

CRS Report for Congress

Fiscal Year 2007 Homeland Security Grant Program and H.R. 1: Description and Analysis

February 2, 2007

Shawn Reese
Analyst in American National Government
Government and Finance Division

Steven Maguire
Analyst in Public Finance
Government and Finance Division



Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

Fiscal Year 2007 Homeland Security Grant Program and H.R. 1: Description and Analysis

Summary

On January 5, 2007, the Office for Grants and Training — within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) — issued the *FY2007 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidance and Application Kit*, to states and localities. On January 10, 2007, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1 — “Implementing the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007.” The FY2007 guidance provides information on how the department intends to allocate Homeland Security Grant Program funding to states, urban areas, and U.S. insular areas. H.R. 1 proposes changes to the distribution methods the Department of Homeland Security uses to allocate some components the Homeland Security Grant Program funding.

The Homeland Security Grant Program includes the State Homeland Security Grant Program, the Urban Area Security Initiative, the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, the Metropolitan Medical Response System, and the Citizen Corps Program. H.R. 1, however, only addresses the State Homeland Security Grant Program, the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, and the Urban Area Security Initiative distribution methods, and is silent on Metropolitan Medical Response System and Citizen Corps Program.

The FY2007 guidance and H.R. 1 both propose using risk and effectiveness evaluations to allocate Homeland Security Grant Program funding to the states, the District of Columbia (DC), and U.S. insular areas. Both intend for the Urban Area Security Initiative funding to be based purely on risk and effectiveness assessments.

This report summarizes and compares the FY2007 program guidance and H.R. 1 Homeland Security Grant Program distribution methods; it presents rough estimates of the State Homeland Security Grant Program and the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program grant allocations following each of the two methods and assuming a \$900 million appropriation; it also compares the estimates with actual FY2006 allocations.

Both the FY2007 guidance and H.R. 1 address critical infrastructure protection, homeland security information sharing, interoperable communications, radiological and nuclear detection capabilities, catastrophic planning, and National Incident Management System compliance. These homeland security activities and programs are, however, outside the scope of this report.

For information on the National Preparedness Goal, Homeland Security Strategies, and Targeted Capabilities Enhancement Plans, see CRS Report RL33583, *Homeland Security Grants: Evolution of Program Guidance and Grant Distribution Methods*, by Shawn Reese. For more on the DHS grant distributions for more DHS programs for earlier years, see CRS Report RL33770, *Department of Homeland Security Grants to State and Local Governments: FY2003 to FY2006*, by Steven Maguire and Shawn Reese.

This report will updated as legislative events warrant.

Contents

Introduction	1
Homeland Security Grant Program	
Distribution Methods	2
FY2007 DHS Program Guidance	3
Risk and Anticipated Effectiveness	4
H.R. 1	6
Estimating SHSGP and LETPP Grant Allocations	
for FY2007 and Under H.R. 1	11
Caveat	12
Calculating the Estimates	12
Establishing Proxies for Risk and Effectiveness Scores	12
Estimating Risk and Effectiveness	12
Meeting the Minimums	13
Allocating the Excess Amount	13
Final Estimates	24
Comparison of the Estimates	24

List of Tables

Table 1. FY2006, FY2007, and H.R. 1 Distribution Methods	7
Table 2. Potential Allocation of DHS Grants for SHSGP and LETPP for FY2007 Based on Proxy FY2006 Measures of Risk and Effectiveness ...	14
Table 3. Estimated FY2007 DHS Grants for SHSGP and LETPP with Possible Under-Minimum Adjustments	18
Table 4. Estimated DHS Grants for SHSGP and LETPP under H.R. 1 with Possible Under-Minimum Adjustments	21
Table 5. Estimated SHSGP and LETPP Grant Allocations Under FY2007 Program Guidance and H.R. 1 as Passed by the House	24

Fiscal Year 2007 Homeland Security Grant Program and H.R. 1: Description and Analysis

Introduction

On January 5, 2007, the Office for Grants and Training (G&T) — within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) — issued the *FY2007 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidance and Application Kit*, to states and localities. On January 10, 2007, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1 — “Implementing the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007.” The FY2007 guidance provides information on how DHS intends to allocate Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) funding to states, urban areas, and U.S. insular areas. H.R. 1 proposes changes to the distribution methods DHS uses to allocate some components HSGP funding.

HSGP includes the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP), the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI), the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP), the Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS), and the Citizen Corps Program (CCP). H.R. 1, however, only addresses SHSGP, LETPP, and UASI distribution methods, and is silent on MMRS and CCP.

The FY2007 guidance and H.R. 1 both propose using risk and effectiveness evaluations to allocate HSGP funding to the states, the District of Columbia (DC), and U.S. insular areas. Both intend for UASI funding to be based purely on risk and effectiveness assessments. The primary differences between distribution methods in the FY2007 guidance and in H.R. 1 are as follows:

- The FY2007 guidance states that DHS intends to guarantee a minimum of 0.75% — as required by Section 1014 of the USA PATRIOT Act (P.L. 107-56) — of total appropriations for SHSGP and LETPP to each state, DC, and Puerto Rico; each U.S. insular area is guaranteed a 0.25% minimum of total appropriations. H.R. 1 proposes to amend Section 1014 of the USA PATRIOT Act and reduce the minimum guaranteed amount from 0.75% to 0.25% for states without international boundaries, DC, and Puerto Rico, and to 0.45% for applicants with international borders. U.S. insular areas other than Puerto Rico would be guaranteed a minimum of 0.08%.¹

¹ The insular areas are American Samoa, Guam, Northern Marianas, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

- The FY2007 guidance provides information on how DHS intends to allocate MMRS and CCP funding. H.R. 1 is silent on the distribution method for these two programs.
- The FY2007 guidance intends to separate UASI high-threat, high-density urban areas into two categories: Tier I urban areas — applying for \$410.8 million (approximately 54% of total UASI funding), and Tier II urban areas — applying for \$336.1 million (approximately 46% of total UASI funding).² H.R. 1 is silent on the categorization of UASI applicants.

This report summarizes and compares the FY2007 program guidance and H.R. 1 HSGP distribution methods; it presents rough estimates of SHSGP and LETPP grant allocations following each of the two methods and assuming a \$900 million appropriation; it also compares the estimates with actual FY2006 allocations.

Both the FY2007 guidance and H.R. 1 address critical infrastructure protection, homeland security information sharing, interoperable communications, radiological and nuclear detection capabilities, catastrophic planning, and National Incident Management System compliance. These homeland security activities and programs are, however, outside the scope of this report.

Homeland Security Grant Program Distribution Methods

The HSGP includes five separate programs and Congress appropriates funding for each program separately.³ For purposes of satisfying the minimum as prescribed by Congress, DHS groups SHSGP and LETPP together.⁴ Following is a brief description of the five programs including the FY2007 appropriation, summaries of FY2007 DHS guidance and of H.R. 1, and an explanation of the “risk and effectiveness” parameter.

