



San Francisco Bay Area UASI Background

December 2011

In the late 1990s, increasing concern regarding recent domestic terrorist attacks at the World Trade Center and the Oklahoma City Bombing, as well as increased global terrorist activity, the federal government began funding the development of new terrorism prevention and response capabilities for major U.S. cities. The initial grant programs were relatively small.

In response to the events of 9/11, Congress dramatically increased funding for these efforts by creating a dozen new grant programs while simultaneously directing the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security.

The largest of these grant programs is the Urban Areas Security Initiative which focuses on enhancing regional preparedness in major metropolitan areas. Consistent with the 9/11 Act, states are required to ensure that at least 25 percent of UASI-appropriated funds are dedicated towards law enforcement terrorism prevention-oriented planning, organization, training, exercise, and equipment activities. This includes those activities that support the development and operation of intelligence fusion centers. The program provides funding to 31 high threat, high density, urban areas and is based on risk and effectiveness.

Funding

A summary of UASI funding from 2003-2011:

	2003	2003 Suppl.	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Amount allocated	\$96.5	\$593.3	\$675	\$829.7	\$710	\$747	\$781.6	\$798.6	\$832.5	\$662.6
# of UASI regions	7	30	50	43	46	46	60	62	64	31
San Francisco	10.3	18.6	26.3	18.7						
Oakland			7.8	5.7						
San Jose			9.9	6.0						
Bay Area UASI					22.7	27.3	29.7	32.5	34.3	35.5

Funds are allocated by “Tiers”. Tier I cities are considered to be at the greatest risk – and receive half of all grant funds awarded. The remainder of the funding is shared by other cities with a lesser level of risk and those cities have been designated as Tier II.

Tier I areas: New York City, Los Angeles/Long Beach, National Capital Region, Chicago, San Francisco Bay Area, Houston, Jersey City/Newark, Dallas/Fort Worth/Arlington, Philadelphia, Boston, and San Diego.



Target UASI Geographic Areas

The jurisdictions eligible to receive UASI funding have evolved over many years with a gradual overall increase in the number of participating cities and counties or “footprint”. In Fiscal Years 2003-2007, funds were awarded to the core city and core county in each urban area. In FY2008, FEMA used risk analysis methodology to allocate funds. This “risk model” considers the potential risk of terrorism to people, critical infrastructure, and economic security to estimate the relative risk of terrorism faced by a given area. Further, it uses Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as the designation of the geographic urban area.

For Fiscal Years 2003-2006, there were three separate UASI programs in the Bay Area: San Jose, Oakland, and San Francisco. Each was comprised of the core city and the core county in which that city was located. Each UASI was also required to coordinate efforts with adjoining counties.

In FY 2006, FEMA directed the three Bay Area UASIs to consolidate into one regional UASI program comprised of ten counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma) and the three major cities of Oakland, San Francisco, and San Jose. The Bay Area UASI is inclusive of over 100 incorporated cities and has a combined total population exceeding 7.5 million.

In 2011, at the direction of the existing Approval Authority and the signing of a new Master MOU, the Bay Area UASI footprint was expanded to include Monterey and San Benito Counties. This is in recognition of the valuable partnership in Regional Catastrophic planning.

Governance

Approval Authority

As per the MOU, the Bay Area UASI is managed through a three-tiered governance structure. The top tier is the eleven-member Approval Authority that includes representation from each of the three major cities of Oakland, San Francisco, and San Jose and each of the counties in which they are located Alameda, San Francisco, and Santa Clara as well as Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, Sonoma and Monterey. The California Emergency Management Agency, (CalEMA) also provides a non-voting presence on the Board. The Approval Authority provides policy direction to the program and is responsible for final decisions.

Advisory Group

The Advisory Group membership includes one voting representative and two alternates from Oakland, San Francisco, San Jose, Alameda County, Contra Costa County, Marin County, Monterey County, Napa County, San Benito County, San Mateo County, Santa Clara County, Santa Cruz County, Solano County, Sonoma County, the Fusion Center and CalEMA.

The Advisory Group makes policy and programmatic recommendations to the Approval Authority and ensures there is broad representation, input and participation in the regional planning process.



Management Team

The UASI Management Team consists of a general manager, strategy and compliance director, regional project managers and finance and grants managers. The City and County of San Francisco has been designated as the fiscal agent for the grants managed by the Bay Area UASI.

The UASI program is also used to administer other major federal grant programs including:

- Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (through the FY2011 funding cycle)
- Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program (through the FY2010 funding cycle)

Grant Administration Process

Each year FEMA issues UASI grant guidance that describes the priorities and requirements for the annual grant cycle. FEMA requires each UASI region to develop and submit a strategic plan that outlines the region's common goals and objectives. The UASI Strategy development process includes a regional risk assessment, a capabilities assessment, and a gap analysis. This capabilities-based UASI Strategy is intended to drive UASI projects (jurisdictions seeking funds must justify their proposals) which are submitted to the state and federal government as a consolidated package of "investment justifications".