



DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

In reaction to the tragic terrorist events of 9/11, Congress and the Bush Administration created the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) “to secure the nation from the many threats we face.”¹ An unwieldy agency at its birth, its size and scope of the agency has only grown. DHS is the federal government’s third largest agency, with an annual budget well over \$40 billion.²

DHS has also been a tool for Congress and the executive branch to expand the role of the federal government into policy areas once left to states and local agencies. Instead of encouraging states to take on their basic responsibility of preparedness and response, Congress and the executive branch have pushed policies that increasingly federalize local law enforcement and local disaster response and recovery.

To highlight this point, there seems to be a growing acceptance to use DHS grant dollars to pay for overtime of local law enforcement. For example, the New York Police Department plans to use \$24.3 million of its Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) FY 2010 grants for overtime purposes.³ DHS grants were created to build response capabilities at the state and local level, not pay for local law enforcement overtime for parades and other local events.

Disaster response, once primarily the responsibility of the states, is now being viewed as responsibility of FEMA. The Heritage Foundation points out that federal disaster declarations have tripled over the past 16 years. Heritage found that disaster declarations went “from 43 under President George H. W. Bush to 89 under President Bill Clinton to 130 under President George W. Bush. In the first year of President Obama’s administration, FEMA issued 108 declarations—the 12th highest number in FEMA history—without the occurrence of one hurricane or other major disaster.”⁴

¹ “About DHS,” DHS website, accessed June 28, 2011, <http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/>.

² Government Accountability Office, 2011 High-Risk List, “Implementing and Transforming the Department of Homeland Security,” http://www.gao.gov/highrisk/risks/safety-security/homeland_security.php.

³ G.W. Schultz, Center for Investigative Reporting, “Big Apple bonanza: \$24 million in grants for NYPD overtime,” February 24, 2011, <http://centerforinvestigativereporting.org/blogpost/20110224bigapplebonanza24millioningrantsfornypdovvertime>.

⁴ The Heritage Foundation, “Solutions for America: The Federalization of Homeland Security,” August 17, 2010, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2010/08/The-Federalization-of-Homeland-Security>

Improving the Management of DHS Funds and Resources

In 2003, DHS' first year of operation, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) placed DHS on its biannual High-Risk list.⁵ This designation was primarily due to Congress creating DHS from 22 separate agencies and bringing together over 200,000 employees. Bringing together a behemoth like DHS has led to problems in all areas of the department including acquisition, information technology, and financial management.

Since 2003, GAO has made numerous recommendations through audits and investigation on how to improve the management of DHS, which included identifying financial weakness. Even with the GAO recommendation, "DHS has been unable to obtain an unqualified audit opinion on its department-wide financial statements and has not yet implemented a consolidated financial management system."⁶

Over the past year, the DHS Inspector General identified \$256 million in taxpayer dollars that could have been better managed to increase our nation's homeland security.⁷ As the table below shows, in the past six months alone, the DHS IG found over \$120 million in mismanaged funds.⁸

Statistical Highlights of OIG Activities October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| Questioned Costs | \$107,558,867 |
| Funds Put to Better Use | \$17,434,529 |

The IG found FEMA had dispersed \$643 million in improper payments to individuals who had applied for assistance after hurricanes Katrina and Rita.⁹ Only recently did FEMA start the process to collect the hundreds of millions in taxpayer dollars paid out improperly.

DHS could save hundreds of millions a year by reducing improper payments made to contractors and state and local grant recipients. In FY 2010, DHS had \$200 million in improper payments.¹⁰

⁵ Government Accountability Office, 2011 High-Risk List, "Implementing and Transforming the Department of Homeland Security", http://www.gao.gov/highrisk/risks/safety-security/homeland_security.php.

⁶ Government Accountability Office, 2011 High-Risk List, "Implementing and Transforming the Department of Homeland Security", http://www.gao.gov/highrisk/risks/safety-security/homeland_security.php.

⁷ Total dollars from the questioned costs and funds put to Better column in the DHS IG Semiannual Report to Congress dated April 1, 2010 – September 30, 2010 and October 1, 2010 – March 31, 2011,

http://www.dhs.gov/xoig/assets/OIG_SAR_Apr10_Sep10.pdf,

http://www.dhs.gov/xoig/assets/OIG_SAR_Oct10_Mar11.pdf.

⁸ Table is pulled from the DHS IG Semiannual Report to Congress, October 1, 2010 – March 31, 2011,

http://www.dhs.gov/xoig/assets/OIG_SAR_Oct10_Mar11.pdf.

⁹ Kelley Lunney, *Government Executive*, "Committee approves bill that would forgive debt for some disaster assistance recipients", May 27, 2011, <http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0511/052711k11.htm>.

¹⁰ <http://www.paymentaccuracy.gov/>.

Reducing Excessive Overhead Costs and Unnecessary Bureaucracy

With better cost controls, DHS could save hundreds of millions of dollars without reducing or compromising services. President Obama has proposed cutting \$404 million in DHS' administrative budget next year. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) notes "the Federal Government spends extensive amounts on services or products that may be characterized as administrative or overhead."¹¹

No Way to Measure if the Billions in DHS Grants have made our Country More Secure

The Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 required that FEMA develop a way to measure and assess the nation's capability levels to respond to and prepare for a terrorist attack or natural disaster.¹² Unfortunately, DHS has no way to measure how the 96 homeland security grants and cooperative agreements are impacting homeland security.

As a result, American taxpayers have funded nearly \$40 billion in preparedness and response grants to states and localities, with no assurance it has improved the nation's security or readiness.

In fact, FEMA Deputy Administrator, Timothy Manning testified before the House Homeland Security Committee in 2009 and stated that FEMA has no way to measure if the billions of dollars in grants have made our nation more secure.¹³ Two years later, this is still the case. In the meantime, DHS continues to claim that these grants are necessary and Congress continues to appropriate billions of dollars annually without one metric to measure if the grants are reducing risk, building capability, or increasing our ability to respond to a terrorist attack or natural disaster.

