not achieved interoperability across many areas of the state, emergency responders were not properly trained or equipped to communicate in a unified environment, and that communications equipment was old and costly to maintain. The same contractor was again hired the next year to assess and monitor Missouri's 28 Homeland Security Response Teams (HSRT's). In their monitoring report, the contractor found communications interoperability problems existed with 13 of the 28 (46.4 percent) teams, including the HSRT's in the high risk areas of the cities of St. Louis and Kansas City. Common issues reported by the contractor included a lack of radios and cellular telephones, age of the equipment, and a lack of towers and repeaters, all of which limit interoperability at the first responder level. The contractor also found a need for some teams to choose one universal system for all their participating disciplines to respond at the highest, most effective level.

State officials have known since before the 2004 contractor report that communications interoperability problems existed throughout the state and progress remains ongoing towards achieving communications interoperability. However, it is a long and costly process. As of July 2005, statewide expenditures for communications interoperability had accumulated to \$2.05 million out of the \$7.83 million budgeted, or approximately 26 percent. This relatively slow rate of progress may have resulted from conditions pointed out in the contractors initial communications interoperability study. The contractor found there was no formal leadership authority for communication issues in Missouri and that the state needed coordinated and integrated planning to shape its communications future.

It is imperative for the state to continue working towards achieving its goal of communications interoperability. Communications interoperability is essential for all of Missouri's responders to function safely and effectively in their efforts to reduce risks to people's lives and property.

- B. The SEMA did not conduct a formal needs assessment prior to contracting for the communications interoperability study and it appears state officials were already aware of the statewide interoperability problems. As a result, the state may have unnecessarily paid approximately \$247,000 for the 2004 study.

Prior to the 2004 report, there already existed similar findings and recommendations in After Action Reports resulting from HSRT exercises. Also, some SEMA and MSHP officials indicated the contractor's study was unnecessary because the state was already aware of the conditions noted in the report and that the issue had been studied before. Therefore, they believed it was considered common knowledge by state public safety officials that communications

interoperability was a problem. Other SEMA officials we spoke with indicated the reason for hiring the contractor was a perceived need for an independent, credible source to persuade some local jurisdictions and state agencies that interoperability was a problem.

A formal needs assessment should be conducted prior to authorizing consulting contracts to evaluate the issues discussed above and the costs and benefits that may arise from such a contract.

**WE RECOMMEND** the Department of Public Safety:

- A. Continue working towards achieving the goal of communications interoperability.
- B. Conduct formal needs assessments prior to entering into consulting contracts.

**AUDITEE'S RESPONSE**

- A. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. The Department of Public Safety and SEMA under the direction of the Missouri Homeland Security Advisory Council will continue to address all issues related to statewide communications interoperability. Additionally, the state is addressing potential public/private partnerships through the State Interoperable Communications Executive Committee (SIEC). The membership of the SIEC includes state agencies, local jurisdictions and private enterprises.*
- B. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation relating to the decision of the prior administration to contract for a communication interoperability study costing \$247,000. The Department of Public Safety and SEMA will ensure formal needs assessments be conducted prior to entering into any future consulting contracts if it is determined that outside assistance is needed.*

***Anticipated completion date: Ongoing***

<b>3. Personal Protective Equipment Purchases</b>
---

The state distributed over \$9.2 million [approximately \$1.8 million to emergency medical services (EMS) and \$7.4 million to law enforcement agencies (LEAs)] of personal protective equipment (PPE) to first responders statewide without adequate planning, coordination, or training. The state distributed almost 19,000 individual PPE complements statewide including breathing masks, chemical suits, gloves, boots, and related accessories. We reviewed the PPE expenditures and conducted site visits to various local agencies and noted the following:

- A. The state may have purchased more PPE than necessary. PPE was distributed to some local agencies that did not need or want the equipment. Some local agency officials indicated they already owned similar equipment and the PPE provided by

the state may never be used. While state officials conducted a general survey of the PPE needs of the state's EMS, fire, and LEA agencies, the survey apparently did not address the individual needs of all local agencies. Local agencies indicated to us they were merely required to report their number of personnel to indicate how many sets of PPE they could receive.

To avoid the possibility of over purchasing, the state should conduct detailed needs assessments prior to any future statewide homeland security equipment purchases.

B. The state did not adequately assess the training needs and requirements of the local responders regarding their PPE. As a result, some local responders may not have received sufficient training to properly use their PPE and some PPE remains unopened and stored in its original boxes.

1. Local responders may not have received sufficient training to properly use their PPE. We visited 43 EMS, fire, and LEA agencies and noted several EMS and LEA agencies that had never opened their shipment of PPE or did not plan to use the PPE. Some agencies claim they never opened the shipment because they were waiting to obtain training related to the PPE. Other agencies claimed they did not plan to use the PPE because they had received no training and did not know usage requirements and limitations for the PPE. One agency supervisor indicated he and his staff did not even know how to assemble the PPE components. Some agencies had at least one staff person with appropriate training for the PPE; however, this was not always shared amongst the entire staff.

There also exists a lack of information regarding the proper storage and/or issuance of the PPE that should be addressed by state. We noted that some local agencies required that PPE be stored, ready for use, in official vehicles. Other local agencies stored the PPE at their headquarters to be issued in the event of an emergency. Some of these local agencies indicated they would not require that PPE be stored in official vehicles because they believed exposure to temperature variations could be damaging to the PPE. We were told by other agencies that temperature variations would not effect the PPE.

