

Adequate Money, Changing Disasters, New Administration: Challenges of Homeland Security and Emergency Management

By Beverly Bell

In 2007, the focus shifted from the failures of the Hurricane Katrina response and recovery to a broader debate on the future of emergency management and homeland security. Major issues included the re-organization of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; the use and control of National Guard troops in times of disaster; and the recurring theme of sufficient federal funding to support programs and mandated responsibilities. After the nation caught its breath following one of the most destructive hurricane seasons on record, the goal now is to continue building capacity at the state and local levels; ensuring that the federal government does a better job of engaging all stakeholders in developing and implementing national policy; and preparing for the transition to a new administration in Washington.

Introduction

The country did not experience an event in 2007 the size or scope of hurricanes Katrina and Rita, but a disaster of a different form did strike. The shootings in April 2007 at Virginia Tech—the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University—were the impetus for schools, businesses and government offices around the country to re-evaluate their emergency plans, communication systems and lockdown procedures. State emergency management agencies have long been involved in school safety planning. The Virginia Tech tragedy served to refocus the nation on the importance of training and conducting drills on safety plans and procedures.

While the 2007 hurricane season in the United States was relatively quiet, numerous other natural disasters tested the states' capabilities and resources. Wildfires in California, tornadoes in Kansas, ice storms in Oklahoma and flooding in Missouri accounted for some of the 63 major disaster declarations and dozens of fire events. In fact, 2007 had the third highest number of major disaster declarations in the past 10 years.¹

In light of the frequent disasters, states are continually concerned about the lack of sustained federal funding for emergency management and homeland security responsibilities, which are often mandated by the federal government. Last year, Congress did appropriate additional money for the Emergency Management Performance Grant, a key emergency management funding program. Questions persist, however, about the State Homeland Security Grant

Program, which actually saw a 48 percent decrease from fiscal year 2004 to 2008.² There is also a belief that because of the growing number of disasters, federal regulations are being interpreted more narrowly in order to reduce the government's financial exposure in assistance programs. State legislatures are trying to make up the difference by committing more dollars to both emergency management and homeland security.

Beyond the fiscal issues, states are also worried about the availability and control of National Guard troops, which by law are under the authority of each governor. The 2007 Defense Authorization amendments to the Federal Insurrection Act gave the president authority to federalize National Guard units without consulting the governor. With this new power and because of the nation's military commitments in the Middle East, there are fewer National Guard soldiers to assist with state-side disaster response and recovery. House and Senate-backed legislation, which was included in the 2008 Defense Authorization Act, would rescind the previous provision.

Other factors are impacting state emergency management and homeland security as well. Changing weather patterns with stronger, more frequent natural disasters are putting more citizens in peril and causing greater destruction of homes and businesses. The national mortgage crisis along with other troubling economic factors and Iraq war expenditures have spawned worries over a recession, which would impact state budgets and their ability to fund vital emer-

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

gency management and homeland security programs. It's unknown how extensively these circumstances will affect the overall security and safety of the country, and the people who try to manage the threats.

Emergency Management and Homeland Security Structures

When a disaster strikes, emergency management becomes one of the most important functions of state government. It is the central coordination point for all resources and assistance provided during disasters and emergencies, including acts of terrorism. It also has the overarching responsibility of saving lives, protecting property and helping citizens recover once a disaster has occurred. Typically, emergency management comes to the forefront once an event has taken place. In reality, much of the critical work comes before in the form of disaster drills and exercises, hazard mitigation programs, public warning tests and preparedness education.

Emergency Management includes four main parts, referred to as the "Four Pillars":

- **Mitigation:** Activities that reduce or eliminate the degree of risk to human life and property
- **Preparedness:** Pre-disaster activities to develop and maintain a capability to respond rapidly and effectively to emergencies and disasters
- **Response:** Activities to assess and contain the immediate effects of disasters, provide life support to victims and deliver emergency services
- **Recovery:** Activities to restore damaged facilities and equipment, and support the economic and social revitalization of affected areas to their pre-emergency status

On the state level, these four elements encompass many different aspects, from planning and implementation to training and exercising. A state emergency manager will interact with all sectors of the population, including other state agencies, elected officials, local jurisdictions, all public safety personnel, the private sector and the general public.