Waste, Fraud and Abuse in DHS Grant Programs

DHS has taken steps to reduce waste fraud and abuse in their grant programs. Audits, however, conducted by the DHS Inspector General (IG) reveal serious shortcomings about grantees' use of grant funds and FEMA's and states' efforts to monitor grantees. For example, a recent audit on California's UASI grant funding revealed that an urban area purchased a license plate reader system for \$6.2 million but cannot explain how this acquisition prevents against a terrorist attack.¹⁴ In another instance, in New York, auditors found that grantees were being reimbursed for costs to backfill for certain positions in the fire department based on estimated rather than

¹¹ "REDUCTION: ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY INITIATIVE," Fiscal Year 2012 Terminations, Reductions, and Savings; Budget of the U.S. Government, Office of Management and Budget, page 88; <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/trs.pdf> .

¹² P.L. 109-295

¹³ Terry Kivlan, *Government Executive*, "FEMA is unable to measure funding benefits", October 27, 2009, <http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/1009/102709cdpm1.htm>

¹⁴ The State of California's Management of Urban Areas Security Initiative Grants Awarded During Fiscal Years 2006 through 2008, Department of Homeland Security, Office of Inspector General, OIG-11-46, February 2011.

actual hours worked.¹⁵ Additional deficiencies found in audits of other states and localities include:

- Grantees' inability to account for equipment purchased;
- Sole source procurement for goods and services;
- Grantees' reliance on federal funding to sustain capabilities; and
- Questionable expenditures that include vehicles purchased with grant funds being used for daily commuting and equipment purchases that were found to support law enforcement activities rather than terrorism prevention or disaster preparedness.

Duplication within DHS Grant Programs

A March 2011 GAO report highlighted duplication within the 17 DHS preparedness grant programs. Specifically, the report cited a 2010 finding by the DHS Inspector General that "planning" and "interoperable communications" is an allowance or activity that can be funded by many if not all of the 17 preparedness grant programs.¹⁶

Examples of duplication in the 96 FEMA grant and cooperative agreement programs:

- FEMA administers 19 mitigation grant and cooperative agreement programs.
- FEMA administers 28 grant and assistance programs relating to firefighters.
- Outside of these 28 fire specific grant and assistance programs, FEMA gave out \$71.8 million in grant funding from 2004-2009 to fire departments using the preparedness grant programs.¹⁷

Eliminate Unnecessary, Duplicative DHS Grants and Other Programs

DHS administers 96 grant programs and cooperative agreements. Given the fact that DHS has no way to measure how these programs are building capability, that many of the grant programs are no stranger to waste, fraud and abuse, and that duplication exists throughout, Congress should eliminate and reduce the number of grant programs going to state and locals.

Emergency Operations Center Grant Program was designed to support local emergency preparedness efforts, by providing funding for construction or renovation of state and local

¹⁵ The State of New York's Management of Urban Areas Security Initiative Grants Awarded During Fiscal Years 2006 through 2008, Department of Homeland Security, Office of Inspector General, OIG-11-30, January 2011.

¹⁶ Government Accountability Office, "Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue", March 2011, http://www.gao.gov/ereport/GAO-11-318SP/data_center/Homeland_security--law_enforcement/FEMA_needs_to_improve_its_oversight_of_grants_and_establish_a_framework_for_assessing_capabilities_to_identify_gaps_and_prioritize_investments.

¹⁷ This information was provided to staff by FEMA on March 8, 2011. The grant programs were queried using the FEMA Grant Reporting Tool. They queried the following grant programs: State Homeland Security Grant Program, Citizen Corps Program, Urban Area Security Initiative, Transit Security Grant Program, Emergency Management Performance Grant Program, Buffer Zone Protection Program, Operation Stonegarden, Interoperable Emergency Communication Grant Program, and the Emergency Operation Center Grant Program.

emergency operation centers.¹⁸ Unfortunately, this grant program has succumbed to congressional earmarking, which has significantly reduced the program's effectiveness in enhancing our national security. The President's FY 2012 budget called for the program's termination, stating that its "focus was compromised by congressional action. . . [B]y 2010, 78 percent of the EOC grant funds were congressionally-directed."¹⁹ In addition, these grants are not awarded based on risk, which is contrary to the Administration's position that homeland security grants should be awarded based on risk.²⁰ Finally, the President's termination list states that these grants are duplicative of the Emergency Management Preparedness Grant Program (EMPG), which allows funding to be used for the construction of EOCs.²¹ Congress could save \$60 million in the first year and \$666 million over ten years by eliminating this duplicative, ineffective grant program.

Intercity Bus Security Grant Program was created to provide funding for security on intercity bus systems. The President has put this grant program on the chopping block stating that the program is not awarded based on risk, which the Administration believes "is the best way to allocate resources to the areas with the greatest need so as to maximize security gains for the Nation."²² In addition, this grant program could be rolled into the Transit Security Grant Program, which provides funding for transit systems.²³ The American taxpayer would save \$133 million over ten years by eliminating this grant program.

Intercity Passenger Rail Grant Program provides security funds solely for Amtrak.²⁴ Amtrak already receives \$1.5 billion annually from the federal government that could be used for funding security upgrades.²⁵ In addition, the Amtrak grant program could be eliminated and allow Amtrak to apply for Transit Security Grant Program, which provides security grants to transit systems.²⁶ Savings over ten years for eliminating this grant program would be \$222 million and \$20 million annually.

Metropolitan Medical Response System Grants, which is one of the five grant programs in the Homeland Security Grant Program, provides "funding to support the integration of emergency management, health, and medical systems into a coordinated response to mass casualty incidents caused by any hazard."²⁷ This program is not funded in the President's 2012 request and has not been included in previous budget request dating back to 2006.²⁸ State Homeland Security

¹⁸ FEMA website, FY 2011 Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Grant Program,

<http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/eoc/index.shtml>

¹⁹ President's fiscal year 2012 budget request, "Terminations, Reductions, and Savings",

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/trs.pdf>.

²⁰ President's fiscal year 2012 budget request, "Terminations, Reductions, and Savings",

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/trs.pdf>.

²¹ President's fiscal year 2012 budget request, "Terminations, Reductions, and Savings",

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/trs.pdf>.

²² President's fiscal year 2012 budget request, "Terminations, Reductions, and Savings",

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/trs.pdf>.

²³ FEMA website, FY 2011 Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP) <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/tsgp/index.shtml>.