- *State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP)* supports states, DC, and U.S. insular areas in implementing their Homeland Security Strategies. The program addresses state-identified planning, equipment, training, and exercise needs for response to acts of terrorism. Additionally, SHSGP supports the implementation of the National Preparedness Goal, the National Incident Management

² U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office for Grants and Training, *FY2007 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidance and Application Kit* (Washington: Jan. 2007), p. 10.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

⁴ Congress directed DHS to allocate funds appropriated for these programs at DHS’s discretion, however, DHS is required to allocate at least 0.75% of total appropriations for SHSGP and LETPP to each state, DC, Puerto Rico; U.S. insular areas, 0.25%. P.L. 109-295 (FY2007 DHS appropriations), Title III, and H.Rept. 109-699 accompanying P.L. 109-295.

System, and the National Response Plan. FY2007 appropriation is \$525 million.

- *Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP)* provides funding to law enforcement and public safety entities to support terrorism prevention activities. This includes establishing and enhancing of information fusion centers and collaborating with non-law enforcement partners, other government agencies, and the private sector. FY2007 appropriation is \$375 million.
- *Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI)* supports eligible high-threat, high-density urban areas⁵ in addressing their planning, equipment, training, and exercise needs for response to acts of terrorism.⁶ FY2007 appropriation is \$770 million.
- *Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS)* supports designated jurisdictions to enhance and sustain a regionally integrated, systematic mass casualty incident preparedness program. It is also intended to prepare jurisdictions for responding to all-hazards mass casualty incidents including chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive (CBRNE); terrorism; epidemic disease outbreaks, natural disasters; and large-scale hazardous materials incidents. FY2007 appropriation is \$33 million.
- *Citizen Corps Program (CCP)* supports community and local government efforts to coordinate community members in emergency preparedness, planning, mitigation, response, and recovery. FY2007 appropriation is \$15 million.⁷

FY2007 DHS Program Guidance

The department's program provides, among other things, information on eligible applicants, authorized expenditures, funding availability, program application requirements, award and reporting requirements, and grant allocation methods. The grant allocation methods are discussed below for each component program.

- *SHSGP and LETPP*. DHS will allocate 100% of funds based on an analyses of risk and anticipated effectiveness. Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico is to receive a minimum of 0.75% of total

⁵ DHS determines what urban areas are high-threat through a classified process based on threat, vulnerability, and consequence assessments. Congress authorized DHS to determine FY2007 UASI recipients in P.L. 109-295 (FY2007 DHS appropriations), Title III.

⁶ For a list of eligible FY2007 UASI high-threat, high-density urban areas, MMRS jurisdictions, and CCP allocations, see U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office for Grants and Training, *FY2007 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidance and Application Kit* (Washington: Jan. 2007).

⁷ P.L. 109-295 (FY2007 DHS appropriations), Title III, and H.Rept. 109-699 accompanying P.L. 109-295.

appropriations; each U.S. insular area, 0.25%.⁸ If a jurisdiction does not receive the statutory minimum, DHS will adjust the distribution to ensure that all jurisdictions receive at least the minimum.⁹

- *UASI program*, each eligible urban area is to receive a grant based on DHS's determination of risk and anticipated effectiveness. Seven high-threat, high-density urban areas would be categorized as Tier I urban areas and would be eligible to apply for \$410.8 million (approximately 54% of total UASI funding). These Tier I urban areas include the San Francisco Bay Area (CA), Chicago (IL), Houston (TX), Los Angeles and Long Beach (CA), the National Capital Region (DC), New York City (NY), and Northern New Jersey (NJ). In FY2006, these same UASI applicants were allocated \$383.2 million, which was approximately 55% of total FY2006 UASI funding. In FY2007, the remaining UASI funding (\$336.1 million) would be allocated to 39 Tier II urban areas.¹⁰
- *MMRS program*, DHS intends to evenly divide total appropriations among 124 jurisdictions.¹¹
- *Citizen Corps Program*, each state, DC, and Puerto Rico will receive a base amount of 0.75% of total appropriations; each U.S. insular area, 0.25%. The remainder of total appropriations will be allocated on a state's, DC's, and U.S. insular area's proportion of the total national and U.S. insular area population.¹²

Risk and Anticipated Effectiveness. As noted above, risk and effectiveness will be the primary tool for distributing funds to the states and insular areas. State and local risk will be determined by DHS using a risk and anticipated effectiveness formula developed by the Office for Grants and Training (G&T), in conjunction with other DHS and federal entities. Distribution of SHSGP, LETPP, and UASI funding will be based on this risk and effectiveness formula. The specific formula, however, is not publicly available at this time and may not be available in the future due to its possible security classification. More generally, DHS has indicated that risk calculations are based upon the following:

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ In FY2006, a base amount was guaranteed to each grant applicant without regard to risk or the effectiveness of proposed spending. Of the total appropriation, 40% was distributed by the base amount formula: 0.75% to each state, DC, and Puerto Rico; 0.25% to each of the four insular areas. The remaining 60% of the total appropriation was then allocated using DHS evaluations of each jurisdiction's level of risk and the effectiveness the jurisdiction's proposed spending. In other words, the total grant received by the recipient was the base amount plus the risk-and-effectiveness amount.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 11.

¹² Ibid., p. 12.

- “threat”: the likelihood of an attack occurring; and
- “vulnerability and consequence”: the relative exposure and expected impact of an attack.¹³

The risk model DHS intends to use to allocate SHSGP, LETPP, and UASI funds will incorporate the potential risk of terrorism to people, critical infrastructure, and economic sectors. For these risk assessments, DHS will use population in geographic areas at possible risk, population density, and specific location characteristics that might contribute to risk.

When considering threat, DHS intends to use the U.S. Intelligence Community’s threat assessments for identifying potential targets. DHS plans to identify vulnerability and consequence by considering the expected impact of successful terrorist attacks occurring at specific geographic locations, to people, economic sectors, and national critical infrastructure and national security facilities. Risk assessments of individual applicants will be worth two-thirds of their final application score.¹⁴

Grant applicants must submit an “Investment Justification” that identifies how their homeland security activities, programs, and initiatives support the National Preparedness Goal, relevant applicant Homeland Security Strategies, and Targeted Capabilities Enhancement Plans.¹⁵ Individual applicant Investment Justifications will be evaluated on the anticipated effectiveness of the applicant’s homeland security priorities, priorities identified in the FY2007 guidance, and the National Preparedness Goal. DHS states that the evaluation of Investment Justifications will identify which applicants have effective plans to reduce overall terrorism risks.¹⁶

Investment Justifications will be scored through a peer review process, which was begun for FY2006. G&T intends to provide additional assistance during the application period to states and urban areas as they develop their justifications, which would include applicants submitting draft justifications to G&T prior to final submission. Anticipated effectiveness will be worth one-third of their final application score.¹⁷

¹³ Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ For information on the National Preparedness Goal, Homeland Security Strategies, and Targeted Capabilities Enhancement Plans, see CRS Report RL33583, *Homeland Security Grants: Evolution of Program Guidance and Grant Distribution Methods*, by Shawn Reese.

¹⁶ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office for Grants and Training, *FY2007 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidance and Application Kit*, p. 9.

¹⁷ Ibid.

