



# governmentattic.org

*"Rummaging in the government's attic"*

Description of document: California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) California Homeland Security Strategy, 2017-2020 - Climate Change Section

Requested date: 03-January-2020

Release date: 06-April-2020

Posted date: 19-February-2024

Source of document: Public Record Act request  
Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)  
Attention: Office of Legal Affairs (Bldg. E)  
3650 Schriever Avenue  
Mather, CA 95655  
[Online Public Record Request Form](#)

The governmentattic.org web site ("the site") is a First Amendment free speech web site and is noncommercial and free to the public. The site and materials made available on the site, such as this file, are for reference only. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals have made every effort to make this information as complete and as accurate as possible, however, there may be mistakes and omissions, both typographical and in content. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage caused, or alleged to have been caused, directly or indirectly, by the information provided on the governmentattic.org web site or in this file. The public records published on the site were obtained from government agencies using proper legal channels. Each document is identified as to the source. Any concerns about the contents of the site should be directed to the agency originating the document in question. GovernmentAttic.org is not responsible for the contents of documents published on the website.



**VIA EMAIL ONLY**

April 6, 2020

Subject: January 3, 2020 Public Records Act Request

This letter serves to respond to your California Public Records Act request dated January 3, 2020 and received by California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) on January 10, 2020. You requested, in brief, a copy of all studies, reports, or memos concerning the impact or potential impact of climate change and/or extreme weather on emergency management in the State during the last four years, excluding any documents already published on the Cal OES website.

As stated in prior correspondence, Cal OES is in possession of documents responsive to your request. These documents are attached hereto and are numbered RAVNITZKY\_001 – 029. Out of professional courtesy and for your convenience and ease of reference, Cal OES has only included pages in the California Homeland Security Strategy with information responsive to your request. The pages containing information which was not responsive to your request have been removed. Such pages may also contain intelligence information and/or security procedures which are exempt from disclosure pursuant to Government Code § 6254(f). Preliminary drafts were also not included pursuant to California Government Code § 6254(d)(3).

3650 SCHRIEVER AVENUE, MATHER, CA 95655  
TELEPHONE (916) 845-8869  
[www.CalOES.ca.gov](http://www.CalOES.ca.gov)



April 6, 2020

Page 2

If you have any questions regarding the responsive records, please contact me at (916) 621-8176, or by email at [pra@caloes.ca.gov](mailto:pra@caloes.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Meg Wilson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Meg Wilson  
Senior Counsel

Cc: Stephanie Ogren, Assistant Chief Counsel





# CALIFORNIA HOMELAND SECURITY STRATEGY

(2017-2020)



***Cal* OES**  
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE  
OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

---

Note: This document is the exclusive property of the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) and is UNCLASSIFIED//FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Because it is a sensitive homeland security document, it contains information that may be exempt from public disclosure under the California Public Records Act (Govt. Code Sec 6250, et seq.). This document is not to be released to the public, the media, or any personnel who do not have a valid need-to-know without prior approval of the Cal OES chief legal counsel.

For additional information about the Strategy or the Homeland Security Advisory Committee (HSAC), contact: Emilie Hill, Homeland Security Coordinator, and liaison to the committee at (916) 845-8827 or via email at [emilie.hill@caloes.ca.gov](mailto:emilie.hill@caloes.ca.gov)





## CALIFORNIA HOMELAND SECURITY STRATEGY

### **Goal 12: Protect Against Effects of Climate Change**

#### ***Background***

Extreme weather, caused by a changing climate, is resulting in tangible impacts to homeland security in California and across the nation. Extreme weather caused by climate change threatens California's critical infrastructure and food security.

Additionally, extreme weather makes California more vulnerable to cascading events that could lead to catastrophic scenarios or human-caused emergencies. Research suggests that climate change will disrupt individuals and whole communities, leading to homeland security risks such as terrorism and violent conflicts over natural resources.<sup>29</sup>

Climate change may cause populations to migrate in response sea levels rising, conflict and economic losses due to resource scarcity, and changing living conditions due to higher average temperatures. It is expected that populations will settle disproportionately inland in California, in contrast to historical trends.<sup>30</sup> Higher populations in inland California may stimulate more development of the urban-wildland interface and increase public safety risk associated with wildfires.