State agencies such as the SEMA and the Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS), along with the University of Missouri and other entities, do offer the various types of training necessary; however, some local agencies claimed they did not know about such training. SEMA staff also indicated that some local agencies may pay for staff training required for maintaining certification within a discipline, but do not always pay for additional training such as that relating to the PPE. Therefore, it is possible some local personnel may not have been able to

obtain the additional PPE related training due to local budgetary constraints.

To ensure responders possess the knowledge and qualifications to safely and effectively use their PPE in response situations, the state should take steps to ensure local responders acquire the training necessary to properly use their PPE.

2. The PPE at some locations remained unopened and stored in its original boxes. The two largest agencies at which this was observed were the cities of Kansas City and St. Louis Police Departments (PD). These agencies stored the PPE in their respective warehouses. If PPE are not issued to officers, or at least stored at the various police stations, it will not be ready for use in the event of an emergency. This condition was also observed at some other smaller local agencies during our site visits.

The Kansas City PD received 1,359 PPE complements over a period of time beginning as early as May 2004. According to a PD official, the PPE has been sitting at the warehouse because personnel in-charge of administering the PPE did not follow through with its distribution. The official also indicated the PD did not have a specific plan for distributing the PPE, although he expected the equipment to be distributed by the first part of 2006.

The city of St. Louis PD received 1,438 PPE complements beginning as early as May 2004. Approximately 200 of the PPE had been issued and the remaining PPE remained stored unopened in their warehouse. According to a PD official, the bulk of the PPE remains warehoused due to the fact that they have not received training on the equipment. Only the new officers of the department, and a few others, have been trained on the PPE. According to the PD official, the PD follows OSHA requirements and will not issue the PPE until each officer has been trained properly. The PD is currently working on a policy regarding sizing, training, and use restrictions for the PPE.

To aid in the safety and effectiveness of responders, the state should require all PPE be distributed to responders or at least maintained in a state of readiness in the event of a disaster.

- C. There exists no statewide use restrictions to guide local agencies on the proper use of the PPE. While the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-102 Common Rule generally requires that federal equipment be used in the program for which it was acquired, the lack of more specific statewide use restrictions may result in improper usage to occur with some of the PPE. One local official informed us that part of the PPE may be used by personnel for personal hunting use.

To help ensure homeland security equipment is used only for authorized purposes, the state should establish and maintain use restrictions to guide local agencies on the proper use of their equipment.

- D. The SEMA did not adequately monitor the contractor that distributed PPE to local LEAs. As a result, some local LEAs did not receive their allotted PPE, due apparently to communication misunderstandings. In addition, the lack of adequate monitoring has resulted in SEMA's records not accurately reflecting the location of the distributed PPE.

The SEMA contracted with the Missouri Police Chiefs' Association to distribute the PPE to the LEAs. The LEAs were notified by SEMA that they could request a drop shipment to their location or obtain the PPE at the Missouri Police Chiefs' Association's warehouse in Jefferson City. During our site visits, LEAs that had not received PPE claimed they had never received notices about the PPE's availability. Others incorrectly assumed their County Sheriff had obtained their PPE for them. Our subsequent visit to the Missouri Police Chiefs' Association revealed that the unclaimed items had already been distributed to other LEAs who requested additional items. Thus, there remained little or no supply of PPE to distribute to the LEAs who had never received their PPE. Additionally, due to the lack of adequate monitoring, SEMA's records inaccurately reflected PPE going to some LEAs who never actually received PPE while also not reflecting the additional PPE obtained at a later date by other LEAs.

To ensure the propriety of any future equipment distributions and the accuracy of recordkeeping thereon, the SEMA should appropriately monitor any contractors it uses.

**WE RECOMMEND** the Department of Public Safety:

- A. Conduct detailed needs assessments prior to any future statewide homeland security equipment purchases. Subsequent equipment distribution should then be based upon the identified need.
- B.1. Take steps to ensure local responders acquire the training and knowledge necessary to properly use and store their PPE.
  - 2. Require all PPE be distributed to responders or at least maintained in a state of readiness in the event of a disaster.
- C. Establish and maintain use restrictions to guide local agencies on the proper use of their equipment.
- D. Appropriately monitor contractors to ensure the propriety of any future equipment distributions.

**AUDITEE'S RESPONSE**

- A. *The previous administration failed to conduct a detailed needs assessment. The present administration, realizing these shortcomings, directed that the State Homeland Security Program be streamlined to remove the current inefficiencies. The Governor directed that all Homeland Security responsibilities would be merged into the existing Department of Public Safety. This will allow the Director to coordinate efforts, maintain better organization, and implement more timely and effective planning, response, recovery and mitigation at the state level.*
  
- B.1. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. We have taken steps to implement this recommendation. As part of the program, jurisdictions are required to sign a statement that they agree to maintain the equipment and ensure personnel are trained on its use and care. The Missouri Police Chiefs' Association conducts training in all jurisdictions.*
  
- B.2. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. Local jurisdictions determine the issue of PPE to first responders and SEMA will reemphasize the proper storage of PPE in the bi-monthly bulletins. It is not the state's responsibility to maintain the purchased equipment; however, SEMA has taken proactive measures to provide additional training whenever requested by local first responders.*
  