Emergency Management Organizations, Budgets and Staff

There is no one organizational structure for a state emergency management agency—most states design it based on their specific needs. In 12 states,³ the emergency management agency is located within the department of public safety; in 18 states it is located within the military department under the auspices of the adjutant general; and in 13 states, it is within the governor's office. From a contextual perspective,

half of the emergency management directors in the 10 states with the most disaster declarations report directly to the governor.⁴

Regardless of agencies' organizational structure for daily operations, emergency management ranks high among governors' priorities. In 33 states, the emergency management director is appointed by the governor. The position is appointed by the adjutant general in eight states and by the secretary of public safety in six states.

Operating budgets for these agencies in 2008 range from a low of \$584,204 to a high of more than \$42 million. This represents a substantial increase of 26 percent. In fact, 37 responding states saw their budgets rise to an average of approximately \$5.4 million with a median of \$3 million. In comparison, the 2007 operating budgets ranged from \$270,000 to \$35 million, and almost \$4.2 million with a median of nearly \$2.5 million.

More money might be due to additional Emergency Management Performance Grant funding that states realized in 2007. This federal grant requires a 50-50 match, so states had to increase their budgets in order to qualify. Also, state legislatures continued to increase emergency management budgets in the post Hurricane Katrina environment to build and strengthen emergency preparedness and response capabilities.

While state budgets rose significantly, staffing levels at all state emergency management agencies inched up only slightly. For 2008, the agencies' combined personnel were 4,689, compared to 4,675 in 2007.

Highly qualified directors run these agencies; two-thirds of them have 12 years or more experience in emergency management. Thirty-five directors, however, have been in the director's position for three years or less. Fifteen directors have never experienced a presidential-declared disaster. Some of the turnover is due to the fact that emergency management directors are politically appointed positions and tend to change as new governors are elected. The aging U.S. work force and retirements have also impacted the field.

Homeland Security Structures and Funding

State homeland security offices continue to evolve. This is apparent from the wide range of structures and responsibilities under which state homeland security offices operate. In some cases, state homeland security directors manage grants and budgets; in other cases, they have very limited roles. The inconsistent approach is a clear indication that the relationship

Table A: State Emergency Management: Agency Structure, Budget and Staffing

State or other jurisdiction	Position appointed	Appointed/ selected by	Organizational structure	Agency operating budget FY 2008	Full-time employee positions
Alabama	★	G	Governor's Office	\$2,900,000	103
Alaska	★	G	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	3,000,000	50
Arizona	★	ADJ	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	1,500,000	62
Arkansas.....	★	G	Governor's Office	2,593,474	82 (a)
California	★	G	Governor's Office	42,767,000	533
Colorado.....	★	ED	Department of Local Affairs	600,000	28
Connecticut	HSEMC	Governor's Office	4,000,000	34
Delaware.....	★	G	Department of Homeland Security	1,880,030	41
Florida	★	G	Governor's Office	10,450,000	138
Georgia	★	G	Governor's Office	2,382,120	109
Hawaii.....	★	ADJ	Department of Defense	1,500,000	94
Idaho.....	★	ADJ	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	1,500,000	40
Illinois.....	★	G	Governor's Office	34,322,000	250
Indiana.....	★	G	Department of Homeland Security	17,000,000	309 (a)
Iowa	★	G	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	2,740,000	62 (a)
Kansas	ADJ	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	611,000	32
Kentucky	★	ADJ	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	3,137,299	82
Louisiana	★	G	Governor's Office	6,968,476	163
Maine.....	★	G	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	662,162	23
Maryland.....	★	G	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	2,558,000	82
Massachusetts.....	★	G	Public Safety	4,000,000	85
Michigan.....	★	G	State Police	4,000,000	67 (b)
Minnesota.....	★	PSS	Public Safety	4,967,000	68 (a)
Mississippi.....	★	G	Governor's Office	6,000,000	120
Missouri.....	★	G	Public Safety	3,000,000	70
Montana	CS	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	781,343	23
Nebraska.....	★	ADJ	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	1,411,000	37
Nevada.....	★	PSS	Public Safety	705,000	24
New Hampshire.....	★	G	Public Safety	4,400,000	48
New Jersey.....	★	G	State Police	6,000,000	83
New Mexico.....	★	G	Department of Homeland Security/ Emergency Management	3,308,000	71
New York.....	★	G	Governor's Office	8,034,000	123
North Carolina.....	★	G	Public Safety	9,280,307	178
North Dakota.....	★	ADJ	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	4,050,000	56
Ohio	★	PSS	Public Safety	5,500,000	101
Oklahoma.....	★	G	Governor's Office	760,000	32
Oregon	★	ADJ	State Police	2,900,000	44
Pennsylvania	★	G	Governor's Office	12,300,000	173
Rhode Island.....	★	G	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	820,000	27
South Carolina.....	★	ADJ	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	2,300,000	72
South Dakota.....	★	PSS	Public Safety	584,204	19
Tennessee.....	★	G	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	4,000,000	109
Texas	SPS	Public Safety	8,590,000	172
Utah	★	PSS	Public Safety	840,000	104 (a)
Vermont.....	★	PSS	Public Safety	913,500	23
Virginia.....	★	G	Public Safety	13,700,000	124
Washington.....	...	G	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	4,900,000	97
West Virginia.....	★	G	Military Affairs and Public Safety	7,757,419	41
Wisconsin.....	★	G	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	7,300,000	43
Wyoming.....	(c)
Dist. of Columbia.....	★	M	Department of Homeland Security	6,000,000	45
Guam.....	★	G	Department of Homeland Security	627,000	45
No. Mariana Islands	★	G	Governor's Office	750,000	30
U.S. Virgin Islands.....	★	G	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	700,000	18

