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Abstract

Why do some U.S. states allocate so much more money to their homeland security/emergency management budgets than others states do? This paper looks at multiple possible claims as to why this might be, including the political party control of the state, the state’s location to another country or body of water, the history of terrorist attacks in the state since September 11th, 2001, and the amount of money that is allocated to the state from the federal Homeland Security Grant Program. Budget information on each state’s homeland security/emergency management budget as well as the state’s overall FY 17 budget was collected and compared to the rest of the states. The states (excluding Missouri and Oklahoma due to lack of information) were all ranked in order from largest to smallest in terms of the percentage of how much the state allocates from its total budget to the homeland security/emergency management part of it. After conducting lots of research, it is still hard to tell which, if any, of these claims best answers the question at hand. Nevertheless, it is important to research and analyze this information as homeland security and emergency management are pressing issues in the ever-changing world we live in, filled with numerous different kinds of threats.
Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my mother and father for always supporting me, encouraging me, and helping me in anything and everything I do – I could not have made it this far without you two. I would also like to thank The Honors College and the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs & Policy honors program for always challenging me and pushing me to be my best, work hard, and to think outside of the box. Lastly, I cannot thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Asal, enough for all of his guidance, mentorship, and patience with me all throughout my undergraduate career at the University at Albany, SUNY. Dr. Asal has been an essential part of my college experience and I am lucky to have been taught by him and to have worked with him on multiple occasions.
Table of Contents

Abstract......................................................................................................................Page 2
Acknowledgements..................................................................................................Page 3
Table of Contents.....................................................................................................Page 4
Introduction.............................................................................................................Page 5
Background of Each U.S. State’s Homeland Security/Emergency Management Budget....Page 6
Method....................................................................................................................Page 32
Budgets Ranked in Order from Largest to Smallest....................................................Page 32
Budgets by Political Party Control of State...............................................................Page 36
Budgets by States’ Location to a U.S. National Border..............................................Page 38
Budgets by Past Terrorism Attacks Since September 11, 2011.................................Page 40
Budget Contributions from the Homeland Security Grant Program........................Page 42
Conclusion and Future Research.............................................................................Page 45
References...............................................................................................................Page 47
Introduction

The threat of terrorism and disasters has always been very real in the United States, but became much more a pertinent issue after the terrorist attacks in New York City, New York on September 11th, 2001. After these attacks, just over a year later, the federal Department of Homeland Security was formed by the Homeland Security Act of 2002. Once this federal department was established, many states on the state level followed suit and established their own departments centered on homeland security and/or emergency management. Other states already had some sort of department of this nature, but revamped and remodeled the old departments and their overall structure. It is not just about homeland security, though. The emergency management aspect is just as important. States must respond to the climate changing, which thus produces more extreme weather events more frequently. There are lots of threats for all fifty states and the country as a whole to deal with, both natural and manmade. With every single state in the United States having a department, division, office, or agency devoted to homeland security and/or emergency management, there are bound to be many similarities and differences between all of them. In terms of similarities, all of the departments, divisions, offices, and agencies have similar goals to ultimately prepare, mitigate, protect, respond, and recover from any and all man-made and natural disasters. In terms of differences, some of the departments, divisions, offices, and agencies function solely based from a homeland security perspective, others solely an emergency management perspective, and others with a joint homeland security and emergency management angle. The departments they fall under also differ and this can all be seen in the background of each states’ respective agencies. The largest and most important difference between each state’s departments, though, are their budgets. This paper examines reasons why some states might allocate more funds to homeland
security/emergency management. These include political party control of the state, location to an international border, the state’s history of past terrorist attacks since September 11th, 2001, and the amount of funding each state gets from the federal government Homeland Security Grant Program.

Background of Each United States State’s Homeland Security/Emergency Management Budget

Alabama

The Alabama Emergency Management Agency, under the directions of Brian Hastings since 2017 when Governor Kay Ivey appointed him, helps Alabama citizens to prepare and recover from disasters such as earthquakes, extreme heat, flooding, home fires, hurricanes, pandemics, severe weather, thunderstorms and lightning, tornadoes, tsunamis, wildfires, winter storms, and extreme cold (Alabama Emergency Management Agency). According to the Agency's website, its facility cost $2.2 million and was built in 1991; it quickly became a "model for other states to follow," which made the Alabama Emergency Management Agency a leader in its field in the United States.

The Alabama Office of Homeland Security falls under the Alabama Department of Transportation and is headed by Bob McWhorter. According to the Office's website, their mission is to secure the Alabama Department of Transportation by assisting with the "prevention, protection, response, recovery and mitigation of the effects of an all hazards incident whether natural or man-made and regardless of magnitude" (ALDOT Office of Homeland Security).

It seems Alabama used to have an Alabama Department of Homeland Security, which was created by the Alabama Homeland Security Act of 2003 (HB 335) in response to the
terrorist attacks in New York City on September 11th. The Alabama Legislature "first in the nation to create in 2003 a Cabinet-level Department of Homeland Security as part of the state's Executive Branch" (Alabama Law Enforcement Agency). The website link for the Department does not work and on the federal Department of Homeland Security's website, there are only links to Alabama's state government website, their Emergency Management Agency website, and their Law Enforcement Agency website. The state DHS also does not show up anywhere in Alabama's budget. As can be seen on the Alabama Law Enforcement Agency website, the agency was created by Act 2013 - 67, and it consolidated twelve state law enforcement agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security, into this one agency.

Alaska

The Alaska Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management, which is directed by Mike Sutton, falls under the Alaska Department of Military and Veterans Affairs. This Division was established in 2003 under the Alaska Disaster Act, which formed the Division of Homeland Security and merged it with Emergency Services, which had previously been created in 1977 (Alaska Legal Resource Center). According to the Division's website, its mission is to "foster a prepared, resilient Alaska capable of meeting the needs of its communities and citizens in response to all-hazards events."

Arizona

The Arizona Department of Homeland Security, under the direction of Gilbert M. Orrantia, is a state agency in Arizona. Orrantia became the director of the Arizona Department of Homeland Security in June of 2009 and served in the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for twenty-six years prior to the director position (Arizona Department of Homeland Security). According to the Department’s website, their mission includes “providing strategic direction and
access to resources that will enable all of the state’s homeland security sub-recipient stakeholders to achieve our collective goals” of preventing terrorism, protecting borders, enhancing cybersecurity protections, building resiliency, and taking an all-hazards approach to reducing vulnerability, planning, mitigating, responding, and recovering to/from any and all hazards that “affect the safety, well-being, and economic security of Arizona” (Arizona Department of Homeland Security). Additionally, according to the website, the Arizona Department of Homeland Security is charged with managing and administering the homeland security grants from the federal government.

Arkansas

The Arkansas Department of Emergency Management takes care of all Arkansas’ homeland security and preparedness related matters; the Department works to “prevent, protect against, mitigate the effects of, respond to, and recover from those threats that pose the greatest risk” (Arkansas Department of Emergency Management). The Department is headed by the director, A.J. Gary, who was appointed by the governor in May of 2016; A.J. Gary was the former Chief of Police for the Conway Police Department prior to his director position Arkansas’s Governor).