- C. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. SEMA will reemphasize the proper use and restrictions to the use of PPE in the bi-monthly bulletins. It is not the state's responsibility to maintain the purchased equipment; however, SEMA has taken proactive measures to provide additional training whenever requested by local first responders.*
  
- D. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. We have taken steps to implement this recommendation.*

**Anticipated completion date:** Ongoing

<b>4. Strategic Plan</b>
--------------------------

Although the Missouri Homeland Security Strategy Plan dated November 17, 2004, met the requirements of the Office of Domestic Preparedness (ODP), some elements of a strategic plan were missing. There were no long-term goals or budgeted dollar amounts for most plan objectives. There were no plans for a public/private cooperative for homeland security research and development challenges in Missouri. Also, there has been no discussion on how to protect citizens' civil liberties in homeland security activities.

- A. The Strategy Plan contains short and mid-term goals, objectives, and completion dates. These goals, objectives, and completion dates cover the plan up until October 2006. However, the Strategy Plan does not contain any long-term goals, objectives, or completion dates. For example, the Strategy Plan did not contain a

long-term goal relating to the future funding of equipment replacement. Such a goal is necessary to ensure the state is prepared to handle future equipment replacement needs. In addition, the plan did not contain estimated costs for all of its goals, and estimated costs for some goals were not up-to-date and reflective of changes occurring in the estimates.

Establishing longer range goals, objectives, and completion dates would provide guidance to the state and allow for efficient and practical long range homeland security planning. This would also allow the state to measure progress towards its long range strategic goals, ensuring the strategic plan remains an effective planning and management tool. In addition, establishing and maintaining current cost estimates for all strategic plan goals would assist the state in allocating resources in the most effective manner. Establishing and monitoring cost estimates for the state's long range goals is also necessary due to the unpredictability regarding types and levels of future federal assistance that may or may not be available.

- B. We obtained and reviewed homeland security strategic plans from four nearby states and compared them with Missouri's plan. We noted that Missouri's plan had no objective for a public/private homeland security cooperative nor an objective ensuring that the state did not infringe upon the civil liberties of its citizens.
- 1) The Missouri strategy did not contain any goals or objectives that relate to developing a public/private cooperative to provide Missouri and the nation with research, development, science, technology, and testing capabilities to assist in identifying and resolving homeland security challenges. Such a goal may be used by the state for both near and long term solutions to homeland security challenges and may help set national standards.
  - 2) The Missouri strategy did not contain any goals or objectives ensuring that it did not infringe upon the civil liberties of its citizens. We found no discussion in the minutes of the Missouri Homeland Security Council that any consideration was given as to how or if the state's homeland security strategy might infringe upon the civil liberties of its citizens. In addition, there was no documentation of a review of the implementation strategy steps by the Attorney General's Office or other appropriate legal counsel. The state should consider measures to ensure that its Homeland Security Strategy Plan does not infringe upon the civil rights of its citizens.

**WE RECOMMEND** the Department of Public Safety:

- A. Establish and monitor within the Homeland Security Strategy Plan long-term goals and objectives, including a long-term goal of funding future equipment replacement costs. Both long and short-term goals should have corresponding



cost estimates to provide assistance in allocating resources in the most effective manner.

- B.1. Establish goals and objectives within the Homeland Security Strategy Plan that relate to developing a public/private cooperative to provide Missouri and the nation with research, development, science, technology, and testing capabilities to assist in identifying and resolving homeland security challenges.
2. Establish goals and objectives to ensure the state's homeland security strategy does not infringe upon the civil liberties of its citizens. In addition, the council should require the State Attorney General's Office or other appropriate legal counsel review the implementation of the Homeland Security strategy steps annually to further ensure that the state is not infringing upon the civil liberties of its citizens.

### **AUDITEE'S RESPONSE**

- A. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. The Department of Public Safety through the Missouri Homeland Security Advisory Council has established the long-term goals and objectives.*

*The current plan was reviewed, updated and submitted to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security on October 31, 2005, after the completion of the audit. The former plan was created by the prior administration on November 17, 2004. Although a completely new plan was not required by the issuance of the Executive Order creating the HSAC, U.S. DHS required a complete review of the plan to include information on compliance with the NIMS and the National Response Plan. Based on federal grant guidelines, funding issues and concerns will be addressed and revised.*

- B1. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. The original format for the strategy from the DHS did not require the establishment of goals and objectives within the Strategy or address the development of public/private cooperatives efforts, this was intentional on the part of the DHS. Federal grant funds cannot be used to finance public/private cooperatives; however, the new guidance coming from DHS, DPS, and SEMA will address this issue.*

*The current plan was reviewed, updated and submitted to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security on October 31, 2005, after the completion of the audit. After the issuance of the Executive Order creating the HSAC, U.S. DHS required a complete review of the plan to include information on compliance with the NIMS and the National Response Plan.*

- B2. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. The original format for the strategy from the DHS did not require the establishment of goals and objectives within the Strategy or address the infringement of the civil liberties of the citizens of the State; however, the new guidance coming from DHS, DPS, and SEMA will address this issue.*

*The current plan was reviewed, updated and submitted to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security on October 31, 2005, after the completion of the audit. After the issuance of the Executive Order creating the HSAC, U.S. DHS required a complete review of the plan to include information on compliance with the NIMS and the National Response Plan. Although not required, the DPS has determined that this plan will be reviewed by legal counsel.*

**Anticipated completion date:** December 31, 2006

<b>5. Response Team Issues</b>
--------------------------------

Response teams may not be adequately prepared to effectively respond to Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, or Explosive (CBRNE) incidents due to inadequate staffing levels, a lack of operational planning, a lack of sufficient training, problems with communications interoperability, insufficiency of the amount of equipment provided or on hand, and/or a need for improvement on equipment inventory and/or maintenance records.