Source: The National Emergency Management Association, January 2008.

Key:

- ★ — Yes
- ... — No
- G — Governor
- ADJ — Adjutant General
- CS — Civil Service
- ED — Executive Director, Dept. of Local Affairs
- M — Mayor
- P — Territory President

HSEMC — Homeland Security/Emergency Management Commissioner

PSS — Public Safety Secretary/Commissioner/Director

SPS — State Police Superintendent

(a) Includes both homeland security and emergency management positions.

(b) Separate homeland security office housed in EM agency; additional 11 FTEs.

(c) Wyoming is not a member of NEMA, and therefore is not represented in the survey data.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

between homeland security and emergency management is still being defined.

All states have a designated homeland security point of contact and this position has become a critical component of a governor's staff. It has the enormous job of preparing citizens, businesses and governments for the next emergency or large-scale disaster.

The person who takes on this responsibility varies from state to state. Sixteen states have established a unique position of homeland security advisor or homeland security director. In nine states, either the emergency management director or a combined emergency management/homeland security director is the primary point of contact. In eight states, the adjutant general serves in this capacity. Ten public safety secretaries/commissioners are in this role.

Many states are also modifying the structure of their homeland security offices. On one hand, this means states are creating structures that work for their particular purposes. On the other, the lack of standardization results in fragmentation in a nation trying diligently to develop a comprehensive homeland security strategy. Twelve states house the day-to-day operations in the governor's office, while eight states run it out of the adjutant general/military affairs department. Another nine have it in a specific homeland security department. Six states keep the homeland security function in their emergency management office, while nine operate out of their public safety department. The other states have different structures in place.

The trend of the homeland security director's position becoming more institutionalized in the organizational structure is holding steady. Forty-two states—the same as in 2006—have authorized their homeland security offices, departments or agencies through either executive order or state statute.

Funding for these state homeland security offices is changing, however. In 2007, 39 states received 60 percent or more of their homeland security funding from the federal government. This compares to 46 states in 2006. Of those 39 states, 18 operate with 100 percent federal funding, down from 22 states last year. The change reflects a steady decline in various federal homeland security grants, and the decision by state legislatures to commit to these programs by investing more state dollars. Only two states—Georgia and Maryland—rely totally on state appropriations for their homeland security funding. This money helps support one of the most important components of homeland security—people. The number of state personnel dedicated to homeland security totals 1,848.

The Emergency Management-Homeland Security Environment

Changes at FEMA

As a result of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act, passed in 2006, the Federal Emergency Management Agency re-organization went into effect March 31, 2007. While the agency remains within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, various preparedness, response and recovery functions that had been shifted out of FEMA were restored, including grant responsibilities. The transition was welcomed as many states believed FEMA had lost much of its resources and responsibilities under the Department of Homeland Security.

FEMA is also addressing its staffing issues. In 2005, FEMA was understaffed at the regional and federal levels because of a mandatory hiring freeze. Now, regional offices are being fully staffed, an important step since these staff members serve as the direct line of communication for state and local governments to tap into federal resources when a disaster occurs.