H.R. 1

The bill proposes to allocate HSGP funding (excluding MMRS and CCP)¹⁸ in the following manner:

- *From SHSGP and LETPP programs*, DHS would allocate 100% of funds based on an analysis of risk and anticipated effectiveness. Each grant applicant (states, DC, and Puerto Rico) without an international border will receive a minimum of 0.25% of total appropriations; applicants (states) with an international border or bordering a body of water with an international boundary will receive a minimum of 0.45%; and U.S. insular areas, 0.08%.
- *From the UASI program*, each eligible urban area is to receive a grant based on DHS's determination of risk and anticipated effectiveness.¹⁹

Specifically, H.R. 1 proposes to require the DHS Secretary to evaluate and prioritize grant applications based on the degree to which the application would achieve, maintain or enhance applicant homeland security capabilities, lessen the vulnerability and consequences to people (including transient, commuting, and tourist populations) and critical infrastructure. The evaluations and prioritization would be based upon current risk assessments.²⁰ H.R. 1 requires the DHS Secretary to consider specific terrorist threats against specific critical infrastructure sectors, and additional factors.²¹

Table 1 provides comparison of the distribution methods for FY2006, FY2007, and as proposed in H.R. 1 for the five programs identified in this report.

¹⁸ H.R. 1 is silent on the distribution of MMRS and CCP funding.

¹⁹ H.R. 1, Title I, Sec. 101, 'Title XX, Sec. 2004(a)(5)'.

²⁰ H.R. 1, Title I, Sec. 101, 'Title XX, Sec. 2004(a)(1)'. Some could argue that the evaluation and prioritization of applications is also a determination of effectiveness, and similar to DHS's present method of determining risk and effectiveness.

²¹ H.R. 1, Title I, Sec. 101, 'Title XX, Sec. 2004(a)'.

Table 1. FY2006, FY2007, and H.R. 1 Distribution Methods

FY2006 Distribution Method	FY2007 Distribution Method	H.R. 1 Distribution Method
State Homeland Security Grant Program		
<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico was guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. U.S. insular areas were guaranteed 0.25% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total SHSGP appropriations based on risk and the effectiveness of the state’s proposed solutions to identified homeland security needs. [FY2006 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. U.S. insular areas guaranteed 0.25% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-295, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS intends to allocate 100% SHSGP appropriations based on risk and the anticipated effectiveness of the state’s proposed solutions to identified homeland security needs. DHS, however, intends to guarantee a minimum of 0.75% to each state; U.S. insular areas, 0.25%. [FY2007 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state (without an international border), DC, and Puerto Rico would be guaranteed 0.25% of total appropriations. States with an international border would be guaranteed 0.45% of total appropriations. U.S. insular areas would be guaranteed 0.08% of total appropriations. [H.R. 1, Title I, Sec. 101, ‘Title XX, Sec. 2004(a)(5)’]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> H.R. 1 would require DHS to allocate 100% SHSGP appropriations based on risk and the anticipated effectiveness of the state’s proposed solutions to identified homeland security needs. DHS, however, would be required to guarantee a minimum of 0.25% or 0.45% to each state; U.S. insular areas, 0.08%. [H.R. 1, Title I, Sec. 101, ‘Title XX, Sec. 2004(a)(5)’]</p>
Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program		
<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico was guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. U.S. insular areas were</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico was guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. U.S. insular areas guaranteed</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state (without an international border), DC, and Puerto Rico would be guaranteed 0.25% of total</p>

FY2006 Distribution Method	FY2007 Distribution Method	H.R. 1 Distribution Method
<p>guaranteed 0.25% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total LETPP appropriations based on risk and the effectiveness of the state’s proposed solution to identified homeland security needs. [FY2006 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>0.25% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-295, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS intends to allocate 100% LETPP appropriations based on risk and the anticipated effectiveness of the state’s proposed solutions to identified homeland security needs. DHS, however, intends to guarantee a minimum of 0.75% to each state; U.S. insular areas, 0.25%. [FY2007 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>appropriations. States with an international border would be guaranteed 0.45% of total appropriations. U.S. insular areas would be guaranteed 0.08% of total appropriations. [H.R. 1, Title I, Sec. 101, ‘Title XX, Sec. 2004(a)(5)’]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> H.R. 1 would require DHS to allocate 100% LETPP appropriations based on risk and the anticipated effectiveness of the state’s proposed solutions to identified homeland security needs. DHS, however, would be required to guarantee a minimum of 0.25% or 0.45% to each state; U.S. insular areas, 0.08%. [H.R. 1, Title I, Sec. 101, ‘Title XX, Sec. 2004(a)(5)’]</p>

CRS-9

FY2006 Distribution Method	FY2007 Distribution Method	H.R. 1 Distribution Method
Urban Area Security Initiative		
<p>Guaranteed Amount NA</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Allocation of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS allocated UASI funds based on risk and effectiveness of urban area's proposed solutions to identified homeland security needs. [FY2006 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount NA</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Allocation of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-295, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS allocated UASI funds based on risk and effectiveness of urban area's proposed solutions to identified homeland security needs. [FY2007 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount NA</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> H.R. 1 would require DHS to allocate 100% UASI appropriations based on risk and the anticipated effectiveness of the state's proposed solutions to identified homeland security needs. [H.R. 1, Title I, Sec. 101, 'Title XX, Sec. 2004(a)(5)']</p>
Metropolitan Medical Response System		
<p>Guaranteed Amount DHS determines what metropolitan medical systems receive funding and amount. [P.L. 109-90, Title III]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount DHS determines what metropolitan medical systems receive funding and amount. [P.L. 109-295, Title III]</p>	<p>NA</p>

CRS-10

FY2006 Distribution Method	FY2007 Distribution Method	H.R. 1 Distribution Method
Citizen Corps Program		
<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total CCP appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2006 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-295, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total CCP appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2007 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>NA</p>

Estimating SHSGP and LETPP Grant Allocations for FY2007 and Under H.R. 1

The previous sections of this report described the DHS programs and the department's methods for allocating grants in FY2006 and FY2007 for the SHSGP and LETPP programs — grants that are not to be less than statutorily set minimums.²² Moreover, H.R. 1, as passed by the House, would lower the minimums that are currently in effect for those two programs.

A question that immediately arises is how those changes would affect total SHSGP and LETPP grant amounts that the states, the District of Columbia, and the insular areas can expect to receive. Answering that question precisely, however, is not feasible because DHS does not disclose the risk and effectiveness scores it assigns to the applications it evaluates. Accordingly, any effort to calculate rough estimates of grant amounts for FY2007 under the current statutory minimum as interpreted by DHS program guidance and under H.R. 1 proposed minimums, must make three fundamental assumptions:²³

Assumption 1. DHS Risk and effectiveness scores for each applicant for FY2007 and under H.R. 1 will equal those for FY2006. This assumption is valid only to the extent that the determinants of risk and effectiveness that pertain to each applicant and the DHS scoring system do not significantly vary from one year to the next.

Assumption 2. A proxy for each grant recipient's undisclosed risk and effectiveness score in FY2006 can be found in the ratio of (a) the amount of the recipient's FY2006 total grant that was based on risk and effectiveness to (b) the sum of risk and effectiveness amounts for all recipients. In other words, if one assumes that if a recipient received 5% of the total funds available for allocation on the basis of risk and effectiveness in FY2006, then that recipient will receive 5% of the total funds available for allocation on the basis of risk and effectiveness in FY2007 and under H.R. 1.

Assumption 3. The total appropriation for FY2007 for the SHSGP and LETPP programs was \$900 million. In order to estimate grants under the provisions of H.R. 1, one assumes the same total appropriation of \$900 million for whatever fiscal year a congressionally enacted and presidentially approved H.R. 1 were to go into effect.