Since fiscal year 1999, the SEMA has received federal grant awards for the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP). The program's objective is to continue to protect and defend the security of the United States of America against the threat posed by terrorism. Program funding may be used to conduct comprehensive threat and needs assessments, and to develop and implement a Statewide Domestic Preparedness Strategy. The SEMA has expended a portion of the HSGP funds to equip and train 23 Homeland Security Response Teams (HSRT's) and seven Forward Regional Response Teams (FRRT's) located throughout the state. The results of our audit indicate a need to better manage and monitor the resources provided to the response teams. From fiscal year 1999 through September 2005, over \$30 million has been spent by the SEMA on the response teams.

The SEMA hired a contractor to evaluate all of the state's HSRT's and FRRT's. The contractor conducted evaluations during January through April 2005 and produced 28 reports, one apiece for 26 teams plus two reports combining the results for the four remaining response teams. The contractor assessed each team's preparedness in five areas: team composition, planning, training, equipment, and communications interoperability. We obtained and reviewed the contractor's reports, noting the following conditions:

- A. Understaffing was noted on 8 of the 28 (28.6 percent) response team reports. This resulted from the SEMA not establishing clear, written minimum staffing level requirements for the teams. In addition, a lack of an adequate team roster was noted on 11 of the 28 (39.3 percent) response team reports. SEMA officials indicated the amount of equipment to be provided correlated to the level of staffing; thus, indicating minimum staffing level requirements. Since the SEMA did not obtain, nor require information regarding the teams' staffing levels, several teams were accepted into the program that did not meet the minimum

staffing level requirements. An understaffed team would not be able to respond as effectively to a CBRNE incident as a fully staffed team. In addition, an understaffed team would have been provided more equipment than was necessary. Further, requiring teams to maintain current rosters of all members may prove to aid with organizing for both trainings and actual responses.

The SEMA should establish clear, written minimum staffing level requirements for the teams. Such requirements should be enforced when additional teams apply for inclusion in the program. In addition, the SEMA should take the necessary steps to ensure existing teams meet minimum staffing level requirements, as documented by current rosters of all members, and that equipment levels are proportional to team size.

- B. A lack of operational plans was noted on 5 of the 28 (17.9 percent) response team reports. The contractor's report noted "an operational plan that covers all disciplines' roles, responsibilities, and hazards will enable response efforts to occur in a more efficient and coordinated manner." The SEMA should take steps to ensure all teams establish and maintain proper operational plans.
- C. Inadequate training or a lack of adequate training records was noted on 6 of the 28 (21.4 percent) response team reports. The monitoring report indicated that on one team, many members had never received the training needed to operate the response equipment. For another team, the monitoring report indicated that only the hazmat team members were trained to the majority of the standards set by the SEMA. Maintaining and improving readiness through adequate training is essential for a response team to function safely, efficiently, and effectively. The SEMA should take steps to ensure all teams are participating in adequate training and maintaining proper records of such training.
- D. Inadequate communications interoperability was noted on 13 of the 28 (46.4 percent) response team reports. As noted above in MAR No. 2, establishing and maintaining communications interoperability is essential for the state's response teams to function safely and effectively in their efforts to reduce risks to people's lives and property.
- E. An insufficient amount of response equipment was found on hand and reported on 4 of the 28 (14.3 percent) response team reports. The monitoring report indicated that even though equipment funding was available through the SEMA, some teams were not adequately equipped to respond to a CBRNE incident. The monitoring report also indicated that another team believed they were inadequately equipped, and until additional equipment was received, they would not distribute the equipment already in their possession. Ensuring response teams maintain an adequate amount and type of equipment would help to ensure safer, efficient, and effective responses to incidents.

- F. Improvement was needed on equipment inventory and/or maintenance records on 10 of the 28 (35.7 percent) response team reports. Adequate equipment inventory records are necessary to aid the teams and the SEMA in knowing how much equipment is available at given locations. This knowledge may be helpful during a response to an incident. In addition, such records are necessary to aid in ensuring valuable equipment is adequately insured. Maintaining proper equipment maintenance records will help ensure all equipment is kept at peak operating condition in the event of an incident.

The SEMA should continue to work on establishing an adequate system to monitor the response teams, including the development of clear, written minimum staffing level requirements, and ensuring teams have proper operational plans, adequate training, communications interoperability, and sufficient levels of equipment along with equipment inventory and maintenance records. Not knowing the resources available and overall abilities of the response teams could hamper the SEMA's ability to perform one of its basic functions, coordinating and directing activities of the state and teams in the event of a significant incident.