Mutual Aid More Important than Ever

If there was one lesson from the 2005 hurricane season, it was that mutual aid is critical in the nation's disaster response and recovery system. The Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC), a mutual aid agreement that allows support across state lines when a disaster occurs, played a crucial role in the aftermath of hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The compact deployed nearly 66,000 people from 48 states at a cost of more than \$830 million. This represented the largest deployment of mutual aid assistance in United States History.

The compact's importance was underscored once again in 2007 when the Government Accountability Office issued a report about EMAC. The report cited the compact's growth, its strengths, the key contribution it made in the 2005 hurricane season, areas for improvement and a recommendation that federal funding for the compact be maintained. EMAC continues to provide assistance in times of disasters and enhance its capabilities.

Shifting Disaster Threats

The debate over global warming is ongoing. Some question if current weather events are simply cyclical occurrences; others insist they are systemic climate changes.

Regardless of who is right, emergency managers are dealing with the repercussions of more active weather patterns and the resulting natural disasters. Of the 63 major disaster declarations in 2007, nearly

Table B: Homeland Security Structures

State or other jurisdiction	State homeland security advisor		Homeland security organizations	
	Designated coordinator	Operates under authority of	Day-to-day operations under	Full-time employee positions
Alabama	Homeland Security Director	SS	Homeland Security Department	13
Alaska	Director, Homeland Security and Emergency Management	SS	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	50
Arizona	Homeland Security Director	SS	Homeland Security Department	20
Arkansas.....	Emergency Management Director	GA	Emergency Management	82 (b)
California	Homeland Security Director	EAO	Governor's Office	86
Colorado.....	Homeland Security Coordinator	EAO	Governor's Office	3
Connecticut	Commissioner of HS/EM	SS	Governor's Office	34
Delaware.....	Secretary, Department of Safety and Homeland Security	GA	Department of Safety and Homeland Security	50
Florida	Florida Dept. of Law Enforcement	SS	Florida Dept. of Law Enforcement	73
Georgia	Emergency Management Director	EAO	Emergency Management	5
Hawaii.....	Adj. General/Director of Civil Defense	GA	Department of Defense	5
Idaho.....	Adjutant General	EAO	Homeland Security Department	10
Illinois.....	Deputy Chief of Staff for Public Safety	EAO	Governor's Office	3
Indiana.....	Homeland Security Director	SS	Governor's Office	309 (b)
Iowa	Lieutenant Governor	GA	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	62 (b)
Kansas	Adjutant General	SS	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	9
Kentucky	Homeland Security Director	EAO	Homeland Security Department	20
Louisiana.....	Emergency Management Director	SS	Emergency Management/Homeland Security	10
Maine.....	Adjutant General	GA	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	4
Maryland.....	Homeland Security Director	EAO	Governor's Office	2
Massachusetts.....	Public Safety Secretary/Commissioner	EAO	Public Safety	9
Michigan.....	Special Assistant to Governor	EAO	State Police	11 (c)
Minnesota.....	Public Safety Secretary/Commissioner	EAO	Emergency Management/Homeland Security	68 (b)
Mississippi.....	Homeland Security Director	EAO	Public Safety	12
Missouri.....	Public Safety Secretary/Commissioner	EAO	Public Safety	20
Montana	Emergency Management Director	EAO	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	4
Nebraska.....	Lieutenant Governor	SS	Emergency Management	9
Nevada.....	Homeland Security Director	GA	Governor's Office	5
New Hampshire.....	Homeland Security Director	SS	Public Safety	1
New Jersey.....	Office of HS and Preparedness	EAO	Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness	188
New Mexico.....	Homeland Security and Emergency Management Director	SS	Emergency Management/Homeland Security	71
New York.....	Public Safety Secretary/Commissioner	GA	Homeland Security Department	184
North Carolina.....	Public Safety Secretary/Commissioner	SS	Emergency Management	11
North Dakota.....	Homeland Security Director	EAO	Homeland Security Division	6
Ohio	Public Safety Secretary/Commissioner	GA	Public Safety	20
Oklahoma.....	Homeland Security Director	SS	Homeland Security	18
Oregon.....	Adjutant General	GA	Emergency Management	10
Pennsylvania.....	Homeland Security Director	EAO	Governor's Office	6
Rhode Island.....	Adjutant General	EAO	Emergency Management	6
South Carolina.....	State Police Super/Commissioner	SS	State Police	7
South Dakota.....	Homeland Security Director	GA	Public Safety	3
Tennessee.....	Public Safety Secretary/Commissioner	EAO	Public Safety	29
Texas.....	Homeland Security Director	EAO	Governor's Office	6
Utah.....	Homeland Security Director	SS	Public Safety	104 (b)
Vermont.....	Public Safety Secretary/Commissioner	EAO	Public Safety	8
Virginia.....	Special Assistant to Governor	SS	Governor's Office	9
Washington.....	Adjutant General	EAO	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	29
West Virginia.....	Public Safety Secretary/Commissioner	GA	Office of the Secretary of Military Affairs and Public Safety	6
Wisconsin.....	Adjutant General	EAO	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	0
Wyoming..... (a).....
Dist. of Columbia.....	Homeland Security Director	SS	Homeland Security	45
Guam.....	Special Assistant to the Governor	EAO	Governor's Office	11
No. Mariana Islands	Special Assistant for Homeland Security	SS	Governor's Office	7
U.S. Virgin Islands.....	Adjutant General	SS	Adjutant General/Military Affairs	8