²⁴ FEMA website, FY 2011 Intercity Passenger Rail - Amtrak (IPR),

<http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/amtrak/>.

²⁵ Public Law 111-117, *Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010*, December 16, 2009.

²⁶ FEMA website, FY 2011 Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP) <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/tsgp/index.shtml>.

²⁷ FEMA website, FY 2011 Homeland Security Grant Program, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/hsgp/index.shtml#4>.

²⁸ International Association of Fire Chiefs, March 1, 2005,

<http://www.iafc.org/Operations/LegacyArticleDetail.cfm?ItemNumber=2173>.

Program (SHSP) grant funds can be used for the same purpose.²⁹ Congress could cut spending by \$455 million over ten years by eliminating this grant program that is duplicative of the SHSP grants.

Citizens Corps program is funded at \$10 million in FY 2011.³⁰ The purpose of this grant program is to provide “funding to bring community and government leaders together to coordinate the involvement of community members and organizations in emergency preparedness, planning, mitigation, response, and recovery.”³¹ This grant program should be eliminated because it is now an allowable expense under the State Homeland Security Program grant, which would save \$111 million over ten years.³²

Driver’s License Security Grant Program (DLSG) is used to fund states’ implementation of REAL ID.³³ This grant program should be eliminated because this is now an allowable expense under the State Homeland Security Program grant.³⁴ This program received \$50 million funding in FY 2010 and FY 2011. Eliminating this program will save \$555 million over ten years.

Interoperable Emergency Communication Grant was authorized to improve interoperable emergency communications capabilities between state, territorial, local and tribal agencies, and help implement the Statewide Communication Interoperability Plans (SCIP).³⁵ This grant program should be eliminated because interoperability purchases are allowable expenses under the State Homeland Security Program grant.³⁶ This program received \$50 million in FY 2011.³⁷ Eliminating this grant program would save \$555 million over ten years.

Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grants was funded at \$34 million in both FY 2010 and 2011.³⁸ According to FEMA, the purpose of this grant program is to enhance catastrophic incident preparedness in selected high-risk, high-consequence urban areas and their surrounding regions. Regional preparedness could be funded using the State Homeland Security Program

²⁹ President’s FY 2012 Budget Request, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/dhs.pdf> ; Jena Baker McNeill, The Heritage Foundation, “Checkbook Homeland Security: Highlights from the FY 2012 Budget Request”, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2011/03/Checkbook-Homeland-Security-Highlights-from-the-FY-2012-Budget-Request#_ftn8

³⁰ FEMA website, Homeland Security Grant Program, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/hsgp/index.shtm#5>.

³¹ FEMA website, Homeland Security Grant Program, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/hsgp/index.shtm#5>.

³² President’s FY 2012 Budget Request, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/dhs.pdf> ; Jena Baker McNeill, The Heritage Foundation, “Checkbook Homeland Security: Highlights from the FY 2012 Budget Request”, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2011/03/Checkbook-Homeland-Security-Highlights-from-the-FY-2012-Budget-Request#_ftn8.

³³ FEMA website, Driver’s License Security Grant Program, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/dlsgp/index10.shtm>.

³⁴ President’s FY 2012 Budget Request, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/dhs.pdf> ; Jena Baker McNeill, The Heritage Foundation, “Checkbook Homeland Security: Highlights from the FY 2012 Budget Request”, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2011/03/Checkbook-Homeland-Security-Highlights-from-the-FY-2012-Budget-Request#_ftn8.

³⁵ FEMA website, Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program (IECGP) Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), http://www.fema.gov/pdf/government/grant/2010/fy10_iecgp_faq.pdf.

³⁶ President’s FY 2012 Budget Request, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/dhs.pdf> ; Jena Baker McNeill, The Heritage Foundation, “Checkbook Homeland Security: Highlights from the FY 2012 Budget Request”, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2011/03/Checkbook-Homeland-Security-Highlights-from-the-FY-2012-Budget-Request#_ftn8

³⁷ President’s FY 2012 Budget Request, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/dhs.pdf>

³⁸ President’s FY 2012 Budget Request, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/dhs.pdf>.

(SHSP) and the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grants. Eliminating this duplicative grant program and would save \$34 million annually and \$377.4 million over ten years.

Boating Safety Financial Assistance Formula Grants are grants to states to encourage greater participation and uniformity in boating safety, particularly to permit the States to assume the greater share of boating safety education, assistance, and enforcement activities, and to assist the states in developing, carrying out and financing their recreational boating safety programs.³⁹ This grant program is unnecessary as recreational boating safety is not a federal issue and states should be funding their own programs. Eliminating this unnecessary grant program would save \$6 million annually and \$66.6 million over ten years.

National Fire Academy Fellowship Program is three-week program through Harvard University that provides training for senior fire executives to help them “assess the tasks they face in managing today's results-driven government agencies.”⁴⁰ The U.S. Fire Administration funds two fire officials at a cost of \$11,200 for each to attend the three-week class.⁴¹ Eliminating this unnecessary program would save \$220,000 over ten years.

DHS Scholars and Fellows Educational Program provides scholarships for undergraduate and graduate students, as well as faculty at minority serving institution to, among other things, “increase the intellectual capacity, skills and talents, especially those of U.S. citizens in areas of relevance to homeland security.”⁴² In FY 2010, this grant program was funded at \$5.6 million.⁴³ This program is unnecessary as grants and loans are available to needy students through the Department of Education. By eliminating this scholarship program it would save \$62.2 million over ten years.

Consolidate Duplicative Mitigation Grant Programs

FEMA administers five mitigation grant programs: the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program (PDM), the Flood Mitigation Assistance Program, the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, the Repetitive Flood Claims Program, and the Severe Repetitive Flood Claims Program. In addition, FEMA administers 14 additional mitigation cooperative agreement programs. While these programs have some differences, they generally fund similar projects.⁴⁴

Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program (PDM), provides funds to states, territories, Indian tribal governments, communities, and universities for hazard mitigation planning and the

³⁹ Catalogue of Domestic Federal Assistance, <https://www.cfda.gov/?s=program&mode=form&tab=step1&id=cf7d884903c43ec9c643ff745a66df49>.