²² As described earlier in the report, in FY2006 each state and the territories received a base amount calculated by formula. States then received an additional allocation based on potential risk and effectiveness. The effectiveness (as judged by peer review) of each jurisdiction's risk mitigation strategy was used to adjust the amount of the risk-based portion of the total allocation. Thus, some states received more or less than they would have under the FY2005 formula, which was based only on population — an admittedly imperfect indicator of risk. For FY2007, however, DHS has decided to allocate grants first on the basis of risk and effectiveness and then to adjust the sub-minimum grants upwards. As of this writing, the department had not identified its method for reducing grants greater than the minimum so as not to exceed the appropriated amount.

²³ This is but one option for making the estimates. Other approaches may yield other results.

Caveat

As with all assumption-based estimates, the estimates that are presented in the following discussion should be *interpreted carefully* and *used with great caution*. Actual grant allocations will almost certainly differ from the estimates presented here.

Calculating the Estimates

Estimating grants for each eligible recipient involves the following steps, the results of which are shown in **Tables 2, 3, and 4**:

1. Establish the proxies for risk and effectiveness. [**Table 2**, col. (g)]
2. Allocate the total available \$900 million in proportion to the proxies.
3. When a recipient's risk and effectiveness allocation is less than the statutory minimum, allocate an additional amount to reach the minimum. [**Tables 3 and 4**, col. (c). *Recipients of additional amount are shown in italics.*]
4. Because this results in a total greater than \$900 million, proportionally reduce the grants of all recipients in excess of the minimum to prevent exceeding the appropriation of \$900 million. [**Tables 3 and 4**, col. (d)]
5. Display the resulting adjusted estimated allocations. [**Tables 3 and 4**, col. (e)]

Each of these steps is discussed below.

Establishing Proxies for Risk and Effectiveness Scores. In FY2006, Congress appropriated a total of \$912 million for the SHSGP and LETPP programs; of that total, 40% (\$365 million) was required to satisfy the minimum allocation for every eligible recipient; the remaining 60% (\$547 million) was allocated based on risk and effectiveness.²⁴ Examination of column (g) in **Table 2** shows, for example, that California received 15.18% of the \$547 million; New York, 8.52%; Texas, 8.05%; and Florida, 6.82%.²⁵ These percentages and the corresponding percentage for each grant recipient serve as a proxy for each jurisdiction's risk-and-effectiveness score for the CRS estimated allocations for FY2007 and as proposed under H.R. 1.

Estimating Risk and Effectiveness. The DHS guidance for FY2007 and H.R. 1 would allocate total SHSGP and LETPP amounts by risk and assessment subject to statutory minimums — generally lower under H.R. 1 than under existing

²⁴ The precise amounts were \$914,975,000, \$368,277,000 and \$546,919,000, respectively.

²⁵ **Table 2** presents the FY2006 actual state-by-state distributions for the SHSGP and LETPP programs. The table also shows the portion of the total allocation distributed to each state in FY2006 by the risk and effectiveness parameter. For the amounts for all DHS programs from FY2003 through FY2006, see CRS Report RL33770, *Department of Homeland Security Grants to State and Local Governments: FY2003 to FY2006*, by Steven Maguire and Shawn Reese.

law. In order to estimate the risk and effectiveness allocations for each eligible jurisdiction, we multiply the proxy percentage discussed above by the total appropriation of \$900 million. For FY2007 under DHS guidance, this unadjusted amount is shown in column (c) of **Table 3**. The corresponding amounts under H.R. 1 are shown in column (c) of **Table 4**.

Meeting the Minimums. As noted earlier, existing law sets two minimum amounts based on the total appropriation: 0.75% per state, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, 0.25% for other U.S. insular areas. Given an appropriation of \$900 million, these minimums are \$6,750,000 and \$2,250,000, per state or insular area respectively. Under H.R. 1, however, there would be three minimum amounts based on the total appropriation: 0.45% for international border states (18 states); 0.25% for states without an international border (32 states) and the District of Columbia; and 0.08% for Puerto Rico and the other U.S. insular areas. With an appropriation of \$900 million, these minimums would be \$4,050,000, \$2,250,000 for the two categories of state respectively, and \$720,000, for Puerto Rico and insular areas.

The risk-and-effectiveness proxies give some jurisdictions less than the required minimum. Column (h) of **Table 2** shows that the FY2007 method does not provide the minimum to 18 states, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Marianas. Those jurisdictions can also be seen in the italicized entries in columns (a) and (c) of **Table 3**. Examination of the italicized entries in columns (a) and (c) of **Table 4** shows that risk and assessment allocations do not meet the H.R. 1 minimums for 14 states, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands

Tables 3 and 4 show that when all minimums are met, adjustments will be required to avoid exceeding the \$900 million appropriation — an excess of \$96,558,345 under DHS program guidance for FY2007; an excess of \$22,826,345 under H.R. 1.

Allocating the Excess Amount. In order to avoid exceeding the \$900 million appropriation, the reductions to cover the excess must be distributed among the jurisdictions whose risk-and-effectiveness allocation exceeded the minimum. For FY2007, a 15.2% reduction in the unadjusted grant amount for those jurisdictions would be needed. Under H.R. 1, a 3.0% reduction would be required²⁶

²⁶ The base for the adjustment percentage is the sum of all risk-and-effectiveness allocations that exceed the minimum. The denominator in the ratio is the sum of amounts required to bring all grants up to the minimum. In the case of FY2007 allocations, the ratio is \$96,558,345/ \$636,558,345 or 0.151688. In the case of estimates under H.R. 1, the ratio is \$22,826,345/ \$772,076,345 or 0.029565.

**Table 2. Potential Allocation of DHS Grants for SHSGP and LETPP for FY2007
Based on Proxy FY2006 Measures of Risk and Effectiveness**

State or Territory (a)	FY2006 Actual Allocations						Estimated FY2007 Allocation: Total SHSGP and LETPP (h)
	SHSGP (b)	LETPP (c)	Total (d)	Guaranteed Base Amount (e)	Risk and Effectiveness		
					Amount (f)	Share of National (g)	
Alabama	\$8,300,000	\$6,030,000	\$14,330,000	\$6,842,138	\$7,487,863	1.37%	12,311,716
Alaska	\$4,430,000	\$3,230,000	\$7,660,000	\$6,842,138	\$817,863	0.15%	1,344,748
Arizona	\$8,660,000	\$6,290,000	\$14,950,000	\$6,842,138	\$8,107,863	1.48%	13,331,134
Arkansas	\$4,550,000	\$3,310,000	\$7,860,000	\$6,842,138	\$1,017,863	0.19%	1,673,593
California	\$47,580,000	\$42,370,000	\$89,950,000	\$6,842,138	\$83,107,863	15.18%	136,647,861
Colorado	\$8,080,000	\$7,600,000	\$15,680,000	\$6,842,138	\$8,837,863	1.61%	14,531,417
Connecticut	\$11,160,000	\$1,850,000	\$13,010,000	\$6,842,138	\$6,167,863	1.13%	10,141,342
Delaware	\$6,070,000	\$4,050,000	\$10,120,000	\$6,842,138	\$3,277,863	0.60%	5,389,537
District of Columbia	\$4,270,000	\$3,110,000	\$7,380,000	\$6,842,138	\$537,863	0.10%	884,366
Florida	\$25,590,000	\$18,610,000	\$44,200,000	\$6,842,138	\$37,357,863	6.82%	61,424,658
Georgia	\$13,360,000	\$11,430,000	\$24,790,000	\$6,842,138	\$17,947,863	3.28%	29,510,289
Hawaii	\$4,490,000	\$3,260,000	\$7,750,000	\$6,842,138	\$907,863	0.17%	1,492,728
Idaho	\$6,690,000	\$4,870,000	\$11,560,000	\$6,842,138	\$4,717,863	0.86%	7,757,218
Illinois	\$19,080,000	\$18,200,000	\$37,280,000	\$6,842,138	\$30,437,863	5.56%	50,046,634
Indiana	\$10,820,000	\$5,090,000	\$15,910,000	\$6,842,138	\$9,067,863	1.66%	14,909,588
Iowa	\$7,520,000	\$5,470,000	\$12,990,000	\$6,842,138	\$6,147,863	1.12%	10,108,457