Source: The National Emergency Management Association, January 2008.

Key:
 GA — Governor's Verbal Authority
 EAO — Executive/Administrative Order
 SS — State Statute

(a) Wyoming is not a member of NEMA, and therefore is not represented in the survey data.
 (b) Includes both homeland security and emergency management positions.
 (c) Separate homeland security office housed in EM agency; total of 78 FTEs.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

two-thirds involved flooding, which experts consider an outgrowth of climate change. In addition, there were 60 fire management assistance declarations. Most of these occurred in states experiencing worsening drought conditions over the past year, including California, Nevada and Georgia. The total number of fire declarations was down from the previous year, but up from 43 in 2004 and 39 in 2005.

Related to the possibility of global warming, there is discussion about enacting more stringent building codes for those threatened by earthquakes and hurricanes. Others are expressing reservations about constructing homes too close to coastal areas or in remote, isolated locations, which makes it difficult for emergency responders to access the property when there is an imminent danger.

Lack of Preparedness

After the 2005 hurricane season, FEMA was heavily criticized for its slow and inadequate response. In an effort to do a better job, FEMA adopted a “lean forward” approach, pre-positioning resources and anticipating needs prior to a disaster event. However, this tactic might have helped create an unintentional expectation that government—and not the individual—is primarily responsible for a person’s safety before, during and after an event. There is a fear this air of entitlement could place more burdens on state resources. States believe adequate public resources must be in place to manage a disaster, but individuals must also take a larger role in protecting themselves, their families and their property.

Issues at the Forefront

The Emergency Operation Center— Nerve Center in a Disaster

In the last two years, nearly 25 percent of the states have built a new Emergency Operations Center. Most used a combination of federal and state funding to pay for the construction, which averaged nearly \$12 million per facility.

During emergencies and disasters, Emergency Operation Centers serve as the nerve center for state and local coordination. Federal agencies use these facilities as well, as a central point for communication during response and recovery phases. After the 2001 terrorist attacks, Congress provided some funding to states to update their centers. However, it only allowed for limited planning and a needs assessment.

The fiscal year 2008 federal budget includes \$15 million for the special centers. Unfortunately, like many infrastructure issues, this represents only a fraction of what is required. Even with the recent invest-

ments states have made in the centers, another \$250 million is needed to build, retrofit and upgrade existing facilities across the country.⁵ For local Emergency Operation Centers, that amount increases to nearly \$1 billion, for a total of almost \$1.4 billion. This includes the costs to upgrade equipment and software, train personnel and conduct operations during emergency and non-emergency situations.

Interoperability

The issue of interoperability—the ability of various emergency responders to talk to each other through both voice and data systems—is still a challenge. In late 2007, the U.S. Department of Commerce announced that more than \$960 million in Public Safety Interoperable Communications grants would be available to states. The one-time grant could be used for items including advanced technologies and improving communications in areas with a high risk for disasters or terrorism.

The grant includes a base amount for each state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. The rest of the funds are allocated in a similar, risk-based formula to that of the Homeland Security Grant Program. Despite the nearly \$1 billion in funding, the grant barely skims the surface of the \$7 billion states estimate it will take to either achieve state-wide interoperability or reach levels required in each state’s homeland security strategy. For those states providing a dollar figure, the needs total is in excess of \$160 million per state.