**WE RECOMMEND** the Department of Public Safety, through the State Emergency Management Agency:

- A. Establish and enforce clear, written minimum staffing level requirements for the teams. Such requirements should be enforced when additional teams apply for inclusion in the program. In addition, SEMA should take the necessary steps to ensure existing teams meet minimum staffing level requirements, as documented by current rosters of all members, and that equipment levels are proportional to team size.
- B. Require all response teams to establish and maintain adequate operational plans.
- C. Require and ensure all response teams participate in sufficient and adequate training and that the teams maintain records of such training.
- D. Continue working towards the goals of establishing and maintaining adequate communications interoperability at all response teams.
- E. Ensure response teams maintain an adequate amount and type of equipment.
- F. Ensure response teams maintain adequate equipment inventory and maintenance records.

**AUDITEE'S RESPONSE**

*A,B,C,*

*E&F. We agree with the auditor's recommendation. To implement the recommended corrective action, SEMA established a working group made up representatives of each team. This*

*working group is jointly developing a Standard Operating Guide (SOG) that addresses all the issues identified.*

- D. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. The Department of Public Safety and SEMA, under the direction of the Missouri Homeland Security Advisory Council, will continue to explore potential options relating to statewide communications interoperability.*

**Anticipated completion date:** A/B/C/E/F: December 31, 2006

D: Ongoing

<b>6. Program Monitoring and Oversight</b>
--

There is a lack of monitoring controls by the SEMA to ensure state agencies and local jurisdictions improve weaknesses identified during homeland security exercises. Further, we noted the SEMA should determine the feasibility of retaining a larger portion of the 3 percent Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) management and administration allocation to improve UASI program monitoring.

- A. There is a lack of monitoring controls by the SEMA to ensure state agencies and local jurisdictions improve weaknesses identified during homeland security exercises. As a result, the SEMA cannot be certain the benefits of the exercises were fully realized by the state nor whether improvements were made by the response teams to correct identified weaknesses.

The SEMA used HSGP funding to conduct exercises for the Homeland Security Response Teams (HSRT) and Forward Regional Response Teams (FRRT) during 2005 and 2004. Upon completion of the 2005 exercises, a contractor prepared after-action reports (AAR's) documenting an evaluation of each response team's exercise. The AAR's identified various implementation steps for each response team to improve upon. Upon completion of the 2004 exercises, each response team completed a self-evaluation regarding the functional areas exercised, lessons learned, and corrective actions needed for improvement. Both the AAR's and self evaluations were obtained by the SEMA. However, the SEMA conducted no documented follow-up monitoring on the teams to ensure action was being taken as noted in the post-exercise reports. As a result of the lack of follow-up, we noted that one HSRT reported on their 2005 exercise similar findings as noted on a previous exercise. Had the SEMA followed up on the previous exercise and required corrective action be taken, the HSRT may have already corrected these deficiencies prior to their 2005 exercise.

The SEMA also used HSGP funding to hire a contractor to support SEMA's state Continuity of Operations – Continuity of Government (COOP-COG) exercise during 2004. The contractor prepared an AAR that identified weaknesses with the state's COOP-COG plan. SEMA conducted no documented follow-up or

monitoring of the weaknesses contained in the AAR to ensure corrective action was being taken.

SEMA personnel indicated they did not have adequate staffing to monitor all of the weaknesses identified during homeland security exercises and to ensure that all weaknesses were improved upon. Because of this, SEMA requests that the agencies and local jurisdictions formally notify SEMA when improvement plans are complete; however, SEMA personnel indicated that SEMA does not have the leverage to make agencies and local jurisdictions prioritize their improvement plans. Although the SEMA currently tracks the status of implementation plans when such information is reported to SEMA, the lack of proactive, ongoing monitoring can result in ongoing preventable weaknesses in Missouri's response plans during homeland security incidents.

- B. Beginning with the federal fiscal year 2005 HSGP, the SEMA is allowed to use 3 percent of Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) funding for grant management and administration. The SEMA has decided to keep only 1.5 percent of the UASI funding for management and administration at the state level as SEMA contends that as much of the UASI management is performed at the local level, the local administrative agencies are entitled to a larger share of the grant funding. Since the SEMA has cited lack of staff as a factor limiting monitoring of the UASI program, keeping a larger portion of the 3 percent UASI management and administration allocation could allow the SEMA to improve its program monitoring.

**WE RECOMMEND** the Department of Public Safety, through the State Emergency Management Agency:

- A. Establish and maintain procedures to follow-up on and monitor the weaknesses identified during exercises.
- B. Determine the feasibility of retaining a larger portion of the 3 percent UASI management and administration allocation to improve UASI program monitoring.

**AUDITEE'S RESPONSE**

- A. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. This has already been implemented. SEMA is moving forward to establish and maintains procedures to follow-up on and monitor the identified exercise weaknesses.*
- B. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. SEMA will explore retaining a larger percent of the 3 percent of the authorized Management and Administration allocation beginning with FY2006. We are committed to ensuring that funds are used effectively and distributed in a manner that is responsive to potential terror threats in Missouri. It is our goal to get as much money to the locals as possible, because they will be the first responders in a crisis.*

*Anticipated completion date: December 31, 2006*

7.

**Federal Compliance Issues**

In March 2006, the State Auditor's Office issued audit report No. 2006-18, *State of Missouri Single Audit*. (A copy of the complete audit report can be obtained from: Missouri State Auditor's Office, P.O. Box 869, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0869, or on the internet at [www.auditor.mo.gov](http://www.auditor.mo.gov).) The report included the following findings related to the Homeland Security Program:

- A. The SEMA has not established a tracking system to monitor and ensure program subrecipients obtain and submit audits to the SEMA, when applicable. As a result, the SEMA did not obtain and review audits from applicable subrecipients, such as the city of Kansas City, the city of Saint Louis, East-West Gateway Council, Mid America Regional Council, and St. Louis County, all of which expended over \$500,000 in a one-year period.