Climate change increases the risk of energy infrastructure disruption due to damage from fire, soot build-up, and heat.<sup>31</sup> Wildfires can clear land and cause larger debris or more sedimentation to travel through streams, posing a threat to the continuity of water conveyance structures like canals and dams.<sup>32</sup> It may also place an increased stress on energy infrastructure due to rising average temperatures and air conditioning usage.

Extreme weather also destabilizes the food and agricultural industry, threatening economic and food security. Shifting seasons can disrupt traditional growing seasons for farmers, flood agricultural fields during wet winters, and cause uncertainty of water availability that can also result in reduced crop yields. The Third California Climate Change Assessment predicts warmer temperatures to cause longer and more intense droughts in California, such as the statewide drought that lasted from 2012-2016<sup>33</sup>. The 2012-2015 drought had a significant impact on California's agriculture, costing \$603 million dollars and more than 4,000 jobs, according to a UC Davis study.<sup>34</sup>

California state agencies are involved in various ongoing activities that promote resiliency against the effects of climate change. The Climate Adaptation Team (CAT), coordinated by the California Environmental Protection Agency, is made up of stakeholders from different state agencies, and leads the state in climate change policy coordination.<sup>35</sup>



## CALIFORNIA HOMELAND SECURITY STRATEGY

### ***Climate Change Research Plan***

The Climate Change Research Plan, developed by the CAT, identifies research priorities aimed at minimizing the effects of extreme weather. The Climate Change Research Plan acknowledges the need for increased precipitation monitoring and sensor networks; improved modeling methods for extreme events; research into low probability-high impact scenarios and incorporation into planning; research into the economic risks associated with climate change impacts; vulnerability assessments for California's populations, infrastructure, property, food, and agriculture; and adaptation strategies to assess the adequacy of surge and response capacity.<sup>36</sup>

### ***Safeguarding California Plan***

The Natural Resources Agency coordinates a statewide Safeguarding California Plan, in which state agencies catalog their recommendations and ongoing activities to address climate change.<sup>37</sup>

### ***Cal Adapt***

The California Energy Commission (CEC) developed an interactive tool for climate change data and projections called Cal Adapt.<sup>38</sup> The tool monitors wildfire activity and assesses wildfire risk per locality. The tool allows users to view the electrical grid located in the area.

### ***Building Resilience Against Climate Effects (CalBRACE)***

The Department of Public Health tool, Building Resilience Against Climate Effects (CalBRACE), provides individual county-specific reports that compile climate change impacts specific to the area, including heat-related illness and wildfire risk.<sup>39</sup> The Climate Change and Health Equity Program, within the Department of Public Health, specifically addresses climate-related health threats to environmental justice groups.<sup>40</sup>





## CALIFORNIA HOMELAND SECURITY STRATEGY

<sup>28</sup>"State of California Emergency Plan," (California Governor's Office of Emergency Services, October 2017.)  
[http://www.caloes.ca.gov/PlanningPreparednessSite/Documents/California\\_State\\_Emergency\\_Plan\\_2017.pdf](http://www.caloes.ca.gov/PlanningPreparednessSite/Documents/California_State_Emergency_Plan_2017.pdf)

<sup>29</sup>Katherina Nett and Luks Ruttinger, "Climate Diplomacy Report: Insurgency, Terrorism and Organised Crime in a Warming Climate," (Climate Diplomacy Initiative, October 2016.)  
<https://www.adelphi.de/en/publication/insurgency-terrorism-and-organised-crime-warming-climate>

<sup>30</sup> "New State Population Projections," (California Department of Finance, March 2017.)  
[http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Projections/documents/P\\_PressRelease.pdf](http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Projections/documents/P_PressRelease.pdf)