CRS-15

State or Territory (a)	FY2006 Actual Allocations						Estimated FY2007 Allocation: Total SHSGP and LETPP (h)
	SHSGP (b)	LETTP (c)	Total (d)	Guaranteed Base Amount (e)	Risk and Effectiveness		
					Amount (f)	Share of National (g)	
Kansas	\$7,850,000	\$5,710,000	\$13,560,000	\$6,842,138	\$6,717,863	1.23%	11,045,664
Kentucky	\$10,510,000	\$4,320,000	\$14,830,000	\$6,842,138	\$7,987,863	1.46%	13,133,827
Louisiana	\$12,020,000	\$8,740,000	\$20,760,000	\$6,842,138	\$13,917,863	2.54%	22,884,070
Maine	\$4,390,000	\$3,200,000	\$7,590,000	\$6,842,138	\$747,863	0.14%	1,229,653
Maryland	\$8,120,000	\$5,910,000	\$14,030,000	\$6,842,138	\$7,187,863	1.31%	11,818,449
Massachusetts	\$11,710,000	\$10,240,000	\$21,950,000	\$6,842,138	\$15,107,863	2.76%	24,840,695
Michigan	\$15,650,000	\$11,390,000	\$27,040,000	\$6,842,138	\$20,197,863	3.69%	33,209,791
Minnesota	\$4,790,000	\$3,490,000	\$8,280,000	\$6,842,138	\$1,437,863	0.26%	2,364,167
Mississippi	\$4,650,000	\$3,390,000	\$8,040,000	\$6,842,138	\$1,197,863	0.22%	1,969,553
Missouri	\$17,980,000	\$5,610,000	\$23,590,000	\$6,842,138	\$16,747,863	3.06%	27,537,221
Montana	\$4,490,000	\$3,260,000	\$7,750,000	\$6,842,138	\$907,863	0.17%	1,492,728
Nebraska	\$11,200,000	\$1,540,000	\$12,740,000	\$6,842,138	\$5,897,863	1.08%	9,697,401
Nevada	\$8,110,000	\$4,180,000	\$12,290,000	\$6,842,138	\$5,447,863	1.00%	8,957,501
New Hampshire	\$4,320,000	\$3,140,000	\$7,460,000	\$6,842,138	\$617,863	0.11%	1,015,904
New Jersey	\$9,170,000	\$7,540,000	\$16,710,000	\$6,842,138	\$9,867,863	1.80%	\$16,224,967
New Mexico	\$4,530,000	\$3,290,000	\$7,820,000	\$6,842,138	\$977,863	0.18%	\$1,607,824
New York	\$27,460,000	\$26,010,000	\$53,470,000	\$6,842,138	\$46,627,863	8.52%	\$76,666,605
North Carolina	\$10,780,000	\$9,560,000	\$20,340,000	\$6,842,138	\$13,497,863	2.47%	\$22,193,496
North Dakota	\$6,270,000	\$4,350,000	\$10,620,000	\$6,842,138	\$3,777,863	0.69%	\$6,211,648

CRS-16

State or Territory (a)	FY2006 Actual Allocations						Estimated FY2007 Allocation: Total SHSGP and LETPP (h)
	SHSGP (b)	LETPP (c)	Total (d)	Guaranteed Base Amount (e)	Risk and Effectiveness		
					Amount (f)	Share of National (g)	
Ohio	\$12,630,000	\$9,180,000	\$21,810,000	\$6,842,138	\$14,967,863	2.73%	\$24,610,504
Oklahoma	\$8,480,000	\$6,170,000	\$14,650,000	\$6,842,138	\$7,807,863	1.43%	\$12,837,867
Oregon	\$4,680,000	\$3,400,000	\$8,080,000	\$6,842,138	\$1,237,863	0.23%	\$2,035,322
Pennsylvania	\$12,810,000	\$11,050,000	\$23,860,000	\$6,842,138	\$17,017,863	3.11%	\$27,981,161
Rhode Island	\$4,460,000	\$2,960,000	\$7,420,000	\$6,842,138	\$577,863	0.11%	\$950,135
South Carolina	\$10,040,000	\$4,100,000	\$14,140,000	\$6,842,138	\$7,297,863	1.33%	\$11,999,314
South Dakota	\$4,380,000	\$3,180,000	\$7,560,000	\$6,842,138	\$717,863	0.13%	\$1,180,326
Tennessee	\$4,780,000	\$3,480,000	\$8,260,000	\$6,842,138	\$1,417,863	0.26%	\$2,331,282
Texas	\$26,140,000	\$24,740,000	\$50,880,000	\$6,842,138	\$44,037,863	8.05%	\$72,408,067
Utah	\$4,520,000	\$3,280,000	\$7,800,000	\$6,842,138	\$957,863	0.17%	\$1,574,940
Vermont	\$7,220,000	\$3,520,000	\$10,740,000	\$6,842,138	\$3,897,863	0.71%	\$6,408,955
Virginia	\$8,720,000	\$6,340,000	\$15,060,000	\$6,842,138	\$8,217,863	1.50%	\$13,511,999
Washington	\$12,730,000	\$9,260,000	\$21,990,000	\$6,842,138	\$15,147,863	2.77%	\$24,906,464
West Virginia	\$7,570,000	\$5,510,000	\$13,080,000	\$6,842,138	\$6,237,863	1.14%	\$10,256,437
Wisconsin	\$8,710,000	\$6,330,000	\$15,040,000	\$6,842,138	\$8,197,863	1.50%	\$13,479,114
Wyoming	\$4,420,000	\$3,090,000	\$7,510,000	\$6,842,138	\$667,863	0.12%	\$1,098,115
U.S. Total	\$516,940,000	\$375,230,000	\$892,170,000	\$348,949,013	\$543,220,988	99.24%	\$893,176,454
Puerto Rico	\$4,300,000	\$3,130,000	\$7,430,000	\$6,842,138	\$587,863	0.11%	\$966,577
U.S. & P.R. Total	\$521,240,000	\$378,360,000	\$899,600,000	\$355,791,150	\$543,808,850	99.35%	\$894,143,031