⁴⁰ U.S. Fire Administration, Harvard Fire Executive Fellowship Program <http://www.usfa.dhs.gov/nfa/harvard/index.shtm>.

⁴¹ Catalogue of Domestic Federal Assistance, <https://www.cfda.gov/?s=program&mode=form&tab=step1&id=f95a148fe7936d7ef18a4d79af0be312>

⁴² Catalogue of Domestic Federal Assistance, <https://www.cfda.gov/?s=program&mode=form&tab=step1&id=af5aeb8e4ee86303909465e13d52662f>.

⁴³ Catalogue of Domestic Federal Assistance, <https://www.cfda.gov/?s=program&mode=form&tab=step1&id=af5aeb8e4ee86303909465e13d52662f>.

⁴⁴ Francis McCarthy, Congressional Research Service, “FEMA's Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program: Overview and Issues”, February 18, 2010, <http://www.crs.gov/pages/Reports.aspx?PRODCODE=RL34537&Source=search>.

implementation of mitigation projects prior to a disaster event.⁴⁵ PDM was funded at \$100 million in both FY 2010 and 2011.⁴⁶

The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) was created in November 1988 by Section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. HMGP provides funds to states after a presidential disaster declaration. HMGP funds are used to implement long-term mitigation projects such as elevating, acquiring and relocating structures in flood prone areas.⁴⁷ Congress has appropriated over \$3.9 billion to this program.⁴⁸

Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) grant program was created in 1994 as part of the National Flood Insurance Reform Act.⁴⁹ The FMA was designed to reduce or eliminate the long-term risk of flood damage to buildings, manufactured homes, and other structures insurable under the NFIP.⁵⁰ Funding for the program in FY 2010 was about \$40 million.⁵¹

The Repetitive Flood Claims (RFC) grant program was authorized by the Bunning-Bereuter-Blumenauer Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004, which amended the National Flood Insurance Act (NFIA) of 1968.⁵² The grant program was funded at \$10 million in FY2010 and is available annually for FEMA to provide RFC funds to assist States and communities reduce flood damages to insured properties that have had one or more claims to the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).⁵³

The Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) grant program was established to provide funding to reduce or in some cases eliminate term risk of flood damage to severe repetitive loss structures insured under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).⁵⁴ A severe repetitive loss property is defined as a residential property that is covered under an NFIP flood insurance policy and has at least four NFIP claim payments (including building and contents) over \$5,000 each, and the cumulative amount of such claims payments exceeds \$20,000; or for which at least two separate claims payments (building payments only) have been made with the cumulative amount of the building portion of such claims exceeding the market value of the building.⁵⁵ The program received \$80 million in 2009.⁵⁶

Mitigation grants have proven a useful tool in reducing the cost to state and federal government. A 2005 FEMA-funded independent study found: “On average, a dollar spent by FEMA on hazard mitigation provides the nation about \$4 in future benefits.” While this funding is important and could potentially save money in the long run, it would make more sense to

⁴⁵ FEMA website, Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/pdm/index.shtm>.

⁴⁶ President’s FY 2012 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/dhs.pdf>.

⁴⁷ FEMA website, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/hmgp/index.shtm>.

⁴⁸ <http://www.crs.gov/pages/Reports.aspx?PRODCODE=R40471&Source=search>.

⁴⁹ S.Rept. 103-414, 103rd Cong. 2nd sess. (1994).

⁵⁰ Congressional Research Service Report, “Federal Flood Insurance: The Repetitive Loss Problem” by Rawle O. King, June 30, 2005, p. 26.

⁵¹ <http://www.6pinternational.com/news/fema%20fy2010%20association%20rollout%20slides.pdf>.

⁵² P.L. 108-264, 42 U.S.C. 400

⁵³ FEMA website, Repetitive Flood Claims Program, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/rfc/index.shtm>.

⁵⁴ FEMA website, Severe Repetitive Loss Program, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/srl/index.shtm>.

⁵⁵ FEMA website, Severe Repetitive Loss Program, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/srl/index.shtm#0>.

⁵⁶ <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/srl/index.shtm>.

consolidate the five mitigation grant programs into one program and reduce funding by 20 percent, which would result in an savings of \$106 million annually and \$1.2 billion over ten years.

Reduce Funding to the Assistance to Firefighter Program

FEMA administers the Assistance to Firefighter Programs that awards grants to “fire departments to enhance their ability to protect the public and fire service personnel from fire and related hazards.”⁵⁷ Grants included in this program are:

- Assistance to Firefighter Grants (AFG);
- Fire Prevention and Safety Grants (FP&S); and
- Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Rescue (SAFER)

AFG grants are used to help firefighters and other first responders purchase equipment and obtain training to protect the public and emergency personnel from fire related hazards.⁵⁸ FP&S grants are used by firefighters to enhance the safety of local communities with the goal of reducing fire related injury and death. Grant funds have been used to purchase items such as smoke detectors in rural areas in Oklahoma and stovetop fire extinguishers in Bristol, Virginia.⁵⁹ The two fire grant programs received \$390 million in funding in FY 2010.⁶⁰

Funding for fire prevention and safety in local communities is an important issue; however, it is not an issue that should be the responsibility of the federal government. A 2009 Heritage Foundation study found that these grants had no impact on reducing fire casualties.⁶¹ In fact, the report states that “without receiving fire grants, comparison fire departments were just as successful at preventing fire casualties as grant-funded fire departments.”⁶² This proposal would recommend reducing funding to AFG and FP&S by 50 percent, which would save \$2.1 billion over ten years.

Congress, moreover, is seeking to reduce competition in the AFG grant program by making the grants guaranteed percentage allocation for career, volunteer and combination fire departments. Under current law, AFG grants are competitive based on need. If congress is successful, changing this grant program from a competitive to guarantee could encourage state and local governments to supplant funding of fire departments on behalf of “guaranteed” funding. This proposal would recommend reducing funding to AFG and FP&S by 50 percent, which would save \$2.1 billion over ten years. President Obama supported reducing funding for this program in 2010 and in the FY 2012 budget request.

⁵⁷ FEMA Website, Assistance to Firefighter Program, <http://www.fema.gov/firegrants/>.

⁵⁸ FEMA website, Assistance to Firefighter Grants, <http://www.fema.gov/firegrants/afggrants/index.shtm>.