<sup>31</sup> "U.S. Energy Sector Vulnerabilities to Climate Change and Extreme Weather," (U.S. Department of Energy, July 2013.) <https://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2013/07/f2/20130710-Energy-Sector-Vulnerabilities-Report.pdf>

<sup>32</sup>"Burned Area Emergency Response, Rim Fire, Stanislaus National Forest: Hydrology and Watershed Specialist Report," (Modoc National Forest, Klamath National Forest, Cleveland National Forest, Inyo National Forest, Pacific Southwest Region, Stanislaus National Forest, Regional Water Quality Control Board, September 2013.)  
[https://inciweb.nwcg.gov/photos/CASTF/2013-09-06-1648-Rim-PostFire\\_BAER/related\\_files/pict20130830-204231-0.pdf](https://inciweb.nwcg.gov/photos/CASTF/2013-09-06-1648-Rim-PostFire_BAER/related_files/pict20130830-204231-0.pdf)

<sup>33</sup> "Assessment Report: Causes and Predictability of the 2011-14 California Drought," (The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Drought Task Force, August 2014.)  
[http://cpo.noaa.gov/sites/cpo/MAPP/Task%20Forces/DTF/californiadrought/california\\_drought\\_report.pdf](http://cpo.noaa.gov/sites/cpo/MAPP/Task%20Forces/DTF/californiadrought/california_drought_report.pdf)

<sup>34</sup> "Economic Analysis of the 2016 California Drought on Agriculture: A Report for the California Department of Food and Agriculture," (University of California Davis, Center for Watershed Sciences, August 2016.) [https://watershed.ucdavis.edu/files/DroughtReport\\_20160812.pdf](https://watershed.ucdavis.edu/files/DroughtReport_20160812.pdf)

<sup>35</sup>"Climate Action Team & Climate Action Initiative," (California Air Resources Board and Environmental Protection Agency, 2017.) [http://climatechange.ca.gov/climate\\_action\\_team/](http://climatechange.ca.gov/climate_action_team/)

<sup>36</sup> "Climate Change Research Plan for California," (California Environmental Protection Agency, Climate Action Team, February 2015.)  
[http://climatechange.ca.gov/climate\\_action\\_team/reports/CAT\\_research\\_plan\\_2015.pdf](http://climatechange.ca.gov/climate_action_team/reports/CAT_research_plan_2015.pdf)

f





## CALIFORNIA HOMELAND SECURITY STRATEGY

---

<sup>37</sup> "Safeguarding California Plan," (California Natural Resources Agency, 2017,) <http://resources.ca.gov/climate/safeguarding/>

<sup>38</sup> "Cal-Adapt Climate Tools," (California Energy Commission, 2017) <http://cal-adapt.org/>

<sup>39</sup> "Climate Change and Health Profile Reports," (California Department of Public Health, 2017,) <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/OHE/Pages/ClimateHealthProfileReports.aspx>

<sup>40</sup> "Climate Change and Health Equity Program," (California Department of Public Health, 2017,) <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/OHE/Pages/CCHEP.aspx>



**House Homeland Security Committee  
Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, & Communications**

***The Future of FEMA: Stakeholder Recommendations for the Next Administrator***  
**February 14, 2017**

**Comments from the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services  
Via the National Governors Association**

## **What three issue areas should the next administrator focus on?**

### **1) Expand Federal Efforts to Prepare and Mitigate for Extreme Weather Events**

In the last eight years, states have experienced a dramatic increase in the number of extreme weather events. In addition to an increase in frequency and severity, weather events such as droughts, flash and coastal flooding, tornadoes, hurricanes, wildfires, are occurring in states that have historically been unaffected by these types of weather events. States are working continuously to prepare for, prevent, respond, and recover from extreme weather events. However, disasters are often not bound by state borders and require funding and coordination on a national scale to ensure a seamless response. The next administration should be aware that these weather events will continue to occur and states will be at the forefront of responding to these disasters with federal government support. Therefore, there is a need to maintain and expand efforts to enhance mitigation practices, foster regional collaboration, and build more resiliencies into disaster preparedness activities.