CRS-17

State or Territory (a)	FY2006 Actual Allocations						Estimated FY2007 Allocation: Total SHSGP and LETPP (h)
	SHSGP (b)	LETTP (c)	Total (d)	Guaranteed Base Amount (e)	Risk and Effectiveness		
					Amount (f)	Share of National (g)	
Virgin Islands	\$1,560,000	\$1,130,000	\$2,690,000	\$2,280,713	\$409,288	0.07%	\$672,960
American Samoa	\$2,115,000	\$2,530,000	\$4,645,000	\$2,280,713	\$2,364,288	0.43%	\$3,887,416
Guam	\$1,550,000	\$1,130,000	\$2,680,000	\$2,280,713	\$399,288	0.07%	\$656,518
N. Mariana Islands	\$1,700,000	\$970,000	\$2,670,000	\$2,280,713	\$389,288	0.07%	\$640,075
All Areas Total	\$528,165,000	\$384,120,000	\$912,285,000	\$364,914,000	\$547,371,000	100.00%	\$900,000,000

**Table 3. Estimated FY2007 DHS Grants for SHSGP and LETPP
with Possible Under-Minimum Adjustments**

State or Territory (a)	Actual FY2006 Allocation for SHSGP and LETPP (b)	Estimated FY2007 Allocation				Percentage Change from FY2006 to FY2007 (g)
		Unadjusted (c)	Over-Minimum Adjustment (d)	Under- Minimum Adjustment (e)	Allocation After Adjustment (f)	
Alabama	\$14,330,000	\$12,311,716	(\$843,646)	\$0	\$11,468,070	-20.1%
<i>Alaska</i>	<i>\$7,660,000</i>	<i>\$1,344,748</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$5,405,252</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-11.9%</i>
Arizona	\$14,950,000	\$13,331,134	(\$998,280)	\$0	\$12,332,854	-17.5%
<i>Arkansas</i>	<i>\$7,860,000</i>	<i>\$1,673,593</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$5,076,407</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-14.1%</i>
California	\$89,950,000	\$136,647,861	(\$19,703,964)	\$0	\$116,943,897	30.0%
Colorado	\$15,680,000	\$14,531,417	(\$1,180,349)	\$0	\$13,351,068	-14.9%
Connecticut	\$13,010,000	\$10,141,342	(\$514,426)	\$0	\$9,626,915	-26.0%
<i>Delaware</i>	<i>\$10,120,000</i>	<i>\$5,389,537</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$1,360,463</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-33.3%</i>
<i>District of Columbia</i>	<i>\$7,380,000</i>	<i>\$884,366</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$5,865,634</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-8.5%</i>
Florida	\$44,200,000	\$61,424,658	(\$8,293,497)	\$0	\$53,131,161	20.2%
Georgia	\$24,790,000	\$29,510,289	(\$3,452,466)	\$0	\$26,057,823	5.1%
<i>Hawaii</i>	<i>\$7,750,000</i>	<i>\$1,492,728</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$5,257,272</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-12.9%</i>
Idaho	\$11,560,000	\$7,757,218	(\$152,783)	\$0	\$7,604,435	-34.2%
Illinois	\$37,280,000	\$50,046,634	(\$6,567,586)	\$0	\$43,479,049	16.6%
Indiana	\$15,910,000	\$14,909,588	(\$1,237,713)	\$0	\$13,671,876	-14.1%
Iowa	\$12,990,000	\$10,108,457	(\$509,438)	\$0	\$9,599,019	-26.1%
Kansas	\$13,560,000	\$11,045,664	(\$651,601)	\$0	\$10,394,063	-23.3%
Kentucky	\$14,830,000	\$13,133,827	(\$968,351)	\$0	\$12,165,477	-18.0%

CRS-19

State or Territory	Actual FY2006 Allocation for SHSGP and LETPP	Estimated FY2007 Allocation				Percentage Change from FY2006 to FY2007
		Unadjusted	Over-Minimum Adjustment	Under- Minimum Adjustment	Allocation After Adjustment	
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Louisiana	\$20,760,000	\$22,884,070	(\$2,447,347)	\$0	\$20,436,723	-1.6%
<i>Maine</i>	<i>\$7,590,000</i>	<i>\$1,229,653</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$5,520,347</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-11.1%</i>
Maryland	\$14,030,000	\$11,818,449	(\$768,824)	\$0	\$11,049,625	-21.2%
Massachusetts	\$21,950,000	\$24,840,695	(\$2,744,144)	\$0	\$22,096,552	0.7%
Michigan	\$27,040,000	\$33,209,791	(\$4,013,636)	\$0	\$29,196,154	8.0%
<i>Minnesota</i>	<i>\$8,280,000</i>	<i>\$2,364,167</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$4,385,833</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-18.5%</i>
<i>Mississippi</i>	<i>\$8,040,000</i>	<i>\$1,969,553</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$4,780,447</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-16.0%</i>
Missouri	\$23,590,000	\$27,537,221	(\$3,153,175)	\$0	\$24,384,046	3.4%
<i>Montana</i>	<i>\$7,750,000</i>	<i>\$1,492,728</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$5,257,272</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-12.9%</i>
Nebraska	\$12,740,000	\$9,697,401	(\$447,086)	\$0	\$9,250,316	-27.4%
Nevada	\$12,290,000	\$8,957,501	(\$334,852)	\$0	\$8,622,649	-29.8%
<i>New Hampshire</i>	<i>\$7,460,000</i>	<i>\$1,015,904</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$5,734,096</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-9.5%</i>
New Jersey	\$16,710,000	\$16,224,967	(\$1,437,240)	\$0	\$14,787,727	-11.5%
<i>New Mexico</i>	<i>\$7,820,000</i>	<i>\$1,607,824</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$5,142,176</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-13.7%</i>
New York	\$53,470,000	\$76,666,605	(\$10,605,519)	\$0	\$66,061,086	23.5%
North Carolina	\$20,340,000	\$22,193,496	(\$2,342,595)	\$0	\$19,850,901	-2.4%
<i>North Dakota</i>	<i>\$10,620,000</i>	<i>\$6,211,648</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$538,352</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-36.4%</i>
Ohio	\$21,810,000	\$24,610,504	(\$2,709,226)	\$0	\$21,901,278	0.4%
Oklahoma	\$14,650,000	\$12,837,867	(\$923,457)	\$0	\$11,914,410	-18.7%
<i>Oregon</i>	<i>\$8,080,000</i>	<i>\$2,035,322</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$4,714,678</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>-16.5%</i>
Pennsylvania	\$23,860,000	\$27,981,161	(\$3,220,515)	\$0	\$24,760,646	3.8%