U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) *Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement* requires grant recipients to ensure that subrecipients obtain an A-133 audit when grant expenditures exceed \$500,000 in a fiscal year.

- B. The SEMA has not established adequate procedures to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of funds from the U.S. Treasury and disbursement. Adequate supervisory review of the SEMA's grant tracking spreadsheets could have ensured that the time elapsing between transfer and disbursement was minimized. The OMB *Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement* requires that when funds are advanced, recipients must follow procedures to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of funds from the U.S. Treasury and disbursement.

We reviewed transfers of funds from the U.S. Treasury for the State Homeland Security Grant Program, the Homeland Security Grant Program, and the Urban Areas Security Initiative during the year ended June 30, 2005, and noted 18 instances in which the SEMA received transfers of funds from the U.S. Treasury and had not completely disbursed the balance of the transfers within a period of at least three days. These undisbursed balances ranged from \$325 to \$499,024 and took up to 90 days to completely disburse. These instances included one in which the SEMA mistakenly drew down \$517,400 twice. The second of these drawdowns resulted in an undisbursed balance of \$465,934 which took 90 days to completely disburse. The SEMA should implement adequate procedures, including supervisory review of grant tracking spreadsheets, to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of funds from the U.S. Treasury and disbursement.

- C. Unallowable costs were charged to the State Homeland Security Grant Program.

- 1) Costs totaling \$33,320 for the 2004 Governor's Meth Summit were improperly charged to the Federal Fiscal Year 2003 State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) Part II – Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) allocation during the year ended June 30, 2005. The stated goal of the summit was to provide valuable training for the fight against "meth." SEMA officials indicated the costs were charged to the grant program because portions of the seminar were related to homeland security. Although the summit did provide some sessions that addressed homeland security in general, the summit did not provide specific CIP training.

DHS – Office of Domestic Preparedness (ODP) Information Bulletin No. 84 states that "CIP training must be designed to enhance the capabilities to protect and secure critical infrastructure."

We question the \$33,320 for 2004 Governor's Meth Summit costs improperly charged to the SHSGP – (CIP) allocation.

- 2) Cellular phone, wireless personal digital assistant, and satellite phone monthly service fees totaling \$38,684 were improperly charged to the Federal Fiscal Year 2003 SHSGP Part II during the year ended June 30, 2005 by the city of Saint Louis. SEMA officials indicated they allowed these costs to be charged to the grant because they believed grant guidelines were not clear on this issue. The DHS – ODP program guidelines for the Federal Fiscal Year 2003 SHSGP Part II do not authorize expenditures for cellular phone, wireless personal digital assistant, and satellite phone monthly service fees.

We question the \$38,684 for monthly service fees improperly charged to the SHSGP Part II.

**WE RECOMMEND** the Department of Public Safety, through the State Emergency Management Agency:

- A. Ensure all subrecipients submit an A-133 audit, when applicable.
- B. Implement adequate procedures, including supervisory review of grant tracking spreadsheets, to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of funds from the U.S. Treasury and disbursement.
- C. Resolve the questioned costs with the grantor agency. In addition, the SEMA should comply with the DHS – ODP program guidelines.



## **AUDITEE'S RESPONSE**

- A. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. Procedures to ensure all subrecipients submit an A-133 audit receiving Homeland Security funds are as follows:*
1. *Applicants are informed of audit requirements at Applicant Briefing conducted by SEMA upon approval of application for Homeland Security funding.*
  2. *Audit requirements are continually provided to subrecipients as funds are advanced and closeout procedures are accomplished.*
  3. *The receipt of audit reports are logged and entered into a computer database by the Fiscal Section's Internal Auditor.*
  4. *Where audits indicate or identify questionable costs, appropriate actions are taken with the subrecipient contacted by SEMA and the matter rectified.*
  5. *As recommended, SEMA staff will ensure that all audits will be reviewed and corrective action initiated within six months.*
- B. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. The Fiscal Section has implemented a new procedure to initiate drawdowns of funds. A spreadsheet is used to record all expenditures for Homeland Security grants as the expenditures are made, showing the balance of cash on hand. Funds will be drawn down as the request for checks is made to the state accounting department or at least weekly to replenish our revolving fund. The spreadsheet is reconciled with the State of Missouri accounting system on monthly basis.*
- C. *We agree with the auditor's recommendation. The prior administration incorrectly charged expenses for the 2004 Governor's Meth Summit. Steps have been taken to appropriately change the cost. The city of St. Louis has been notified that monthly service fees are no longer authorized relating to authorized equipment. In the future, under this administration SEMA will comply with DHS-ODP program guidelines.*

***Anticipated completion date:*** *The correction has been made.*

HISTORY, ORGANIZATION, AND  
STATISTICAL INFORMATION

HOMELAND SECURITY PROGRAM  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY  
HISTORY, ORGANIZATION, AND  
STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Governor Bob Holden created the Missouri Office of Homeland Security on September 26, 2001. Missouri was the first state in the nation to create an office reporting directly to the governor and charged to assist the governor in leading Missouri's response to the disaster of September 11, 2001. Governor Holden appointed Colonel Tim Daniel, US Army (Retired), to this cabinet level position. Colonel Daniel's job was to assess the readiness of the state and its communities to deter, prevent, and appropriately respond to acts of terrorism in Missouri.