California

California’s Homeland Security Division falls under the larger Office of Emergency Services. The Division is led by the Homeland Security Advisor, Mark Ghilarducci, and it works to prepare, mitigate, prevent, respond, and recover from any threats, terrorist acts, as well as any other natural or man-made disasters (Cal OES). The Division has a framework known as the “2017 – 2020 California Homeland Security Strategy” that lays out the priorities of the Division,
a metric to measure performance of the Division’s implementation of the Strategy, and helps to match priorities with state funding (Cal OES). As can be seen on the Division’s website, some of these priorities include the enhancement of information collection, the protection of critical infrastructure, strengthening cybersecurity, enhancing community preparedness, amongst other matters.

**Colorado**

The Colorado Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management was formed with the passage of House Bill 12-1283, which created the new Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management on July 1, 2012 and moved the original Division of Emergency Management, which was under the Department of Local Affairs, to be a part of the new Division (Colorado Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Management). The Division aims to have a “prepared, safe, and resilient Colorado” by preventing, mitigating, protecting, responding, and recovering from Colorado’s all-hazards events as well as by following their core values: service, teamwork, respect, integrity, vision, and excellence (Colorado Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Management). The Division is led by Director Kevin R. Klein, who also serves as the Governor’s Homeland Security Advisor and has a long history of a background in fire safety and public service (Colorado Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Management).

**Connecticut**

Connecticut’s Emergency Management and Homeland Security is organizationally under the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection and is charged with creating a
program that “encompasses all human-made and natural hazards, and includes prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery components to ensure the safety and well-being of the citizens of Connecticut” (Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security). The Deputy Commissioner, William J. Hackett, is in charge of the division and oversees all of its actions, including terrorism prevention, administering grant programs, the State Fusion Center, and more (Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security).

*Delaware*

The Delaware Department of Safety and Homeland Security was formed in June of 2003 with the passage of a bill by the Delaware General Assembly, which replaced the original Department of Public Safety state agency (Department of Safety and Homeland Security). The Department encompasses many other offices, such as the Capitol Police, the Delaware Emergency Management Agency, the Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Enforcement, and a few others. The department looks to “promote and protect the safety of people and property in Delaware” (Department of Safety and Homeland Security). Robert Coupe, the Secretary of the Delaware Department of Safety and Home, was formerly the Commissioner of Department of Corrections until being appointed as secretary in January of 2017 (Department of Safety and Homeland Security).

*Florida*

The Florida Division of Emergency Management duties include planning and responding for man-made and natural disasters and it is located primarily in Tallahassee at the Emergency Operations Center (FloridaDisaster.org). Under the direction of Wesley Maul, the Division
focuses heavily on natural disasters, such as marine hazards, floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, thunderstorms, and many more, mainly due to their southern coastal location; they have lots of resources on their website to assist residents and businesses in the proper precautions and actions during such disasters (FloridaDisaster.org).

**Georgia**

The Georgia Emergency Management and Homeland Security Agency (GEMA/HS), under the leadership of Homer Bryson, is part of the Office of the Governor (The Georgia Emergency Management and Homeland Security Agency). Its “services include critical infrastructure analysis, terrorism incident management and response, All Hazards Councils programs, fire services coordination, agroterrorism preparedness, exercise and training, intelligence gathering and analysis, and homeland security grant services (The Georgia Emergency Management and Homeland Security Agency). The Homeland Security Division is responsible for terrorism preparedness and their programs focus on meeting local needs. This division works with the following state agencies: Homeland Security Task Force (purpose is to advise on issues related to Terrorism and Homeland Security), Counter Terrorism Task Force (purpose is to protect Georgia from terrorist attacks, major disasters, and emergencies), and Georgia Information Sharing and Analysis Center (fusion center to aid in intelligence and information sharing) (The Georgia Emergency Management and Homeland Security Agency).

**Hawaii**

The Office of Homeland Security (OHS) in Hawaii was created in 2013 and is part of the Department of Defense and is located in Honolulu (Office of Homeland Security). Their purpose
is to prevent and, if necessary, deal with all aspects of attacks, natural disasters, and threats (Office of Homeland Security). Within the OHS is the Office of Cybersecurity. This office strives to make online communications more secure by working with the community to implement strategies and hold monthly events to educate and engage its residents (Office of Homeland Security). Also, within the OHS is the Hawaii State Fusion Center (HSFC), the 77th one in our country. They collect various information with their top priority being cyber security and counter terrorism (Office of Homeland Security). They work behind large events to help to make such events safe for all (Office of Homeland Security).

Idaho

A Division under the Idaho Military Division, the Idaho Office of Emergency Management is directed by William B. Richy, who also is the director of the Joint Staff, Joint Force Headquarters of Idaho (Idaho Office of Emergency Management). The Office’s mission is to “effectively preparing for, protecting against, mitigating the effects of, responding to, and recovering from all hazards” by protecting the people and property of Idaho, the environment and economy of Idaho, as well as by assisting neighboring states (Idaho Office of Emergency Management).

Illinois

The mission of the Illinois Emergency Management Agency is to “prepare, protect and assist the citizens of the State of Illinois through planning, prevention, training, mitigation, response, and recovery to all hazards, natural or manmade.” (IEMA). Additionally, the Illinois Emergency Management Agency acts as the State Emergency Response Commission, maintains
a 24-hour State Emergency Operations Center and Communication Center (IEMA). The Agency follows the Illinois Emergency Operations Plan and helps local municipalities to their operations plans (IEMA). Another key responsibility of the Illinois Emergency Management Agency is to protect the people and environment from harmful effects of ionizing radiation (IEMA).

**Indiana**

The Indiana Department of Homeland Security (IDHS) is headed by Bryan J. Langley, who serves as the Executive Director (Indiana Department of Homeland Security). He is also the director of the Counter Terrorism and Security Council for Indiana (Indiana Department of Homeland Security). According to their website, IDHS is open 24/7 to strive to take action against threats and disasters, both naturally occurring and those that are manmade. The office is comprised of four operational divisions – Response and Recovery; Fire and Building; Planning and Assessment; Training and Preparedness – and four administrative and support offices – General Counsel; Finance and Administration; Information Technology; Public Affairs (Indiana Department of Homeland Security). Within IDHS is the Indiana Homeland Security Foundation. This foundation funds local public safety projects throughout the state. To help raise funds, residents can purchase a “Secure Indiana” license plate when renewing their plates, and the revenue goes to the foundation (Indiana Department of Homeland Security).

**Iowa**

The Homeland Security and Emergency Management Department (HSEMD) first began its work as the State Civil Defense Agency in 1965 (Iowa Homeland Security and Emergency Management Department). HSEMD is prepared and ready to respond to all hazards including
terrorism, although its likeliness in Iowa is unknown, natural disasters, such as floods and
tornadoes, and human-caused disasters, such as plane crashes (Iowa Homeland Security and
Emergency Management Department). In addition to HSEMD, homeland security is enhanced
by the Iowa Division of Intelligence and Fusion Center, whose purpose is to coordinate
intelligence and homeland security efforts within Iowa (Division of Intelligence).

**Kansas**

The Kansas Homeland Security Division is under the direction of Major General Le
Tafanelli and is within the Adjutant General’s Department (Kansas Adjunct General’s
Department). They are responsible for all aspects of terrorism is Kansas, and it is their
responsibility to coordinate with all levels of government – federal, state, local, and private while
focusing on awareness, prevention, protection, and response (Kansas Adjunct General’s
Department). Some of Kansas’ homeland security areas of priority are the implementation of
the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the National Response Framework to
improve information sharing, and increasing regional collaboration with an emphasis on food
and agriculture security (Kansas Adjunct General’s Department). Within Homeland Security
there are 7 regional councils determined by geographical areas – Northwest, North Central,
Northeast, KC Metro, Southwest, South Central, and Southeast.