CRS-20

State or Territory (a)	Actual FY2006 Allocation for SHSGP and LETPP (b)	Estimated FY2007 Allocation				Percentage Change from FY2006 to FY2007 (g)
		Unadjusted (c)	Over-Minimum Adjustment (d)	Under- Minimum Adjustment (e)	Allocation After Adjustment (f)	
<i>Rhode Island</i>	\$7,420,000	\$950,135	\$0	\$5,799,865	\$6,750,000	-9.0%
South Carolina	\$14,140,000	\$11,999,314	(\$796,259)	\$0	\$11,203,055	-20.8%
<i>South Dakota</i>	\$7,560,000	\$1,180,326	\$0	\$5,569,674	\$6,750,000	-10.7%
<i>Tennessee</i>	\$8,260,000	\$2,331,282	\$0	\$4,418,718	\$6,750,000	-18.3%
Texas	\$50,880,000	\$72,408,067	(\$9,959,549)	\$0	\$62,448,518	22.7%
<i>Utah</i>	\$7,800,000	\$1,574,940	\$0	\$5,175,060	\$6,750,000	-13.5%
<i>Vermont</i>	\$10,740,000	\$6,408,955	\$0	\$341,045	\$6,750,000	-37.2%
Virginia	\$15,060,000	\$13,511,999	(\$1,025,715)	\$0	\$12,486,284	-17.1%
Washington	\$21,990,000	\$24,906,464	(\$2,754,120)	\$0	\$22,152,344	0.7%
West Virginia	\$13,080,000	\$10,256,437	(\$531,885)	\$0	\$9,724,552	-25.7%
Wisconsin	\$15,040,000	\$13,479,114	(\$1,020,727)	\$0	\$12,458,387	-17.2%
<i>Wyoming</i>	\$7,510,000	\$1,098,115	\$0	\$5,651,885	\$6,750,000	-10.1%
U.S. Total	\$892,170,000	\$893,176,454	(\$96,309,969)	\$85,994,475	\$882,860,961	-1.0%
Puerto Rico	\$7,430,000	\$966,577	\$0	\$5,783,423	\$6,750,000	-9.2%
U.S. & P.R. Total	\$899,600,000	\$894,143,031	(\$96,309,969)	\$91,777,898	\$889,610,961	-1.1%
<i>Virgin Islands</i>	\$2,690,000	\$672,960	\$0	\$1,577,040	\$2,250,000	-16.4%
American Samoa	\$4,645,000	\$3,887,416	(\$248,377)	\$0	\$3,639,039	-21.7%
<i>Guam</i>	\$2,680,000	\$656,518	\$0	\$1,593,482	\$2,250,000	-16.0%
<i>N. Mariana Islands</i>	\$2,670,000	\$640,075	\$0	\$1,609,925	\$2,250,000	-15.7%
All Areas Total	\$912,285,000	\$900,000,000	(\$96,558,345)	\$96,558,345	\$900,000,000	-1.3%

Note: Data for FY2006 are actual distribution and the FY2007 data are CRS estimates. Italicized states and territories would receive the minimum allocation amount under the FY2007 distribution method estimated by CRS and described in the text.

Table 4. Estimated DHS Grants for SHSGP and LETPP under H.R. 1 with Possible Under-Minimum Adjustments

State or Territory (a)	Estimated FY2007 Allocation for SHSGP and LETPP (b)	Estimated Allocation under H.R. 1				Percentage Change from FY2007 to H.R. 1 (g)
		Unadjusted (c)	Over-Minimum Adjustment (d)	Under- Minimum Adjustment (e)	Allocation After Adjustment (f)	
Alabama	\$11,468,070	\$12,311,716	(\$335,003)	\$0	\$11,976,713	-20.1%
Alaska*	\$6,750,000	\$1,344,748	\$0	\$3,155,252	\$4,500,000	-33.3%
Arizona*	\$12,332,854	\$13,331,134	(\$294,031)	\$0	\$13,037,103	5.7%
Arkansas	\$6,750,000	\$1,673,593	\$0	\$576,407	\$2,250,000	-66.7%
California*	\$116,943,897	\$136,647,861	(\$4,399,838)	\$0	\$132,248,023	13.1%
Colorado	\$13,351,068	\$14,531,417	(\$408,907)	\$0	\$14,122,510	5.8%
Connecticut	\$9,626,915	\$10,141,342	(\$262,741)	\$0	\$9,878,601	2.6%
Delaware	\$6,750,000	\$5,389,537	(\$104,530)	\$0	\$5,285,007	-21.7%
District of Columbia	\$6,750,000	\$884,366	\$0	\$1,365,634	\$2,250,000	-66.7%
Florida	\$53,131,161	\$61,424,658	(\$1,970,209)	\$0	\$59,454,448	11.9%
Georgia	\$26,057,823	\$29,510,289	(\$907,626)	\$0	\$28,602,663	9.8%
Hawaii	\$6,750,000	\$1,492,728	\$0	\$757,272	\$2,250,000	-66.7%
Idaho*	\$7,604,435	\$7,757,218	(\$108,448)	\$0	\$7,648,770	0.6%
Illinois	\$43,479,049	\$50,046,634	(\$1,591,380)	\$0	\$48,455,254	11.4%
Indiana	\$13,671,876	\$14,909,588	(\$421,499)	\$0	\$14,488,090	6.0%
Iowa	\$9,599,019	\$10,108,457	(\$261,646)	\$0	\$9,846,811	2.6%
Kansas	\$10,394,063	\$11,045,664	(\$292,850)	\$0	\$10,752,814	3.5%
Kentucky	\$12,165,477	\$13,133,827	(\$362,375)	\$0	\$12,771,452	5.0%
Louisiana	\$20,436,723	\$22,884,070	(\$687,007)	\$0	\$22,197,062	8.6%

CRS-22

State or Territory	Estimated FY2007 Allocation for SHSGP and LETPP	Estimated Allocation under H.R. 1				Percentage Change from FY2007 to H.R. 1
		Unadjusted	Over-Minimum Adjustment	Under- Minimum Adjustment	Allocation After Adjustment	
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
<i>Maine*</i>	\$6,750,000	\$1,229,653	\$0	\$3,270,347	\$4,500,000	-33.3%
Maryland	\$11,049,625	\$11,818,449	(\$318,580)	\$0	\$11,499,869	4.1%
Massachusetts	\$22,096,552	\$24,840,695	(\$752,153)	\$0	\$24,088,542	9.0%
Michigan*	\$29,196,154	\$33,209,791	(\$955,887)	\$0	\$32,253,903	10.5%
<i>Minnesota*</i>	\$6,750,000	\$2,364,167	\$0	\$2,135,833	\$4,500,000	-33.3%
<i>Mississippi</i>	\$6,750,000	\$1,969,553	\$0	\$280,447	\$2,250,000	-66.7%
Missouri	\$24,384,046	\$27,537,221	(\$841,933)	\$0	\$26,695,288	9.5%
<i>Montana*</i>	\$6,750,000	\$1,492,728	\$0	\$3,007,272	\$4,500,000	-33.3%
Nebraska	\$9,250,316	\$9,697,401	(\$247,960)	\$0	\$9,449,441	2.2%
Nevada	\$8,622,649	\$8,957,501	(\$223,325)	\$0	\$8,734,176	1.3%
<i>New Hampshire*</i>	\$6,750,000	\$1,015,904	\$0	\$3,484,096	\$4,500,000	-33.3%
New Jersey	\$14,787,727	\$16,224,967	(\$465,294)	\$0	\$15,759,673	6.6%
<i>New Mexico*</i>	\$6,750,000	\$1,607,824	\$0	\$2,892,176	\$4,500,000	-33.3%
New York*	\$66,061,086	\$76,666,605	(\$2,402,774)	\$0	\$74,263,831	12.4%
North Carolina	\$19,850,901	\$22,193,496	(\$664,015)	\$0	\$21,529,481	8.5%
North Dakota*	\$6,750,000	\$6,211,648	(\$56,989)	\$0	\$6,154,659	-8.8%
Ohio*	\$21,901,278	\$24,610,504	(\$669,575)	\$0	\$23,940,929	9.3%
Oklahoma	\$11,914,410	\$12,837,867	(\$352,521)	\$0	\$12,485,346	4.8%
<i>Oregon</i>	\$6,750,000	\$2,035,322	\$0	\$214,678	\$2,250,000	-66.7%
Pennsylvania*	\$24,760,646	\$27,981,161	(\$781,801)	\$0	\$27,199,360	9.8%
<i>Rhode Island</i>	\$6,750,000	\$950,135	\$0	\$1,299,865	\$2,250,000	-66.7%