⁵⁹ FEMA website, FP&S success stories, http://www.fema.gov/firegrants/program/success_stories/fps/BristolVA2_Success.shtm.

⁶⁰ Lennard Kruger, Congressional Research Service, Assistance to Firefighters Program: Distribution of Fire Grant Funding, January 3, 2011,

⁶¹ <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/09/Do-DHS-Fire-Grants-Reduce-Fire-Casualties>.

⁶² David Muhlhausen, The Heritage Foundation, “Do DHS Fire Grants Reduce Fire Casualties?”, September 3, 2009, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/09/Do-DHS-Fire-Grants-Reduce-Fire-Casualties>.

SAFER grants are used to recruit and pay the salaries of state and local firefighters so fire departments can comply with staffing and other standards established by OSHA and the National Fire Protection Association.⁶³ SAFER was enacted in 2003 as part of the FY2004 National Defense Authorization Act.⁶⁴ Congress funded SAFER at \$420 million in FY 2010 and \$405 million in FY 2011.⁶⁵

While states are going broke, so is the federal government. Given our nation's financial problems, we cannot afford to pay the salaries of local firefighters nor should the American taxpayer as a whole be forced to pay for fire service in areas they do not live. State and local governments need to make this a priority and cut spending to pay for this essential service. By eliminating this grant program, it will free up \$420 million annually and over \$4.6 billion over ten years.

Reduce Funding to the Emergency Food and Shelter Program

The Emergency Food and Shelter Program was created to “supplement and expand ongoing efforts to provide shelter, food and supportive services” for homeless and hungry individuals nationwide.⁶⁶ This program was funded at \$200 million in FY 2010.⁶⁷ According to the GAO duplication report, the federal government spent more than \$90 billion on 18 domestic food and nutrition assistance programs in Fiscal Year 2010.⁶⁸ The report highlights that many of these “programs provide comparable benefits to similar or overlapping populations.”⁶⁹ This proposal would reduce funding for this program by 50 percent or \$100 million, which is the identical to the President's FY 2012 budget request.⁷⁰ By reducing funding for this duplicative program it would save \$1.1 billion over ten years.

Eliminate the Office of Bombing Prevention

Terrorists' use of improvised explosive devices (IED) has been a real threat to this nation because of the relative ease with which an IED can be made and the massive destruction resulting from these bombings makes them a very attractive weapon for terrorists to employ. Given the importance our own intelligence agencies have placed on the threat of IEDs and the examples already out there of IEDs easily being employed, it is critically important that our government address these issues to effectively prevent terrorists from using IEDs here in

⁶³ NFPA 1710 and/or NFPA 1720 and OSHA 1910.134, <http://www.nfpa.org/categoryList.asp?categoryID=999&itemID=24345>.

⁶⁴ Section 1057, P.L. 108-136.

⁶⁵ P.L. 111-83, P.L. 112-10.

⁶⁶ FEMA website, Emergency Food and Shelter Program, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/efs.shtm>.

⁶⁷ President's FY 2012 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security,

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/dhs.pdf>.

⁶⁸ Government Accountability Office, “Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue”, March 2011, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11714t.pdf>.

⁶⁹ Government Accountability Office, “Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue”, March 2011, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11714t.pdf>.

⁷⁰ President's FY 2012 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/dhs.pdf>.

America. The federal government, however, is duplicating efforts to address this issue. Instead of one agency focusing on this important issue, several agencies are involved. Federal explosives laws have been administered and enforced by the ATF for the past 40 years.⁷¹ In administering and enforcing the provisions of these federal explosives laws, DOJ, through ATF and the FBI, has a full range of programs and capabilities designed to “deter, detect, prevent, protect against, and respond to terrorist explosives attacks.” These include:

- ATF’s U.S Bomb Data Center⁷²
- ATF’s National Center for Explosives Training and Research⁷³
- FBI’s Hazardous Devices School⁷⁴
- ATF’s Arson and Explosives National Response Team⁷⁵
- The Terrorist Explosive Device Analytical Center⁷⁶

Despite the Department of Justice’s clear expertise and resources at the ready to deal with bombing incidents, the Department of Homeland Security established the Office for Bombing Prevention (OBP) in 2003. OBP has never been authorized by Congress. In FY 2011, the department received about \$15 million in funding.⁷⁷ OBP mission is to “develop tools to improve national preparedness for bombing threats at all levels of government, the public, and within the private sector.”⁷⁸

There is no doubt that the pre-9-11 coordination and communication problems continue to exist among federal agencies. However, the answer is not to add more agencies into the mix to act as “coordinators.” By eliminating the DHS’ Office of Bombing Prevention, and allowing ATF and FBI to handle explosives, it would save the American taxpayer \$163 million over ten years.

Eliminate the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office

The Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO), funded at \$39 million in FY 2010, has spent over \$1.2 billion attempting to develop and acquire radiation detectors for U.S. ports of entry, to prevent terrorists from smuggling in a nuclear device.⁷⁹ Today, no such devices are in regular use. In fact, DNDO has little to show for its efforts but failed research, angry members of Congress, and a string of critical reports from the GAO.

“You screwed up big time,” an angry Rep. Dan Lungren chastised then-DNDO chief Vayl Oxford in a 2007 hearing. GAO concluded at the time that DNDO was moving ahead with

⁷¹ 18 U.S.C. § 841

⁷² ATF website, U.S. Bomb Data Center, <http://www.atf.gov/explosives/groups/usbdc/>.

⁷³ ATF Fact Sheet, August 2008, <http://www.atf.gov/publications/factsheets/factsheet-ncetr.html>.

⁷⁴ FBI website, Critical Incident Response Group, <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cirg/hazardous-devices>.

⁷⁵ ATF website, National Response Team, <http://www.atf.gov/explosives/programs/national-response-team/>.

⁷⁶ ATF Fact Sheet, March 2010, <http://www.atf.gov/publications/factsheets/factsheet-improvised-explosives-devices.html>.