**Kentucky**

According to the office’s website, effective as of February 1, 2016, John Holiday became
the Executive Director of the Kentucky Office of Homeland Security. This office operates under
the mandate of the United States Department of Homeland Security and the Kentucky General
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Assembly and it has various initiatives such as community safety and security, federal grants, counterterrorism, law enforcement protection, and critical infrastructure protection (Kentucky Office of Homeland Security). Another initiative within Kentucky’s office of Homeland Security is the Fusion Center. Their purpose is “to improve intelligence sharing among public safety and public service agencies at the federal, state, and local levels,” and, currently, there are sixteen federal and state agencies that collaborate within this agency (Kentucky Office of Homeland Security). The counterterrorism area is charged with monitoring threats, gathering intelligence, and sharing information with other law enforcement agencies. The key for this unit “is foreseeability rather than reaction” (Kentucky Office of Homeland Security).

*Louisiana*

The Louisiana Governor’s Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness identifies the state of Louisiana as a “high-risk State for emergency events and disasters” such as many natural disasters like “hurricanes, floods, high winds, and others” as well as an attractive target for man-made disruptions considering they are “home to critical supply routes and energy production resources” (Governor’s Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness). This Office was created by the Louisiana Revised Statute Title 29:725, less formally known as the Louisiana Homeland Security and Emergency Assistance and Disaster Act by the Louisiana Legislature (Governor’s Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness). The Governor’s Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness is organized into five focus areas: prepare, prevent respond, recover, mitigate, and four divisions: grants and administration, preparedness, response, and interoperability, public assistance, and hazard
mitigation assistance (Governor’s Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness). The Office is mainly located and operated out of the State Emergency Operations Center.

**Maine**

In the spring of 2006, Maine’s state legislature adopted an executive order issued in the summer of 2005 by the governor to create the Maine Homeland Security Advisory Council (HSAC) (Maine Emergency Management Agency). The council consists of nine members that advise the governor in all areas of homeland security as well as develops a strategic plan (Maine Emergency Management Agency). The Critical Infrastructure Protection Program (CIPP) was created to support one of the main objectives of the HSAC, which is to strengthen the critical infrastructure of Maine (Maine Emergency Management Agency). This program is focused on ensuring information and intelligence is shared with all relevant parties. Under the guidelines of Presidential Directive #21, they have identified 16 sectors under this program. CIPP works on developing their assets and partnerships within these sectors to help secure the infrastructure. CIPP also is focusing on getting security alerts and warnings as well as critical information to the leaders of the sectors so the public and private sectors will be more informed and prepared while helping to protect Maine’s critical assets. (Maine Emergency Management Agency).

**Maryland**

In July 2003, the Governor’s Office of Homeland Security was created; it is part of the Governor’s Executive Department and is run by Director Walter F. Landon(Governor’s Office of Homeland Security). The department is charged with coordinating, directing, and advising the
Governor in all areas of homeland security, including responses to disasters and emergencies and terrorist attacks. This office works with various other agencies, including the Anti-Terrorism Advisory Council of Maryland, the Maryland Coordination and Analysis Center, the White House Office of Homeland Security, and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (Governor’s Office of Homeland Security). The director was given the responsibility in October 2017 to implement a cyber security plan using the resources of the state government, private sector, and academia. (Governor’s Office of Homeland Security).

**Massachusetts**

In Massachusetts, “the Homeland Security Division organizes and distributes homeland security funding for Massachusetts, helping communities prepare for, and respond to, terrorist attacks and natural disasters” (Mass.gov Homeland Security Division). In August of 2017, Governor Charlie Baker announced that the state police department would include a Division of Homeland Security and Preparedness to help, amongst other things, to counter terrorism and collect and analyze criminal intelligence (Boston Globe).

**Michigan**

Emergency Management & Homeland Security is a division of the Michigan State Police. Governor Richard Snyder created the Michigan Intelligence Operations Center for Homeland Security in April 2012. It is within the Department of State Police as well. The advisory board consists of eleven members, and three of them have no ties to law enforcement or the government (Executive Order No. 2012 – 5). This center, a fusion center, is responsible to share information “24-hours a day statewide information sharing among local, state, and federal
public safety agencies and private sector organizations in order to facilitate the collection, analysis and dissemination of intelligence relevant to terrorism and public safety” (Michigan Operations Intelligence Center). The participating agencies include: Michigan State Police, Michigan Department of Corrections, Michigan National Guard, Michigan State University Police Department, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Michigan Sheriffs Association, United State Department of Homeland Security and Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police (Michigan Operations Intelligence Center). The Emergency Management & Homeland Security Division is also “responsible for coordinating state and federal resources to assist local government in response and relief activities in the event of an emergency or disaster” (Michigan State Police.

**Minnesota**

The Homeland Security and Emergency Management is a division of the Minnesota Department of Public Safety. It is under the direction of Joe Kelly and has 75 fulltime employees. In 1951, Minnesota established the Department of Civil Defense which is now the current Homeland Security and Emergency Management division (Homeland Security and Emergency Management). This division is responsible to “help Minnesotans prevent, prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters and works to keep Minnesota secure from acts of terrorism” (Homeland Security and Emergency Management). This division has six regions: Southeast, Northeast, Southwest, Northwest, West Central, and Metro (Homeland Security and Emergency Management).

**Mississippi**
Mark McKee is the Executive Director of Mississippi Office of Homeland Security (Mississippi Office of Homeland Security). In 2003, Executive Order 872 created this office and in 2004 Executive Order 916 put this office under the authority of the Mississippi Department of Public Safety. MOHS is a partner with federal, state, and local agencies to help respond to both man-made and natural disasters and also to combat threats/acts of terrorism within the state (Mississippi Office of Homeland Security). MOHS educates and has outreach programs for the citizens of their state. MOHS offers active shooter training classes that are not only for its law enforcement officers but also for its citizens (Mississippi Office of Homeland Security).

**Missouri**

Missouri was the first state to create an office of homeland security in response to the September 11, 2001 attack on our country. Executive Order 05-20 signed in 2005 created the Homeland Security Advisory Council and also moved the Missouri Office of Homeland Security, which was established in September of 2001, under the authority of the Missouri Department of Public Safety (Office of Homeland Security). Missouri citizens can participate in the Fight Terrorism License Plate Program. This program allows citizens to make a donation of $25 to the Antiterrorism Fund which supports the Missouri Office of Homeland Security. They are then able to apply for “Fight Terrorism” specialty license plates (Office of Homeland Security).

**Montana**

Delila Bruno is the Division Administrator for the Montana Disaster & Emergency Services (MT DES) agency, which is under the Montana Department of Military Affairs and
receives guidance from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Montana.gov). This agency is in charge of managing emergencies in Montana and works with local and tribal governments. MT DES is comprised of Administration, Preparedness Branch, and the Response and Recovery Branch, and departments within this last branch are: State Emergency Coordination Center (SECC) / Mitigation; Mitigation; Recovery (Montana.gov).