In November of 2001, Governor Holden appointed the Missouri Security Panel, charging it with the task of examining security within Missouri and submitting their findings to the governor. The Panel consisted of leaders representing state and local government, state and local law, fire, and emergency planning officials, private citizens, and other relevant officials. The results of the Panel were briefed to Governor Holden on January 25, 2002, and these results served as signposts in the homeland security programs of Missouri.

On September 11, 2002, Governor Holden created by Executive Order the Missouri Security Council. The Council made recommendations to the governor regarding homeland security issues that were significant and interdepartmental in nature. The Council served as the Board of Directors for the Office of Homeland Security. Finally, the Council recommended the level of state participation and leadership in issues that must be coordinated regionally, statewide, or that involved local government and the private sector.

Upon taking office in 2005, Governor Matt Blunt proposed moving the state Office of Homeland Security into the Department of Public Safety (DPS) to streamline the operations of offices involved in protecting Missourians and to maximize both state and federal resources. In February 2005, Governor Blunt appointed Michael Chapman as Deputy Director of the DPS. In that role, Mr. Chapman also oversaw the state's homeland security efforts, thus effectively merging Homeland Security functions into the DPS. Mr. Chapman resigned in September 2005 and Mark James, Director of the DPS, assumed all responsibility and duties previously held by Mr. Chapman.

On July 21, 2005, Governor Blunt created by Executive Order the Missouri Homeland Security Advisory Council, replacing the Missouri Security Council. The Missouri Homeland Security Advisory Council was charged to examine current state and local homeland security plans to ensure that proper plans are in place while also examining how homeland security grant funds can best be coordinated and expedited. This council will prepare an emergency preparedness plan for the governor's review including recommendations for structural changes, developing polices and procedures to implement up-to-date response capabilities, and improving the homeland security grant reimbursement process.

The State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) was created by statute in 1951 as a division of the executive branch of state government. The agency was transferred to the Office of the

Adjutant General by executive order on October 1, 1966. The 74<sup>th</sup> General Assembly confirmed the transfer in 1967. The State Omnibus Reorganization Act of 1974 transferred the Office of the Adjutant General to the Department of Public Safety. Chapter 44, RSMo, gives detailed provisions as to the organization and function of SEMA.

SEMA, in cooperation with local, state, and federal governments, is responsible for developing statewide all hazard plans, hazard mitigation plans, and administering state and federal programs. In the event of a Presidential Disaster Declaration, and after the signing of a federal-state disaster agreement, SEMA coordinates and serves as a liaison between the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and victims of natural disasters for the payments of disaster assistance claims ranging from temporary housing to mitigation. When damages occur to publicly owned property, SEMA in cooperation with FEMA conducts damage assessments, writes project scope of work, administers federal funds to local communities, and conducts closeout project audits.

In the event of a major statewide natural or man-made disaster, the governor, state officials, and support staff coordinate state agency response from the State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC). The SEOC is located 18-feet underground at the Adjutant General's Headquarters of the Missouri National Guard, ISTS (Ike Skelton Training Site) on Militia Drive in Jefferson City. The SEOC is designed and built to provide protection from radioactive fallout and earthquakes. The SEOC has back-up generators, an independent water system, a communications center, and a computer system for continuity of government for disaster response. The SEOC is occupied and used on a daily basis as the regular offices of SEMA to assure operational readiness in the event of an emergency.

The SEMA Director supervises the day-to-day operations of the agency. During normal working conditions, he reports to the Adjutant General and coordinates certain activities with the Director of Public Safety and the Governor's Office.

During a disaster, the SEMA Director reports directly to the Governor's Office. The Governor has the responsibility of carrying out all or any part of the emergency response functions within the state.

The SEMA has received grants for the Domestic Preparedness Equipment Program since fiscal year 1999. The program's objective is to enhance the capacity of state and local first responders to respond to a Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) terrorism incident involving chemical, biological, nuclear, radiological, incendiary, and explosive devices. Program funding has been used to conduct comprehensive threat and needs assessments and to develop and implement a Statewide Domestic Preparedness Strategy. In addition, program funding is used to purchase equipment for state and local first responders and support the planning and conduct of exercises.

The SEMA has indicated there were no major homeland security efforts funded by federal grants passed through to the state or by state funds prior to state fiscal year 1999. However, for federal fiscal years 1997 through 1999, the following direct awards (not passed through the state) of homeland security funds were made from the Federal Department of Justice under the Nunn-Luger-Domenici Act:

	TOTAL	Fed FY 1999	Fed FY 1998	Fed FY 1997
Kansas City (KC)	\$ 600,000	100,000	-0-	500,000
St. Louis (STL)	904,599	404,599	-0-	500,000
Jackson County (JC)	200,000	200,000	-0-	-0-
JC / KC	250,000	-0-	250,000	-0-
STL County	793,963	300,000	493,963	-0-
Totals	\$2,748,562	1,004,599	743,963	1,000,000

The 1997 grant was intended to fund training, equipment, and exercises. The 1998 and 1999 grants were intended to fund equipment purchases only. The state (SEMA) had no obligation to monitor or account for these funds and thus, is unaware of the status.