⁷⁷ FY 2012 DHS Congressional Budget Justification, Page 2006, <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/dhs-congressional-budget-justification-fy2012.pdf>

⁷⁸ DHS website, Office of Bombing and Prevention, http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/structure/gc_1184010933025.shtm

⁷⁹ President’s FY 2012 Budget request for the Department of Homeland Security, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/dhs.pdf>.

buying expensive devices that didn't work as well as advertised. "You're kind of leading us down a big rat hole with a lot of money," Lungren warned.⁸⁰

In 2009, GAO reported "continuing issues" with DNDO efforts, questioning whether the devices it was developing were worth their cost.⁸¹ The next year, GAO found "inadequate oversight" and "immature technology" at DNDO, and all but accused the office of misleading Congress about the quality and success of its efforts.⁸²

To make matters worse, a recent *Washington Post* article states that DNDO plans to spend \$300 million on the failed radiation detection devices over the next four years.⁸³ Given its inability to produce technology suitable to detect nuclear devices and the stove piped nature of the agency, DNDO should be eliminated. It is possible that the Science and Technology directorate could handle the development of this type of technology. If DNDO was eliminated, it would save \$433 million over ten years.

Reduce Funding to the Office of Intelligence and Analysis

DHS' intelligence operations, now known as the Directorate of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A), have been an object of curiosity and concern amongst intelligence experts since they began. Before DHS existed, responsibility for gathering and analyzing intelligence to protect the United States was handled by numerous federal entities – from the CIA and NSA to the FBI and even intelligence offices at the Departments of State and Energy.

Of course, that fractured system was not perfect, as the Sept. 11 attacks demonstrated. Boosting information-sharing and coordination became a priority for the intelligence community. When DHS was created, it was expected to help fuse intelligence from those disparate sources. But that responsibility went to the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC).

In the absence of a clear, distinct role for I&A, the directorate has chosen to define itself with extraordinary breadth and cardinality. I&A is "the leading provider of intelligence and high-quality analysis to the Homeland Security Enterprise (HSE)," I&A Undersecretary Caryn Wagner wrote earlier this year.⁸⁴ The "HSE" includes nearly everyone, in I&A's view: "Departmental leaders and components, state, local, tribal, territorial and private sector partners and other Intelligence Community (IC) members."

⁸⁰ http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/GSN_20070315_60F31763.php

⁸¹ <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10252t.pdf>

⁸² <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d101041t.pdf>

⁸³ Robert O'Harrow Jr., DHS plans to spend \$300 million on troubled radiation detectors, Thursday July 14, 2011, http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/dhs-plans-to-spend-300-million-on-troubled/2011/07/13/gIQA6gmPDI_story.html?hpid=z3.

⁸⁴ DHS, "Office of Intelligence and Analysis Strategic Plan: Fiscal Year 2011-2018," February 18, 2011, <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/ia-fy2011-fy2018-strategic-plan.pdf>, accessed July 14, 2011.

It is safe to say that few outside of I&A consider it “the leading provider of intelligence and . . . analysis” within the intelligence community. Nonetheless, the directorate received \$335 million in unclassified funds in 2011 to gamely attempt to achieve that status.⁸⁵

As long as the CIA, the FBI and the Defense Intelligence Agency exist, DHS is unlikely to take the driver’s seat for the U.S. intelligence community. And it shouldn’t spend like it wants to be.

When conceiving a functional mission for I&A, it may be instructive to look at how other, more seasoned agencies approach the issue. The State Department, for example, has a dedicated intelligence office, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR). Unlike DHS’ I&A, it has a very tailored, defined role: “to provide all-source intelligence support to the Secretary of State and other State Department policymakers, including ambassadors, special negotiators, country directors, and desk officers.”⁸⁶

Like DHS, it supports both its executive leadership as well as far-flung customers – in this case, U.S. embassies around the world. Like I&A, INR conducts all-source intelligence analysis; contributes to the President’s Daily Briefing; maintains a 24-hour watch center; acts as its agency’s liaison to the intelligence community; provides its agency’s voice in community-wide affairs; and helps shape its agency’s policies to keep the United States safe and free.⁸⁷

It accomplishes all those tasks with funding just one-fifth the size of I&A’s budget and a staff one-third the size of I&A’s. For an unclassified budget of merely \$65 million, and utilizing just 337 employees (I&A has over 1,000), INR has been successfully analyzing and disseminating crucial intelligence for its clients, and ensuring seamless information-sharing with the broader intelligence community.⁸⁸

Congress should consider directing I&A to model itself in the image of State’s INR, and point it in that direction by giving it a commensurate budget. This proposal would recommend cutting the I&A budget by 80 percent, which would save \$3.1 billion over 10 years.

Reduce Funding for the Office of Science and Technology

The Office of Science and Technology (S&T) was created to provide “knowledge, products and innovative technology solutions for the Homeland Security Enterprise.”⁸⁹ S&T was funded at \$1 billion in FY 2010.⁹⁰

⁸⁵ DHS, “Congressional Budget Justification FY 2012,” <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/dhs-congressional-budget-justification-fy2012.pdf>, accessed July 14, 2011.

⁸⁶ State Department, “2012 Budget Justification – D&CP – Bureau of Intelligence and Research,” <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/158307.pdf>, accessed July 14, 2011.

⁸⁷ State Department, “2012 Budget Justification – D&CP – Bureau of Intelligence and Research,” <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/158307.pdf>, accessed July 14, 2011.

⁸⁸ State Department, “2012 Budget Justification – D&CP – Bureau of Intelligence and Research,” <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/158307.pdf>, accessed July 14, 2011.

⁸⁹ DHS website, Science and technology, <http://www.dhs.gov/files/scitech.shtm>.

⁹⁰ DHS, “Congressional Budget Justification FY 2012,” Page 2941, <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/dhs-congressional-budget-justification-fy2012.pdf>, accessed July 14, 2011.

Since the creation of S&T, the directorate has been criticized by Congress because of its inability to organize itself with a clear mission and purpose. According to a CRS report, other criticisms with S&T surround:⁹¹

- allocation of R&D funding;
- how priorities are set;
- a lack of metrics; and
- the inability of S&Ts to properly coordinated with other federal R&D organizations, such as the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, the Department of Energy national laboratories.

In addition, S&T seems to be developing numerous detection and screening technologies based off of stakeholder interests such as Congress, instead of making focused efforts to develop technology based on actual intelligence and risk assessments.⁹² This proposal would reduce the funding for S&T by 20 percent, which would save \$2.2 billion over ten years.



TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

In response to the terrorist attacks on 9/11, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) was created to “protect the nation's transportation systems to ensure freedom of movement for people and commerce.”⁹³ But there are serious questions about how effective TSA is in keeping the American flying public safe. Instead of focusing on intelligence to prevent a future terrorist attack, TSA seems to implement security standards in reaction to an attempted terrorist plot. This has cost the American public a lot of money, but brings no assurance that we are any safer when we travel.

TSA has invested millions of dollars in screening systems that were not properly tested before being purchased and deployed to our nation's airports. For example, TSA spent \$29.6 million buying 207 explosive trace portal devices, also known as “puffer machines.”⁹⁴ These explosive detection devices continually broke down, costing thousands to maintain. Without ever having detected any explosives in real testing environments, GAO investigators found that they were prone to false-positives. In 2009, TSA finally terminated the use of these machines in U.S. airports, and recalled the costly machines.



⁹¹ Dana Shea, Congressional Research Service,

⁹² James Carafano, Testimony before http://www.heritage.org/Research/Testimony/2011/03/Next-Steps-for-Homeland-Security-Research#_ftn4

⁹³ TSA website, Who We Are, http://www.tsa.gov/who_we_are/index.shtm.

⁹⁴ Government Accountability Office, Testimony before the before the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, “Aviation Security: TSA is Increasing Procurement and Deployment of the Advanced Imaging Technology, but Challenges to This Effort and Other Areas of Aviation Security Remain”, March 17, 2010, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10484t.pdf>.

According to GAO, the TSA Screening of Passengers by Observation Techniques (SPOT) program, was not properly designed or tested.⁹⁵ The program, implemented in 2003, is intended to detect terrorists by focusing on behavior and appearance analysis.⁹⁶ However, SPOT has not been effective in leading to arrests of terrorist at our nation's airports, "despite the discovery that multiple known terrorists evaded detection at SPOT airports."⁹⁷

In March, the GAO said this program should be validated to justify any further funding. According to GAO, if Congress froze current funding until the program is validated; it would save roughly \$20 million annually.⁹⁸ SPOT receives over \$200 million in annual funding.⁹⁹ By eliminating this ineffective program it would save \$2.2 billion over ten years.



TSA has moved forward with enhanced screening techniques and technologies that have raised serious questions about health and privacy. The Advanced Imaging Technology (AIT) machines, also known as body scanners, have caused many in the flying public to raise privacy concerns surrounding these machines due to the fact that they are a "virtual strip search." TSA continues to say they are essential to aviation security despite the GAO saying that they most likely would have not detected the Christmas day underwear bomber.¹⁰⁰

In addition to privacy concerns, many members of Congress have voiced concerns about the potential health effects associated with the radiation exposure to individuals who are screened, as well as the TSA employees operating the machines. TSA has insisted the machines are safe, even though maintenance records have showed that the radiation exposure could be as much as 10 times higher than TSA expected.¹⁰¹ Congress should eliminate funding for these machines

⁹⁵ Government Accountability Office, "Aviation Security: Efforts to Validate TSA's Passenger Screening Behavior Detection Program Underway, but Opportunities Exist to Strengthen Validation and Address Operational Challenges", May 2010, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10763.pdf>.

⁹⁶ Government Accountability Office, "Aviation Security: Efforts to Validate TSA's Passenger Screening Behavior Detection Program Underway, but Opportunities Exist to Strengthen Validation and Address Operational Challenges", May 2010, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10763.pdf>.

⁹⁷ Congressman John Mica, press release, June 21, 2010, <http://mica.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=191499>.

⁹⁸ \$20 million is the average increase the program receives annually.

⁹⁹ Government Accountability Office, "Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue", March 2011, http://www.gao.gov/ereport/GAO-11-318SP/data_center_savings/Homeland_security--Law_enforcement/Validation_of_TSA's_behavior-based_screening_program_is_needed_to_justify_funding_or_expansion.

¹⁰⁰ Spencer Hsu, *Washington Post*, "GAO says airport body scanners may not have thwarted Christmas Day bombing", March 18, 2010, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/17/AR2010031700649.html>.

¹⁰¹ Alison Young and Blake Morrison, *USA Today*, "TSA to retest airport body scanners for radiation", March 14, 2011, http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2011-03-11-tsa-scans_N.htm.

until newer technology is developed that is proven to be safe and does not infringe on privacy rights. Eliminating immediate funding would save \$76 million in FY 2012.¹⁰²

If the controversial body scanners don't do the job, according to TSA, an invasive pat down will. TSA has done little to ensure Congress and the American public that these pat downs are targeted and based on threat. Instead, there are multiple examples of children as young as three and six being pulled aside to go through pat downs.¹⁰³ Most recently, TSA was universally condemned for requiring a 95-year-old cancer patient to go through an invasive pat-down, even requiring her to remove her adult diaper.¹⁰⁴

Reduce Funding for TSA and Improve Efficiency by Expanding the Screening Partnership Program

Chairman Mica of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure recently released a report that found the American taxpayer could save \$1 billion over the next five years if TSA would expand the Screening Partnership Program (SPP) to the top 35 airports in the country.¹⁰⁵ The SPP allows airports to use private screening security companies, under the oversight of TSA, to handle aviation security.¹⁰⁶ Currently 16 airports nationwide participate in the program.¹⁰⁷

In January of this year, TSA Administrator John Pistole halted the expansion of this program claiming that after reviewing TSA policies he did “not see any clear or substantial advantage” to expanding the program.¹⁰⁸ Soon after halting the SPP, Pistole made the decision give TSA employees limited bargaining rights, therefore, putting personnel issues above the mission of TSA to protect the flying public.¹⁰⁹

According to Mica's report, the 35 airports represent 75 percent of all commercial passengers in the U.S. If all 35 airports switched to SPP, that would eliminate the need for 7,601 federal employees, and would save \$1 billion in salaries alone.¹¹⁰

The report also found:

- SPP screeners are 65 percent more efficient than TSA federal employees;

¹⁰² Andrew Taylor, *Huffington Post*, “TSA Body Scanners: House GOP move to cut off new funding formachines”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/12/tsa-body-scanners-house-gop-cut-new-funding_n_861388.html.