Nebraska

The Nebraska Emergency Management Agency, which falls under the Military Department, is directed by the Adjutant General of Nebraska, Major General Daryl Bohac, while day-to-day operations are handled by the assistant director, Bryan Tuma (Nebraska Emergency Management Agency). The Nebraska Emergency Management Agency was created by the Nebraska Emergency Management Act, which was effective on July 19, 1996 (Nebraska Emergency Management Act). The Agency has four core missions -- preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation; the Agency also encompasses a homeland security aspect and works to "detect, prevent against, protect against, respond to, and recover from threats or incidents of terrorism, disasters, and major emergencies" (Nebraska Emergency Management Agency).

Nevada

Falling under the Department of Public Safety, the Nevada Division of Emergency Management - Homeland Security was created and operates under NRS 414 (Division of Emergency Management - Homeland Security). The Nevada Division of Emergency Management consists of five different agencies that carry out day-to-day operations, which are the administrative/fiscal section, grants and recovery section, preparedness section, homeland
security section, and the state emergency operations center (Division of Emergency Management - Homeland Security). Their mission states, "Coordinating preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation resources through partnerships to sustain safe and livable communities for Nevada’s residents and visitors" and they aim to do this by having goals which look to have a strong, collaborative team, a Whole Community approach, and building and sustaining response capacity (Division of Emergency Management - Homeland Security).

**New Hampshire**

New Hampshire's Homeland Security and Emergency Management operations are led by Director Perry Plummer and falls under the New Hampshire Department of Safety (Homeland Security and Emergency Management). New Hampshire Homeland Security and Emergency Management is in charge of "coordinating the planning for, responding to and recovery from major natural and man-made disaster" for the State of New Hampshire" (Homeland Security and Emergency Management). They will only become involved if state resources are needed or the disaster size requires state intervention. Otherwise, issues are usually handled more locally by police, medical/ambulance personnel, or firefighters. (Homeland Security and Emergency Management).

**New Jersey**

The State of New Jersey's Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness "leads and coordinates New Jersey’s counterterrorism, cybersecurity, and emergency preparedness efforts while building resiliency throughout the State" by following values including service, teamwork, excellence, and diversity (State of New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness).
Under the leadership of Director Jared Maples, who was appointed by the Governor on June 5, 2017, the Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness offers resources on their website such as active shooter response training, grants information, hometown security, and various reports (State of New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness).

New Mexico

The New Mexico Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Management is led by the Cabinet Secretary, M. Jay Mitchell, and it looks to "protect the people of New Mexico and the nation through a comprehensive, consolidated, and coordinated program of mitigating hazards, preparing for emergencies, preventing attacks, and responding and recovering from events that occur without regard to cause" (New Mexico Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Management). The Emergency Management piece of the Department originated back in 1959, while the Office of Homeland Security was created in 2003; the two separate parts were joined together by the New Mexico legislator in 2007, forming the current department (New Mexico Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Management).

New York

The New York Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (DHSES), made up of four offices: counter terrorism, emergency management, fire prevention and control, and interoperable and emergency communications, was created in July 2010 by the New York State Legislature (Homeland Security and Emergency Services). The Division looks to “provide leadership, coordination and support for efforts to prevent, protect against, prepare for, respond
to, and recover from terrorism and other man-made and natural disasters, threats, fires and other emergencies” (Homeland Security and Emergency Services).

**North Carolina**

North Carolina’s Homeland Security is one of the many law enforcement related branches under the Department of Public Safety and is directed by the secretary of this department, Erik A. Hooks (NC DPS). The North Carolina Homeland Security branch was created in 2003 has worked to “prevent, protect, respond and recover to all hazards, both man-made and natural” by working with local and state partners as well as securing federal funding (NC DPS).

**North Dakota**

The North Dakota Department of Emergency Services (NDDES) was formed when the Division of Emergency Management, which can be traced back to the Civil Defense Act of 1951, was combined with the State Radio Communications, which can also be traced back to 1951 (NDDES Homeland Security State Radio). The Division of Homeland Security was added into NDDES two year later by the North Dakota Legislative Assembly (NDDES Homeland Security State Radio). MG Alan S. Dohrmann, who is the Adjutant General, oversees the department, which “provides 24/7 emergency communications and resource coordination with more than 50 lead and support agencies, private enterprise, and voluntary organizations to assist local jurisdictions in disaster and emergency response activities” (NDDES Homeland Security State Radio).

**Ohio**
The Ohio Homeland Security has the following major goal areas: facilities and human capital, planning and grants management, training and education, intelligence analysis and production, information and intelligence management, critical infrastructure/key resource protection and security, collaboration and outreach, and operational assessment (Ohio Homeland Security). According to their website, the Ohio Legislature began planning for homeland security for Ohio and on June 26, 2003, House Bill 95 was signed by the Governor, creating the Homeland Security Division (Ohio Homeland Security). Additionally, the division has an Ohio Public Private Partnership that aims to “build a safer Ohio through an effective partnership committed to protecting, responding, and recovering from disasters, aiding businesses to continue to operate and assisting communities to recover following a disaster” (Ohio Homeland Security).

Oklahoma

Prior to the Oklahoma Office of Homeland Security being established in 2002, Oklahoma had already begun to address the need for a plan to monitor and handle terrorism. In 1995 the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building was bombed under a domestic terrorist attack, killing 168 people (Oklahoma Office of Homeland Security). The Oklahoma Domestic Preparedness Advisory Group was the group that began dealing with terrorism in Oklahoma. After 9/11, the Oklahoma legislature passed Senate Joint Resolution 42 in February 2002. This created the Office of Interim Oklahoma Homeland Security Director. In 2004, House Bill 2280 was passed, creating the Oklahoma Office of Homeland Security (Oklahoma Office of Homeland Security). The office “coordinates initiatives to prevent, reduce vulnerability to, and prepare to respond to and recover from any terrorist attacks” (Washington Post). The Oklahoma Highway Patrol is the

Oregon

The State of Oregon State Homeland Security Strategy document outlines their approach in dealing with terrorism and all hazards preparedness. The Oregon Homeland Security Council was created by House Bill 2101 in 2005 and is under the authority of Oregon Emergency Management. This group meets annually to discuss and advise on matters of security. Oregon Homeland Security Senior Advisory Committee meets quarterly. Their purpose is to improve the communication of all involved in homeland security (State of Oregon State Homeland Security). Oregon is made up of 9 tribes, 36 counties and 1 Urban Area; many of these jurisdictions are small and do not have the ability to deal with terrorism or other emergencies (State of Oregon State Homeland Security). Oregon’s strategy is to encourage those areas that have the means to respond to work with and have agreements with those areas that do not have the ability to respond (State of Oregon State Homeland Security). Oregon Homeland Grant Program receives funding from the State Homeland Security Program and the Urban Area Security Initiative. This funding is used for terrorism or catastrophic events. Applications are accepted from various groups to obtain this funding (Homeland Security Grant Program).

Pennsylvania

The Governor’s Office of Homeland Security was established in 2012 under Executive Order 2012-03. Its objective is to “prepare for, prevent, respond and recover from acts of terrorism” (Executive Order 2012-03). The office is comprised of the Homeland Security
Advisor and the Homeland Security Director, both of which are appointed by the Governor (Executive Order 2012-03). Currently, Marcus L. Brown holds both of these positions.