Federal Requirements/Legislation and Impact on States

“The Implementing of the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007,” which passed in late August 2007, will have a significant impact on some states receiving homeland security grants. The funding allocation formula was changed, placing greater emphasis on risk as opposed to the previous approach of allocating dollars on a percentage plus population basis. Now, smaller rural states will find it more difficult to carry on terrorism-preparedness programs without adequate federal support. The response equipment purchased by states and localities, along with the planning efforts and training conducted for thousands of state and local emergency response personnel, are characterized as a national security effort. States and emergency response disciplines are concerned about what will happen to this investment without sustained federal funding.

The National Response Framework, which was previously known as the National Response Plan,

also directly affects states. Re-written in 2007, this document was designed to be an all-hazards approach to domestic incident management, as required by a presidential directive (HSPD-5). The National Response Framework is extremely important for the nation because it links all levels of government, private sector and non-governmental organizations in a unified approach to emergency management. After much debate and input from states, the framework now allows FEMA to coordinate federal disaster operations and provides a closer alliance with the bottoms-up approach that states favor. It has an improved focus on planning, short-term recovery and clarified roles, responsibilities and relationships which should allow for a quicker response that disasters demand.

Finally, with federal grants such as the Public Safety Interoperable Communications and legislation such as the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act come onerous deadlines and concurrent reporting requirements—many directly from Congress. In most cases, the value of the programs themselves isn't disputed; but they entail many hours of staff time and coordination, both on the state and local levels. In those jurisdictions with fewer personnel, meeting the target dates can be very difficult.

Border Security/Real ID

The topic of border security cuts across a wide spectrum of issues. These include not only public safety, but also health care, education and employment. States such as Arizona, New Mexico and Texas are on the front lines of illegal immigration, but all states are expected to eventually face the same problems. This translates into unbudgeted costs in many areas, including homeland security and emergency management.

The fiscal year 2008 Omnibus Budget targets money for hiring 3,000 border patrol agents. There are also provisions for the construction of a 700-mile fence along the almost 2,000 mile border with Mexico. This funding, however, doesn't address the need for a comprehensive immigration and border security policy, one that includes enforcement of immigration and employment laws; developing the Mexican as well as South and Central American economies; and bolstering legal immigration.

Along with border security is the question of proper and secure identification. The Real ID Act of 2005 mandated national standards for driver's licenses and identification cards with an original implementation deadline of May 2008. Now, total compliance is required by 2017.

This program has proven to be problematic for many states, essentially because of the price tag. A \$31 million grant program for states will help in the implementation with additional money later in 2008. States are also allowed to use some of the State Homeland Security Grant Program funds, but with a recent estimated total cost of almost \$10 billion over 11 years for implementation and \$4 billion of this coming from the states, the Real ID Act represents a considerable burden on states. These projected expenditures were down from earlier numbers, which stood at \$23 billion.

A New Administration

With the 2008 presidential election, states are preparing for a new administration in Washington. In addition, all 435 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives as well as a third of the seats in the U.S. Senate, are up for election. This suggests the possibility of a new or revised approach to disaster preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery. It will also be the first time the U.S. Department of Homeland Security—created in 2003—will transition to new leadership in the White House. Finally, 11 states will hold gubernatorial elections, so many other changes could be on the horizon for those in state homeland security and emergency management.

Notes

¹ *Declared Disasters by Year or State*, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

² U.S. Department of Homeland Security; *FY2007 Homeland Security Grant Program and Final Overall Fact Sheet FY 08 Grant Guidance*.

³ This data is based on an annual NEMA survey of state emergency management directors. There were a total of 53 responses which included 49 states, three territories and the District of Columbia.

⁴ *Declared Disasters by Year or State*; Federal Emergency Management Agency.

⁵ In 2006, states estimated that \$393 million was needed for EOC construction. With the recent \$140 million that states have spent on new/renovated construction, this leaves an estimated \$253 million in expenditures.

About the Author

Beverly Bell is the senior policy analyst for the National Emergency Management Association, an affiliate of The Council of State Governments. In her position, she coordinates and conducts research, interacts with the states on changing federal policy, and acts as an information clearinghouse for emergency management and homeland security issues.