CRS-23

State or Territory (a)	Estimated FY2007 Allocation for SHSGP and LETPP (b)	Estimated Allocation under H.R. 1				Percentage Change from FY2007 to H.R. 1 (g)
		Unadjusted (c)	Over-Minimum Adjustment (d)	Under- Minimum Adjustment (e)	Allocation After Adjustment (f)	
South Carolina	\$11,203,055	\$11,999,314	(\$324,602)	\$0	\$11,674,712	4.2%
<i>South Dakota</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>\$1,180,326</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$1,069,674</i>	<i>\$2,250,000</i>	<i>-66.7%</i>
Tennessee	\$6,750,000	\$2,331,282	(\$2,706)	\$0	\$2,328,576	-65.5%
Texas*	\$62,448,518	\$72,408,067	(\$2,260,986)	\$0	\$70,147,081	12.3%
<i>Utah</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>\$1,574,940</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$675,060</i>	<i>\$2,250,000</i>	<i>-66.7%</i>
Vermont*	\$6,750,000	\$6,408,955	(\$63,558)	\$0	\$6,345,397	-6.0%
Virginia	\$12,486,284	\$13,511,999	(\$374,966)	\$0	\$13,137,033	5.2%
Washington*	\$22,152,344	\$24,906,464	(\$679,429)	\$0	\$24,227,035	9.4%
West Virginia	\$9,724,552	\$10,256,437	(\$266,573)	\$0	\$9,989,864	2.7%
Wisconsin*	\$12,458,387	\$13,479,114	(\$298,958)	\$0	\$13,180,156	5.8%
<i>Wyoming</i>	<i>\$6,750,000</i>	<i>\$1,098,115</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$1,151,885</i>	<i>\$2,250,000</i>	<i>-66.7%</i>
U.S. Total	\$882,860,961	\$893,176,454	(\$25,412,677)	\$25,335,898	\$893,099,675	1.2%
Puerto Rico	\$6,750,000	\$966,577	(\$8,210)	\$0	\$958,367	-85.8%
U.S. & P.R. Total	\$889,610,961	\$894,143,031	(\$25,420,887)	\$25,335,898	\$894,058,043	0.5%
<i>Virgin Islands</i>	<i>\$2,250,000</i>	<i>\$672,960</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$47,040</i>	<i>\$720,000</i>	<i>-68.0%</i>
American Samoa	\$3,639,039	\$3,887,416	(\$105,459)	\$0	\$3,781,957	3.9%
<i>Guam</i>	<i>\$2,250,000</i>	<i>\$656,518</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$63,482</i>	<i>\$720,000</i>	<i>-68.0%</i>
<i>N. Mariana Islands</i>	<i>\$2,250,000</i>	<i>\$640,075</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$79,925</i>	<i>\$720,000</i>	<i>-68.0%</i>
All Areas Total	\$900,000,000	\$900,000,000	(\$25,526,345)	\$25,526,345	\$900,000,000	0.0%

Note: FY2007 data are CRS estimates. Italicized states and territories would receive the minimum allocation amount under the H.R. 1 distribution method as estimated by CRS and described in the text. *States marked with an asterisk are considered international border states.

Final Estimates. Column (f) of **Tables 3 and 4** show the total post-adjustment estimates of allocations under the FY2007 guidance and H.R. 1, respectively.

Comparison of the Estimates

Table 5 presents the estimated, post-adjustment allocations for each eligible jurisdiction under the FY2007 program guidance and H.R. 1.

Table 5. Estimated SHSGP and LETPP Grant Allocations Under FY2007 Program Guidance and H.R. 1 as Passed by the House

Jurisdiction	Estimated Post-Adjustment Allocations	
	FY2007 Program Guidance	H.R. 1
Alabama	\$11,468,070	\$11,976,713
Alaska	\$6,750,000	\$4,500,000
Arizona	\$12,332,854	\$13,037,103
Arkansas	\$6,750,000	\$2,250,000
California	\$116,943,897	\$132,248,023
Colorado	\$13,351,068	\$14,122,510
Connecticut	\$9,626,915	\$9,878,601
Delaware	\$6,750,000	\$5,285,007
District of Columbia	\$6,750,000	\$2,250,000
Florida	\$53,131,161	\$59,454,448
Georgia	\$26,057,823	\$28,602,663
Hawaii	\$6,750,000	\$2,250,000
Idaho	\$7,604,435	\$7,648,770
Illinois	\$43,479,049	\$48,455,254
Indiana	\$13,671,876	\$14,488,090
Iowa	\$9,599,019	\$9,846,811
Kansas	\$10,394,063	\$10,752,814
Kentucky	\$12,165,477	\$12,771,452
Louisiana	\$20,436,723	\$22,197,062
Maine	\$6,750,000	\$4,500,000
Maryland	\$11,049,625	\$11,499,869
Massachusetts	\$22,096,552	\$24,088,542
Michigan	\$29,196,154	\$32,253,903
Minnesota	\$6,750,000	\$4,500,000
Mississippi	\$6,750,000	\$2,250,000
Missouri	\$24,384,046	\$26,695,288
Montana	\$6,750,000	\$4,500,000
Nebraska	\$9,250,316	\$9,449,441
Nevada	\$8,622,649	\$8,734,176
New Hampshire	\$6,750,000	\$4,500,000
New Jersey	\$14,787,727	\$15,759,673
New Mexico	\$6,750,000	\$4,500,000
New York	\$66,061,086	\$74,263,831
North Carolina	\$19,850,901	\$21,529,481

Jurisdiction	Estimated Post-Adjustment Allocations	
	FY2007 Program Guidance	H.R. 1
North Dakota	\$6,750,000	\$6,154,659
Ohio	\$21,901,278	\$23,940,929
Oklahoma	\$11,914,410	\$12,485,346
Oregon	\$6,750,000	\$2,250,000
Pennsylvania	\$24,760,646	\$27,199,360
Rhode Island	\$6,750,000	\$2,250,000
South Carolina	\$11,203,055	\$11,674,712
South Dakota	\$6,750,000	\$2,250,000
Tennessee	\$6,750,000	\$2,328,576
Texas	\$62,448,518	\$70,147,081
Utah	\$6,750,000	\$2,250,000
Vermont	\$6,750,000	\$6,345,397
Virginia	\$12,486,284	\$13,137,033
Washington	\$22,152,344	\$24,227,035
West Virginia	\$9,724,552	\$9,989,864
Wisconsin	\$12,458,387	\$13,180,156
Wyoming	\$6,750,000	\$2,250,000
	\$882,860,961	\$893,099,675
Puerto Rico	\$6,750,000	\$958,367
	\$889,610,961	\$894,058,043
Virgin Islands	\$2,250,000	\$720,000
American Samoa	\$3,639,039	\$3,781,957
Guam	\$2,250,000	\$720,000
N. Mariana Islands	\$2,250,000	\$720,000

Source: Estimates calculated by CRS. Caveat: Other estimating methods based on different assumptions would yield different results.