Beginning with federal fiscal year 2003 grant awards, the equipment program was included under the broader State Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP). This grant had two parts. Part 1 was used for equipment, exercise, training, and planning/administration. Part 2 was used for equipment purchase, training, planning/administration, and critical infrastructure protection. Part 2 resulted from the President signing into law the Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2003, which provides state and local governments with additional funding to participate in the national effort to combat terrorism. This financial assistance was provided to address the unique equipment, training, planning, and exercise needs of state and local emergency responders, as well as to pay for costs associated with increased security measures at critical infrastructure sites during the period of hostilities with Iraq and for future periods of heightened threat. Part 2 was a much larger grant that also allowed monies to be spent to mitigate the costs of enhanced security at critical infrastructure sites.

Also beginning in federal fiscal year 2003 was the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI). This grant is allocated between St. Louis and Kansas City and their metropolitan areas, including areas in the neighboring states of Illinois and Kansas. The program provides financial assistance to address the planning, equipment, training, and exercise needs of large urban areas, and to assist them in building an enhanced and sustainable capacity to prevent, respond to, and recover from threats or acts of terrorism.

The following represents the status, as of September 30, 2005, of SEMA's various homeland security grants, according to SEMA grant tracking records:

Program Name	Award Amount	Expenditures Through September, 2005	Unexpended	Unexpended Percentage	Grant Termination Date
Domestic Preparedness Equipment Program					
'99 Award	\$1,044,000	1,044,000	0	0.00%	9/30/2002
'00 Award	1,402,000	1,402,000	0	0.00%	2/1/2005
'01 Award	1,474,000	1,474,000	0	0.00%	2/1/2005
'02 Award	6,079,000	6,074,884	4,116	0.07%	7/31/2005
State Homeland Security Grant Program Part 1					
'03 Award	10,834,000	9,545,450	1,288,550	11.89%	3/31/2006
State Homeland Security Grant Program Part 2					
'03 Award	28,697,000	20,946,985	7,750,015	27.01%	4/30/2006
Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI)					
'03 Award	19,548,603	7,516,900	12,031,703	61.55%	6/30/2006
'04 Award	23,938,622	2,873,663	21,064,959	88.00%	5/31/2006
'05 Award	15,253,865	441,245	14,812,620	97.11%	3/31/2007
State Homeland Security Grant Program FY '04					
Equipment	32,046,000	13,871,929	18,174,071	56.71%	5/31/2006
Law Enforcement Terrorist Prevention	9,509,000	4,485,365	5,023,635	52.83%	5/31/2006
Citizen Council	666,000	135,071	530,929	79.72%	5/31/2006
Total FY '04 Homeland Security Grant Program	<u>42,221,000</u>	<u>18,492,365</u>	<u>23,728,635</u>	56.20%	
State Homeland Security Grant Program FY '05					
Equipment	20,288,866	0	20,288,866	100.00%	3/31/2007
Law Enforcement Terrorist Prevention	7,377,769	0	7,377,769	100.00%	3/31/2007
Citizen Council	257,567	0	257,567	100.00%	3/31/2007
Emergency Management Performance Grant	3,318,388	2,695,933	622,455	18.76%	3/31/2007
Metropolitan Medical Response System	455,184	0	455,184	100.00%	3/31/2007
Total FY '05 Homeland Security Grant Program	<u>31,697,774</u>	<u>2,695,933</u>	<u>29,001,841</u>	91.49%	
TOTALS for ALL GRANTS	<u>\$182,189,864</u>	<u>72,507,425</u>	<u>109,682,439</u>	60.20%	

The following schedule shows SEMA's expenditures from their federal homeland security grants beginning with state fiscal year 2001 through September 30, 2005:

Grant Program	Award Amount	Expenditures, Year Ended June 30,						TOTALS
		2006 *	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	
2005 Homeland Security Grant Program	\$31,697,774	696,195	1,999,738	0	0	0	0	2,695,933
2004 Homeland Security Grant Program	42,221,000	4,130,572	14,350,376	11,417	0	0	0	18,492,365
2003 Homeland Security Grant Program - Part I	10,834,000	541,691	4,595,510	4,408,249	0	0	0	9,545,450
2003 Homeland Security Grant Program - Part II	28,697,000	3,158,635	10,083,343	7,705,007	0	0	0	20,946,985
2002 Domestic Preparedness Equipment Program	6,079,000	35	1,010,259	3,466,520	1,598,070	0	0	6,074,884
2000 / 2001 Domestic Preparedness Equipment Program	2,876,000	0	125,157	947,628	1,803,215	0	0	2,876,000
1999 Domestic Preparedness Equipment Program	1,044,000	0	0	0	5,492	194,388	844,120	1,044,000
2005 UASI	15,253,865	4,590	436,655	0	0	0	0	441,245
2004 UASI	23,938,622	1,498,565	1,375,098	0	0	0	0	2,873,663
2003 UASI	19,548,603	1,495,854	4,881,979	1,139,067	0	0	0	7,516,900
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$182,189,864</b>	<b>11,526,137</b>	<b>38,858,115</b>	<b>17,677,888</b>	<b>3,406,777</b>	<b>194,388</b>	<b>844,120</b>	<b>72,507,425</b>

\* State fiscal year 2006 expenditures through September 30, 2005