_Rhode Island_

The Rhode Island Emergency Management Agency is headed by Director Peter Gaynor, who was appointed in January 2015 by the Governor, Gina Raimondo (State of Rhode Island Emergency Management Agency). The Agency’s mission is to “reduce the loss of life and property for the whole community” while also making sure that Rhode Island works cohesively as a state to “build, sustain, and improve our capability to prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate all natural, human-caused, and technological hazards” (State of Rhode Island Emergency Management Agency). The Agency has initiatives such as continuity planning, dam safety, emergency operations planning, floodplain management, hazard mitigation, and an Emergency Management Advisory Council (State of Rhode Island Emergency Management Agency).

_South Carolina_

A division of the Adjutant General’s Office, the South Carolina Emergency Management Division works to “develop, coordinate, and lead the state emergency management program, enabling effective preparation for, response to and recovery from emergencies and disasters in order to save lives, reduce human suffering and minimize property loss” (SCEMD). The Division can trace its roots back to 1950 with different names and slightly different mission, but it was modernly formed in March of 2002 when the “South Carolina Code of Laws were amended in March of 2002, changing the name of the State Emergency Preparedness Division to
the South Carolina Emergency Management Division” (SCEMD). There are different pieces which make up the South Carolina Emergency Management Division including the director (Mr. Kim Stenson), the chief of staff, legal, public information, finance and administrative services, preparedness, operations, operations support, and recovery and mitigation (SCEMD).

South Dakota

The South Dakota Office of Homeland Security, which falls under the South Dakota Department of Public Safety, was founded in 2003 originally to focus on terrorism-related threats, but since then has taken a more all hazards approach (South Dakota Department of Public Safety). The Office has several initiatives that look to have all-hazard response plans, create a network between all governments and private partners to have lots of information-sharing, receiving and administering federal grants, promoting safety like “if you see something, say something,” as well as working with other security-focused groups such as the SWAT teams and the South Dakota Fusion Center (South Dakota Department of Public Safety).

Tennessee

The Tennessee Office of Homeland Security, which more largely falls under the Tennessee Department of Safety and Homeland Security, “has the primary responsibility and authority for directing statewide activities pertaining to the prevention of, and protection from, terrorist related events” (Tennessee Department of Safety and Homeland Security). With this responsibility comes the need to create a strategy to secure the state as well as to be the liaison between all levels of government, the private sector, and the citizens (Tennessee Department of Safety and Homeland Security). To do this, the Office focuses on five key pillars: awareness,
prevention, protection, response, and organizational excellence, while focusing on key topic areas such as actively encouraging citizens to report suspicious activity, cyber awareness, critical infrastructure, training, and emergency protocols (Tennessee Department of Safety and Homeland Security).

Texas

The Texas Homeland Security Grants Division, which falls under the Public Safety Office, receives grant funding from the federal government and is used to promote "strategies to prevent terrorism and other catastrophic events and to prepare communities for the threats and hazards that pose the greatest risk to the security and resilience of Texas and the Nation" (Homeland Security Grants Division). Texas follows the frameworks of the Texas Homeland Security Strategic Plan, the annual State Preparedness Report, and the annual Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment; after reviewing all of these frameworks, the Texas Homeland Security Grants Division uses funding to fill in the gaps identified in the frameworks (Homeland Security Grants Division). In addition, Texas shares an international southern border partly with Mexico and partly with the Gulf of Mexico. Because of this, much of the grant funding is also allocated to increasing resources, such as patrols, to "detect, deter, and disrupt drug, human, and other contraband trafficking and crimes" (Homeland Security Grants Division).

In addition to the homeland security aspect of the state of Texas, there is also the Texas Division of Emergency Management. Somewhat similar in goals to the Texas Homeland Security Grants Division, the Texas Division of Emergency Management focuses more on ensuring that the state of Texas and its municipalities "respond to and recover from emergencies
and disasters, and implement plans and programs to help prevent or lessen the impact of
emergencies and disasters” (Texas Division of Emergency Management).

_Utah_

The Division of Emergency Management (DEM) operates under the Utah Department of
Public Safety. DEM prepares and reacts to threats and hazards as outlined in the State Hazard
Mitigation Plan, which was approved in 2014; these hazards include earthquakes, wildfires,
radon gas, hazardous materials spills, and terrorist acts (Utah Department of Public Safety). The
plan also prioritizes these hazards so the best plan of action to mitigate them can be determined
(Utah Department of Public Safety). The division prepares its residents through training and
outreach programs.

_Vermont_

The Vermont Homeland Security Unit, which falls under the Public Safety Department,
is in charge of the Homeland Security Grant Program. This means they provide federal funding
(Department of Public Safety Homeland Security) -- the Vermont Homeland Security Unit is
fully funded by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. According to the Unit's website,
Jessica Stolz, the Deputy Homeland Security Advisor, is in charge of the Unit. The prevention
and protection from counterterrorism is the Vermont Homeland Security Unit's major focus, but
their programs can also be applied to other hazards and threats that Vermont may face
(Department of Public Safety Homeland Security). Additionally, Vermont does share a border
with Canada, which is spanned with forests, mountains, swamp areas, and a few lakes, so border
security is an important focus as well.
Virginia

The Virginia Homeland Security Division, under the Office of Public Safety and Homeland Security, is headed by Secretary Brian Moran, who was appointed by former Governor McAuliffe in January 2014 and then was reappointed by current Governor Northam in January 2018 (Secretary of Public Safety, Brian J. Moran). According to the Division's website, their initiatives include protection of critical infrastructure, resilience, cyber security, and interoperability. Overall, the Virginia Homeland Security Division looks to "ensure a secure Commonwealth, a confident public, and a strong and resilient society and economy" (Homeland Security Division).

Washington

The vision of the Washington Emergency Management Division is to have a “disaster ready and resilient Washington State” (Emergency Management Division). Falling under the military department, the division is under the leadership of Director Robert Ezelle (Emergency Management Division). The division is a leader and coordinator in all aspects of mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery in order to keep the people, property, environment, and economy of Washington State as safe as possible from the dangers of disasters and emergencies (Emergency Management Division). They do this by incorporating the following values: public services, respect, integrity, dedication, and excellence (Emergency Management Division).

West Virginia

West Virginia Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (DHSEM) has approximately 90 employees and has eight branches: Preparedness and Response,
Technological Hazards, Mitigation and Recovery, WV Intelligence Fusion Center, Mission Support, General Staff, Grants and Administration, and Finance (West Virginia Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management). Since 2010, Jimmy Gianato has served as the Homeland Security Advisor and all of these branches report to him (West Virginia Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management). The state and local agencies are guided by West Virginia Homeland Security Strategy, which was first issued in January 2010; this document is a strategy to help deal with terrorism, accidents, and natural disasters (West Virginia Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management). It also stresses homeland security is shared across the state, and, therefore, this is a state strategy and it is not intended for any one body or state organization (West Virginia Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management).

**Wisconsin**

Wisconsin’s Homeland Security Council consists of the adviser, who is appointed by the Governor, and sixteen other council members who are charged with various tasks such as providing advisement to the governor, keeping up-to-date information on homeland security in Wisconsin, as well as coordinating local efforts to prevent and respond to disasters (Wisconsin Homeland Security). This council was created by executive order in March 2003 to help address homeland security threats and concerns in Wisconsin (Wisconsin Homeland Security).