¹⁰³ Ed O'Keefe, *Washington Post*, TSA, Congress to review screening procedures after pat-down of 6-year-old girl http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/tsa-congress-vow-to-review-pat-down-of-6-year-old-girl/2011/04/13/AFZD9LYD_story.html.

¹⁰⁴ Alex Sunby, CBS News, “TSA defends removing adult's diaper for pat down”, June 27, 2011, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2011/06/27/national/main20074643.shtml>

¹⁰⁵ Chairman John Mica, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, “TSA Ignores More Cost-Effective Screening Model”, June 3, 2011, http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/112th/Aviation/2011-06-03-TSA_SPP_Report.pdf.

¹⁰⁶ TSA website, Screening Partnership Program, http://www.tsa.gov/what_we_do/optout/index.shtm. SPP was authorized under the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (ATSA) of 2001.

¹⁰⁷ TSA website, Screening Partnership Program, http://www.tsa.gov/what_we_do/optout/index.shtm.

¹⁰⁸ TSA website, TSA Statement on Contractor Screening Program, January 28, 2011, http://www.tsa.gov/press/happenings/2011/012811_contractor_screening_program.shtm.

¹⁰⁹ Emily Long, *Government Executive*, “TSA workers granted limited bargaining rights”, February 4, 2011, <http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0211/02041112.htm>.

¹¹⁰ Mica's report examined San Francisco airport, which is under the SPP program and LAX, which is run by federal employees under TSA.

- Screening of passengers by TSA employees is almost double the cost of screening under the SPP program - \$4.22 per passenger for a federal screening workforce, as opposed to only \$2.42 per passenger for private screeners;
- Many countries, including Israel and Western European nations, rely on SPP-like screening programs;
- TSA has spent more than \$2 billion on recruiting and training costs due to high attrition, which has hindered its ability to focus on security.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

According to the Government Accountability Office, CBP has a \$639.4 million unobligated balance in its Customs User Fee Account. This account is for fees collected for the costs associated with CBP processing air and sea passengers and shipments. As a result of a temporary fee increase in 1993 and elimination of certain North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) country exemptions from January 1, 1994, to September 30, 1997, the account incurred this balance.¹¹¹ GAO found that this unobligated balance has been in the fee account for ten years.¹¹² Congress should rescind the money for a one-time cost savings of \$639.4 million.

Consolidate Multiple DHS Mascots

DHS is making an effort to “prepare” younger Americans for potential threats, both terrorist or natural by spending at least \$462,106 in federal tax dollars to create the *Ready Kids* Initiative¹¹³, a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for Kids website¹¹⁴, a U.S. Fire Administration for Kids website¹¹⁵, a Mountain Lion Family, Herman the Crab, the “Disaster Twins,”¹¹⁶ and the U.S. Fire Administration’s Marty and his turtle friend Jett. With the critical mission of securing America, one would question if multiple, duplicative websites and mascots are a wise use of the agency’s time and money. This proposal would simply consolidate them into one kids program, which would save DHS \$2.6 million over ten years.



¹¹¹ Government Accountability Office, Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue, March 2011, [http://www.gao.gov/ereport/GAO-11-318SP/data_center_savings/Homeland_security--Law_enforcement/Clarifying_availability_of_certain_customs_fee_collections_could_produce_a_one-time_savings_of_\\$640_million#1](http://www.gao.gov/ereport/GAO-11-318SP/data_center_savings/Homeland_security--Law_enforcement/Clarifying_availability_of_certain_customs_fee_collections_could_produce_a_one-time_savings_of_$640_million#1).

¹¹² Government Accountability Office, Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue, March 2011, [http://www.gao.gov/ereport/GAO-11-318SP/data_center_savings/Homeland_security--Law_enforcement/Clarifying_availability_of_certain_customs_fee_collections_could_produce_a_one-time_savings_of_\\$640_million#1](http://www.gao.gov/ereport/GAO-11-318SP/data_center_savings/Homeland_security--Law_enforcement/Clarifying_availability_of_certain_customs_fee_collections_could_produce_a_one-time_savings_of_$640_million#1).

¹¹³ Ready Kids Initiative website, <http://www.ready.gov/kids/>

¹¹⁴ FEMA for Kids website, <http://www.fema.gov/kids/index.htm>

¹¹⁵ U.S. Fire Administration kids website, <http://www.usfa.dhs.gov/kids/flash.shtm>.

¹¹⁶ FEMA Disaster twins website, <http://www.fema.gov/kids/twins/>.

SAVINGS:

\$23.5 billion in savings over the next decade and \$3.1 billion in savings in the first year by enacting these reforms which includes eliminating at least 15 programs and reducing the cost of ten other programs.

PROGRAM ELIMINATED

Emergency Operation Centers
 Intercity Bus Security Grant Program
 Intercity Passenger Rail Grant Program
 Metropolitan Medical Response System
 Citizens Corps Program
 Drivers License Security Grant Program
 Interoperability Emergency Communications Grant Program
 Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Rescue Grants
 Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grants
 Boating Safety Financial Assistance Formula Grant
 National Fire Academy Fellowship Program
 DHS Scholars and Fellows Educational Program
 Office of Bombing Prevention
 Eliminate the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
 TSA Screening of Passengers by Observation Techniques Program

ADDITIONAL SAVINGS/PROGRAM REDUCTIONS

Reduce funding by 50 percent to the AFG and FP&S fire grant programs
 Reduce Funding to the Emergency Food and Shelter Program by 50 percent
 Reduce Funding to the Office of Intelligence and Analysis by 80 percent
 Reduce Funding for the Science and Technology Directorate by 20 percent
 Moving to Screening Partnership Program (SPP) at the top \$35 airports in the Nation
 Freeze immediate funding for Advanced Imaging Technology scanners
 President Obama's proposed administrative reduction
 Consolidate Mitigation Grant Programs and reduce funding by 20 percent
 CBP unobligated balance in its Customs User Fee Account
 Consolidate multiple DHS kids programs

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY TEN YEAR SAVINGS

Discretionary: \$23.29 billion

Total: \$23.29 billion