### **2) Recognize Cyber Incidents as a Disaster in the Stafford Act**

States are witnessing a more diverse array of disasters than at any other time in history. As the nation now faces threats from both natural and manmade sources, the new Administrator should support the states in preventing, preparing for, responding to and recovering from high impact cyber-attacks. For instance, the Administrator should advocate for Congress to amend the Stafford Act to include cyberattacks as a qualifying disaster.

### **3) Support State and Local Capabilities:**

#### **a) Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program**

State and local communities would benefit from an increase in Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program (PDMGP) funding, as it has dramatically declined in recent years. Congress and the new Administrator are urged to support increased funding to the PDMGP, which allows communities to implement critical risk-reduction projects before disaster strikes, which ultimately reduces damage to infrastructure and vital resources.

#### **b) Emergency Management Performance Grant**

Ensuring the Emergency Management Performance Grant Program's (EMPG) federal funding levels are maintained or increased will enhance the states' all-hazards emergency management and preparedness capabilities. By building and sustaining the EMPG's all-hazards emergency management core capabilities across the Prevention, Protection, Mitigation, Response, and Recovery mission areas, the program fosters an integrated, whole community, risk informed, and capabilities based approach to national preparedness.

#### **c) National Incident Management System (NIMS) Refresh**

In 2016, FEMA implemented a refresh of NIMS. States are now expected to develop an alternative set of protocols and training curriculums in order to align with new national standards. The FEMA Administrator should ensure that this NIMS Refresh retains consistency with the Incident Command System (ICS), in order to maintain consistency with the state's ICS-based Emergency Operations Centers.



### **What aspects of FEMA are working well? What needs improvement?**

#### **Working Well:**

When impacted by catastrophic events, states rely heavily on FEMA's presence to fill the gaps with programs to support local and state response and recovery. Many states are supported by various FEMA programs that deliver vital services, such as the Individual Assistance Program, to individuals and communities impacted by large-scale disasters. Further, during non-emergency times, states are also supported by FEMA programs that play an essential role in helping to plan and mitigate for disasters, such as the Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program and the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program.

Additionally, the next FEMA Administrator should codify the Fire Management Assistance Grant (FMAG) Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP). The recent pilot program was effective and well utilized in California during the 2015 Valley and Butte Fires (DR-4240). Unfortunately, there are more rapid-spreading, severe fires caused by extreme weather warranting a greater need to ensure that communities are protecting themselves, and mitigating against future damage.

#### **Needs Improvement:**

The new Administrator should consider "regionalization" of FEMA's grant programs. Currently, the grant process consists of multiple points of contact and processes by both the regional offices and in the Grants Program Directorate at FEMA headquarters. This is not effective, can slow down the grant process and makes it cumbersome for stakeholders. Like all the other programs in FEMA, the grant's programs should receive policy and formal guidance from Washington, and be administered through the Regions, making the process much more efficient and streamlined.

### **How should the next administrator work with states?**

The new Administrator should host periodic meetings with the state emergency managers in order to enhance and strengthen collaboration and communication. While the National Emergency Management Association and the International Association of Emergency Managers provide helpful forums for states to advocate, and share best practices and lessons learned, the states and Administration would benefit from a more routine, direct dialog.

### **What additional recommendations would you make to the next administrator?**

In 2016, FEMA proposed a disaster deductible for the Public Assistance Grant Program. If FEMA continues to consider a disaster deductible in its most recent form, states will be required to satisfy an annual financial commitment before FEMA would provide public assistance authorized by the Stafford Act. The FEMA Administrator should maintain the current financial threshold, per disaster, for states to be eligible for public assistance reimbursement.

The Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) should be managed by FEMA. EMAC enables neighboring states to provide lifesaving support during catastrophic disasters, and as such, would be more appropriately administered by the federal government agency that handles these events. Federalizing EMAC would standardize mutual aid, streamline the pre-contracting and reimbursement processes, and eliminate the constant need for states to pass legislation extending their membership in the compact.