**Wyoming**

Guy Cameron is the director of the Wyoming Office of Homeland Security, which is located in the city of Cheyenne (Wyoming Homeland Security). The Office has many goals and
initiatives including being prepared, grants, the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC), search and rescue, mitigation, radiological, public assistance, disaster declaration info, regional emergency response teams, national flood insurance program, cyber security, and the Wyoming Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Services (RACES) (Wyoming Homeland Security).

**Method**

Information for this paper was mainly gathered by researching online. All of the information regarding the agency name, its mission, goals, focuses, etc., as well as information about the agency’s leadership were found online on each state’s respective agency websites. The budget information was found online on each state’s respective budget websites. Some states have very easy to navigate and transparent budget websites, while others have much more complicated websites. For some websites where the specific agency budget was too difficult to find, the necessary budget information was obtained through communication via email or phone with state budget employees.

**Budgets Ranked in Order from Largest to Smallest**

Table 1: Ranking of Each State Based on Percentage of Total Budget Allocated to Homeland Security/Emergency Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>FY 2017 Departmental Budget</th>
<th>Total State Budget</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Budget</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Office of Homeland Security &amp; Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>$1,302,175,538.00</td>
<td>$28,356,600,000.00</td>
<td>4.59214%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Department of Safety and Homeland Security</td>
<td>$134,025,863.80</td>
<td>$4,084,051,700.00</td>
<td>3.281689%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Department of Emergency Services</td>
<td>$166,065,492.00</td>
<td>$8,054,000,000.00</td>
<td>2.061901%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Disaster &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>$34,584,221.00</td>
<td>$2,480,172,000.00</td>
<td>1.3944283%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>$348,807,099.00</td>
<td>$31,406,000,000.00</td>
<td>1.11064%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Total Budget 2023</td>
<td>Total Budget 2024</td>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services</td>
<td>$1,432,506,000.00</td>
<td>$157,015,269,000.00</td>
<td>0.9123355%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Emergency Management &amp; Homeland Security</td>
<td>$174,720,300.00</td>
<td>$19,807,200,000.00</td>
<td>0.882105%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Management</td>
<td>$10,977,000.00</td>
<td>$3,424,700,100.00</td>
<td>0.57040%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
<td>$331,052,744.00</td>
<td>$82,154,655,973.00</td>
<td>0.402963%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Management</td>
<td>$253,386,817.00</td>
<td>$74,390,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.351415%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Emergency Management Division</td>
<td>$144,435,984.00</td>
<td>$46,695,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.309318%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Office of Homeland Security</td>
<td>$23,825,665.00</td>
<td>$7,891,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.30193%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>$68,098,849.00</td>
<td>$26,474,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.257229%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Emergency Services &amp; Homeland Security</td>
<td>$11,323,153.00</td>
<td>$4,639,538,438.00</td>
<td>0.244058%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Emergency Management &amp; Homeland Security Division</td>
<td>$12,567,768.00</td>
<td>$5,600,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.224424%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>$33,498,600.00</td>
<td>$15,600,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.214735%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Office of Homeland Security</td>
<td>$11,007,306.00</td>
<td>$5,703,200,000.00</td>
<td>0.1930023%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Division of Homeland Security &amp; Emergency Management</td>
<td>$58,894,000.00</td>
<td>$38,209,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.1541365%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Homeland Security Division</td>
<td>$33,309,454.00</td>
<td>$23,739,270,238.00</td>
<td>0.14031%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
<td>$20,589,569.00</td>
<td>$15,528,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.13260%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Division of Homeland Security &amp; Emergency Management</td>
<td>$32,687,419.00</td>
<td>$27,149,625,151.00</td>
<td>0.120397%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security &amp; Emergency Management</td>
<td>$17,850,800.00</td>
<td>$16,258,511,000.00</td>
<td>0.10979%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td>FY 2011 %</td>
<td>Report Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alaska</strong></td>
<td>Division of Homeland Security &amp; Emergency Management</td>
<td>$9,445,300.00</td>
<td>$9,730,700,000.00</td>
<td>0.097067%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkansas</strong></td>
<td>Department of Emergency Management</td>
<td>$27,905,617.00</td>
<td>$31,764,694,908.00</td>
<td>0.087851%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Carolina</strong></td>
<td>Emergency Management Division</td>
<td>$20,033,983.00</td>
<td>$23,074,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.086825%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona</strong></td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>$22,412,900.00</td>
<td>$40,629,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.055165%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhode Island</strong></td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>$4,328,539.00</td>
<td>$8,964,800,000.00</td>
<td>0.048284%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hawaii</strong></td>
<td>Office of Homeland Security</td>
<td>$6,650,000.00</td>
<td>$14,110,600,000.00</td>
<td>0.047128%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kentucky</strong></td>
<td>Office of Homeland Security</td>
<td>$5,451,162.00</td>
<td>$11,413,432,800.00</td>
<td>0.04427%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nevada</strong></td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management - Homeland Security</td>
<td>$4,479,751.00</td>
<td>$11,527,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.038863%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Carolina</strong></td>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>$8,575,876.00</td>
<td>$22,174,602,923.00</td>
<td>0.0386743%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maine</strong></td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>$707,447.00</td>
<td>$1,867,858,809.00</td>
<td>0.03787%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Hampshire</strong></td>
<td>Homeland Security &amp; Emergency Management</td>
<td>$4,431,070.00</td>
<td>$11,855,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.03738%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nebraska</strong></td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>$1,402,870.00</td>
<td>$4,411,690,837.00</td>
<td>0.0317989%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Jersey</strong></td>
<td>Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness</td>
<td>$9,978,000.00</td>
<td>$34,063,875,000.00</td>
<td>0.0292920%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illinois</strong></td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>$16,391,500.00</td>
<td>$55,978,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.02928%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan</strong></td>
<td>Emergency Management &amp; Homeland Security</td>
<td>$14,933,800.00</td>
<td>$55,231,849,400.00</td>
<td>0.0270384%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td>Homeland Security Division</td>
<td>$60,159,500.00</td>
<td>$265,894,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.022625%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Massachusetts</strong></td>
<td>Homeland Security Division</td>
<td>$8,573,594.00</td>
<td>$39,249,262,000.00</td>
<td>0.02184%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia</strong></td>
<td>Homeland Security Division</td>
<td>$10,556,500.00</td>
<td>$52,186,885,006</td>
<td>0.020228%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>FY 2017 Budget</td>
<td>FY 2017 State Budget</td>
<td>% of State Budget</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
<td>$21,481,000.00</td>
<td>$144,192,900,000.00</td>
<td>0.01490%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Governor's Office of Homeland Security</td>
<td>$6,136,500.00</td>
<td>$42,262,071,879.00</td>
<td>0.01452%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>$3,837,700.00</td>
<td>$33,878,086,600.00</td>
<td>0.0113280%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Homeland Security &amp; Emergency Management</td>
<td>$2,205,836.00</td>
<td>$22,694,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.00972%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>$3,962,000.00</td>
<td>$45,670,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.008675%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Governor's Office of Homeland Security</td>
<td>$1,920,000.00</td>
<td>$36,556,400,000.00</td>
<td>0.0052522%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Division of Homeland Security &amp; Emergency Management</td>
<td>$2,177,609.00</td>
<td>$45,670,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.004768%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>$2,089,997.00</td>
<td>$64,130,715,702.00</td>
<td>0.0032590%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Office of Homeland Security</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$27,322,994,885.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Office of Homeland Security</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s analysis of state budget websites

Each state’s FY 2017 homeland security/emergency management budget, their FY 2017 state budget, the name of their agency, the percentage of the homeland security/emergency management budget out of the total state budget, as well as the state’s ranking in comparison to the other states can be seen in the table above. Missouri and Oklahoma are missing some of this information because it was unclear online, and their state budget agents did not respond to requests via email. One might expect very large states in terms of population, like California or Texas, to be ranked very highly, but as can be seen, this is not the case. Many of the rankings of states based on the percentage of their total budget allocated to homeland security/emergency management did not come out as one might expect when thinking about homeland security and emergency management.
Table 2: Percentage of State Budget Allocated to Homeland Security/Emergency Management Budget by the Number of States in Each Bracket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Percentage</th>
<th># of States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0% - 0.49%</td>
<td>80% (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5% - 0.99%</td>
<td>6% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0% - 1.99%</td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0% - 2.99%</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0% - 3.99%</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0% &amp; above</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding Missouri and Oklahoma because of lack of information
Source: Author’s analysis of state budget websites

Table 2 simplifies table 1 and shows the breakdown of budget percentages. Surprisingly, the majority of states do not allocate much of their total budget to homeland security and/or emergency management. Interestingly, only three states, Louisiana, Delaware, and North Dakota, allocate two percent or more of their budget to homeland security and/or emergency management. In the post 9/11 United States we live in today, along with the ever increasing frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, one would think homeland security and emergency management would be more of a priority budget item for more states. So, why do some states allocate more to their homeland security/emergency management budget than others do?

**Budgets by Political Party Control of State**

One possible reason looked at as to why some states allocate more money to their homeland security/emergency management budget than others do was to see which political
party has control of the state. Information was gathered from the National Conference of State Legislatures’ map of the United States in terms of 2016 post-election legislative control. States can either be fully controlled by the Democratic party, fully controlled by the Republican party, or split control between both parties. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures’ website, when a party has full legislative control of a state, the party controls both chambers of the state legislature.

Table 3: Percentage of State Budget Allocated to Homeland Security/Emergency Management Budget in Comparison to the Political Party in Control of the State in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democratic Controlled State in 2016</th>
<th>Republican Controlled State in 2016</th>
<th>Split Control of State in 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%-0.49%</td>
<td>22% (11)</td>
<td>50% (25)</td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5%-0.99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0%-1.99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0%-2.99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0%-3.99%</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0% &amp; above</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding Missouri and Oklahoma because of lack of information

Source: Author’s analysis of state budget websites and National Conference of State Legislatures website

From the results, which can be seen above in table 3, it does not seem that political party control of the state had much to do with why some states allocate more to their homeland security/emergency management budgets than do others. The state which allocates the most money to homeland security and emergency management, Louisiana, is controlled by the Republican Party, but the state with the second highest allocation, Delaware, is controlled by the Democratic Party. The next three categories of state budget percentages, comprised of North
Dakota, Montana, Indiana, and Idaho, are mostly Republican controlled states, with only two states, New York and Connecticut, controlled by both parties, and no states controlled by the Democratic party. For the lowest category of budget allocations, the majority of states are also controlled by the Republican party, which makes sense considering there are many more Republican controlled states than Democratic controlled states and states controlled by both parties. As stated, most of the states with higher budget allocation percentages to homeland security/emergency management are Republican controlled states, but there are still so many states in the lowest budget allocation percentage category. It seems there may be a slight relationship between how much of their budget a state allocates to homeland security/emergency management and the political party which controls the state, but this evidence does not strongly prove that.

**Budgets by States’ Location to a U.S. National Border**

The following information was gathered by separating each state into one of the following categories: borders Mexico, borders Canada, borders water (as in an ocean or other body of water which “connects” to another country), borders Mexico and water, borders Canada and water, or only borders another United States state. From this, each category was broken up further in relation to the percentage in which the state allocates money to their homeland security/emergency management budget. Bordering Mexico, Canada, and/or water were chosen as options with the assumption that states with some sort of international border would be more likely to allocate more to their homeland security/emergency management budget because of the need to protect the borders. States that only border other U.S. states would not have to protect their borders as much.
Table 4: Percentage of State Budget Allocated to Homeland Security/Emergency Management Budget in Relation to the States’ Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borders Mexico</th>
<th>Borders Canada</th>
<th>Borders Water</th>
<th>Borders Mexico &amp; Water</th>
<th>Borders Canada &amp; Water</th>
<th>Borders Only Another U.S. State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%-0.49%</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>26% (13)</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>8% (4)</td>
<td>34% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5%-0.99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0%-1.99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0%-2.99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0%-3.99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0% &amp; above</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding Missouri and Oklahoma because of lack of information

Source: Author’s analysis of state budget websites and map of the United States

Louisiana, the state with the highest budget allocation percentage to homeland security and emergency management, does border Mexico. The following three highest budget allocation percentage categories also border another country, Canada in this case, or a body of water. In the lowest budget allocation percentage category, the most states only border another U.S. state, but bordering water is a close second. There are also seven states total in the lowest budget allocation percentage category that border Mexico, Canada, water, or a combination of water and another country. Similar to the political party relationship, it seems there may be a slight relationship between how much of their budget a state allocates to homeland security/emergency management and the state’s location to another country or body of water, but this evidence does not strongly prove that. It can clearly be seen from table 4 the top three categories of state budget percentage allocations to homeland security/emergency management match up with the prediction that states with some sort of international border would be more likely to allocate
more to their homeland security/emergency management budget because of the need to protect the borders. Even though this is the case, the states that are located on the border of Mexico, Canada, water, or a combination of the two with the lowest budget allocation percentages make it difficult to prove this claim fully.

**Budgets by Past Terrorism Attacks Since September 11th, 2011**

The data on past terrorism attacks was gathered from Wm. Robert Johnston’s online collection of “Terrorist attacks and related incidents in the United States,” which is a website where every terrorist attack since 1865 is listed. This paper cuts the scope down to just look at terrorist attacks since (and including) September 11th, 2011 considering that is when homeland security became a big deal in the United States and the federal Department of Homeland Security was formed, as well as many individual states agencies, soon after as a result. All of the terrorist attacks were broken up by state and by type and then further categorized into the state budget allocation percentage ranges.

Right-wing extremism refers to a terrorist attack that was motivated by (far) right-wing ideologies, such as racism and neo-Nazism, amongst other beliefs. An example of this kind of terrorism attack occurred on August 12, 2017 in Charlottesville, Virginia when a white nationalist hit protestors with his car (Johnston, 2018). Left-wing extremism refers to a terrorist attack that was motivated by (far) left wing ideologies, such as socialism, Marxism, anti-Capitalism, and anarchism, amongst other beliefs. An example of this kind of terrorism attack occurred on July 17, 2016 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana when an attacker shot and killed multiple police officers (Johnston, 2018). Islamist refers to a terrorist attack in which the attacker(s) profess radical Islamists incentives. An example of this kind of terrorism attack occurred on September 11, 2001 when affiliates of al-Qaeda attacked the Twin Towers in New York City.
Beltway Snipers refers to a series of terrorist attacks committed by the same two people, John Allen Muhammad and Lee Boyd Malvo, over a month’s span of time (FBI). Political refers to a terrorist attack in which the attacker(s) have some sort of political motivation or goal. An example of this kind of terrorism occurred on January 8, 2011 in Tucson, Arizona when a shooter attacked a political event, injuring former Congresswoman Gabriel Giffords (Johnston, 2018). School shooting refers to any attack on a school in the United States. An example of this kind of terrorism attack occurred recently on February 14, 2018 when a former student attacked Stoneman Douglas High School. Although some may not consider school shootings to be terrorist attacks, for the purposes of this paper, they are considered terrorist attacks. Unknown refers to an unidentified motive in the course of researching the terrorist attacks.

Table 5: Percentage of State Budget Allocated to Homeland Security/Emergency Management Budget in Comparison to the Number of Terrorist Attacks since September 11, 2011 by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of State Budget Allocated</th>
<th>Right-Wing Extremism</th>
<th>Left-Wing Extremism</th>
<th>Islamist</th>
<th>Beltway Snipers</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>School Shooting</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%-0.49%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5%-0.99%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0%-1.99%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0%-2.99%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0%-3.99%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0% &amp; above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding Missouri and Oklahoma because of lack of information

Source: Author’s analysis of state budget websites and work compiled by Wm. Robert Johnston

The overwhelming majority of terrorist attacks occurred in states with the lowest budget allocation percentages. This is very surprising, as one would think that states who have
experienced a terrorist attack, or even more so, multiple terrorist attacks, would allocate more money to their homeland security/emergency management budget to help be better prepared, better to mitigate, respond, and recover for the unfortunate next time. Since September 11th, 2001, according to Johnston (2018), Virginia has experienced the most terrorist attacks – 11 – yet they are ranked 40th in the budget allocation percentage to homeland security/emergency management. New York follows behind at 7 terrorist attacks, according to Johnston (2018), with a rank of 6th. Pennsylvania, Maryland, Florida, and California all have experienced 6 terrorist attacks, ranked 46th, 42nd, 9th, and 38th, respectively. Unlike the previous two claims, it does not seem as if there is any relationship between how much of their budget a state allocates to homeland security/emergency management and the state’s history of terrorist attacks since September 11th, 2001. It may be a factor for some states, but those states still just do not allocate much of their budget to homeland security/emergency management.

**Budget Contributions from the Homeland Security Grant Program**

After the terrorist attacks on September 11th, 2001, the federal Department of Homeland Security was formed soon after in 2002. The Department of Homeland Security offers a funding opportunity for states known as the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP), which consists of three possible funding options: State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) totaling FY 2017 allocation of $402,000,000.00, Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) totaling FY 2017 allocation of $580,000,000.00, and Operation Stonegarden (OPSG) totaling FY 2017 allocation of $55,000,000.00, for a HSGP grand total FY 2017 allocation of $1,037,000,000.00 (The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Fiscal Year 2017 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)).

Table 6: Homeland Security Grant Program FY 2017 Allocations to Each State
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>FY 2017 Allocation</th>
<th>Rank (from overall allocation in Table 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$76,930,000.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$60,159,500.00</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$21,481,000.00</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$16,391,500.00</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$11,023,500.00</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$10,037,500.00</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$8,337,000.00</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$7,681,000.00</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$7,428,500.00</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$6,790,000.00</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$6,641,000.00</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$6,476,000.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$6,136,500.00</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$5,628,000.00</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$5,472,000.00</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$4,551,000.00</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$3,963,000.00</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$3,962,000.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$3,962,000.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$3,962,000.00</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$3,962,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$3,962,000.00</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$3,962,000.00</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$3,962,000.00</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$3,962,000.00</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$3,822,100.00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>$3,752,000.00</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table 6, some states are allocated substantially more money than other states are allocated. Some states use the allocation from the HSGP that can be seen above in Table 6 as their sole budget allocation for homeland security/emergency management, while other states allocate state funds on top of the federal money. Louisiana, the 1st ranked state, receives less than $4 million dollars from the federal government towards their homeland security/emergency management budget, so the state allocates close to $1 billion of state money. On the other hand, Virginia, ranked 40th, received a $7,428,500.00 federal allocation, and their overall FY 2017 budget was $10,556,500.00, so the state only allocated a little bit more money to the homeland security/emergency management budget.

While you can see the amount that Missouri and Oklahoma respectively got from the HSGP, this number was not accounted for as these states FY 2017 homeland security/emergency management budget did not have enough information found to verify that the state did not allocate any state money on top of the federal money.

The HSGP definitely helps out states with their homeland security/emergency management budgets by allocating federal funds to them since any extra money is good, but does not seem to do too much. Many of the states with large homeland security/emergency management budgets do not get much at all from the federal government, but they allocate more of the state’s own money to the budget. Many of the states with small homeland
security/emergency management budgets also do not get much from the federal government, but just do not allocate more of the state’s own money to the budget.

**Conclusion and Future Research**

Overall, it does not seem that any of the claims made in this paper do all that great of a job explaining why some states allocate so much more money to their homeland/security emergency management budgets than others. The relationships between how much a state allocates in their budget to homeland security/emergency management and the political party in control of the state as well as how much of their budget a state allocates to homeland security/emergency management and the state’s location to another country or body of water both seem to be slight, but the evidence is not strongly convincing. The relationships between how much of their budget a state allocates to homeland security/emergency management and the states’ history of terrorist attacks as well as between how much of their budget a state allocates to homeland security/emergency management and how much the state receives from the Homeland Security Grant Program seem to be very insignificant. These findings came as a surprise because one would assume that these claims would have more of a relationship with how much a state’s budget is allocated to homeland security/emergency management.

Additionally, though, it is hard to really differentiate some of the claims with many of the budget percentages because so many of them are such small numbers and are all very close to each other. So many states allocate what this paper is looking at as a “small number;” so perhaps for the future it would be better to change the idea of what a “small number is” and further break down the budget allocation percentage categories into smaller, more specific ranges. It would also be helpful to email or call each department, agency, division, or office directly, rather than relying solely on the state’s budget website to find all of the relevant information needed. Many
of the states’ budget websites were confusing, unclear, and hard to navigate, so it may be best to ask directly to ensure the budget numbers are as precise and accurate as possible.

In thinking of terms of future research, there are some other potential claims that may be interesting to look at and may give us more of an exact answer to the question posed in this paper. It may be helpful to look at each homeland security agency and analyze whether each department, division, agency, or office is either its own separate entity, falls under a larger governmental department, or itself is the larger governmental department and has sub-offices falling under it (and if so, how many). It may also be wise to take more of a natural disaster approach, rather than a man-made focus which can be seen more in this paper. Looking at the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, such as hurricanes, tornadoes, snow storms, wildfires, and so on may be helpful in figuring out the exact answer to the question as well. Additionally, it may be a good idea to differentiate between which states focus more on (based on the name of the department) emergency management, home and security, both, or something else. Lastly, looking at each state’s full budget and which departments they allocate how much money to may also be helpful. Some states may allocate the most to education and others may allocate more to infrastructure, but knowing where each state allocates most of its money to will help to understand the state’s main goals and priorities.
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