# **Cal OES Fiscal Year 2020 Appropriations Priorities**

## Subcommittee on Homeland Security

### TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1. Homeland Security Grant Program.....	2
2. Nonprofit Security Grant Program .....	8
3. Emergency Management Performance Grant .....	10
4. Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program and Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Program .....	12
5. Assistance Programs for Firefighters .....	13
6. National Urban Search & Rescue System .....	15
7. Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness.....	16
8. Emergency Management Assistance Compact .....	18

## 1. Homeland Security Grant Program

### A) Status/Background

Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) funds from the Department of Homeland Security allow for state and local first responders to prevent, protect against, prepare for, and respond to terrorism or all-hazards events. California uses HSGP to safeguard critical infrastructure, including protecting and mitigating against cyber-attacks on public and private organizations; organize and develop homeland security exercises, plans, and the *California Homeland Security Strategy*; interdict illegal trafficking operations by criminal gangs and transnational criminal organizations (TCOs); and to support other operations that protect against California's primary threats, as outlined below.

- **State Threat Assessment System:** In Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, the state continued to enhance the capabilities of the terrorism liaison officer network and the State Threat Assessment System (STAS). The STAS – comprised of the State Threat Assessment Center (STAC), and its five regional fusion centers – serves to detect, deter, and prevent homeland security threats to the citizens and critical infrastructure of California. As the state's homeland security agency, Cal OES acts as a strategic hub for the six fusion centers making up the STAS.

The STAS provides a range of intelligence capabilities to statewide public safety and law enforcement officials. For example, the STAS provides records support to out- of-state and federal investigations, real-time social media threat monitoring and analysis during major events or critical incidents. It also vets tips and leads regarding reported suspicious activity, and shares this information with its federal, state, and local law enforcement partners as appropriate. The STAS further incorporates intelligence information into analytical products that are shared with policymakers.

Additionally, in conjunction with the California Specialized Training Institute, fusion centers train terrorism liaison officers (TLOs), who serve as the frontline defense by reporting indications of potential terrorist plots. TLOs are a primary conduit for local agencies to receive information on the evolving security threats facing California.

- **Critical Infrastructure Assets:** California includes three of the ten largest cities in the United States by population—Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Jose—and has approximately 130 DHS-designated Level 1 and Level 2 critical assets, with the state's dams/levees accounting for roughly a



quarter of all Level 1 and 2 assets for that sector nationwide. California has further catalogued 1,331 pieces of infrastructure critical at the state level covering fifteen of the sixteen sectors defined in Presidential Policy Directive 21.

The *California Homeland Security Strategy* continues to expand the depth and breadth of infrastructure protection activities to assess chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear events, analyze long term impacts to energy and water systems, and advance plans for recovery activities covering key infrastructure assets and systems.

- **Cybersecurity:** Cyberattacks continue to grow in number and complexity, and are characterized as one of the top threats for each fusion center within the STAS according to the *2019 California Statewide Threat Assessment Process*. HSGP is used to combat the barrage of cyberattacks that impact California's economy, its critical infrastructure, and public and private sector networks. To address this threat, California established the California Cybersecurity Integration Center (Cal-CSIC) in 2015.

The California Cybersecurity Integration Center is a multi-agency organization comprised of federal and state law enforcement, intelligence, and cybersecurity specialists, and is co-located with the STAC to ensure the state's resources work together seamlessly to protect the state from cyber threats, including online influence operations and election interference, terrorism, human trafficking, gang violence, violent extremism, and other threats—all of which have a nexus to cybersecurity. The Cal-CSIC also works closely with the STAS to share cyber threat information and coordinate incident response efforts.

In FY 2018, the Cal-CSIC has continued to enhance and refine its capabilities to share cyber threat information, provide cybersecurity advisories to government agencies and non-governmental partners, assess risks to critical infrastructure and information technology networks, prioritize cyber threats, and support public and private sector partners in protecting their vulnerable infrastructure. The Cal-CSIC also enables cross-sector coordination and sharing of recommended best practices and security measures, and provides incident response capability for public and private sector incidents. In 2018 alone, the Cal-CSIC responded to over 1,300 reported incidents, deploying Incident Response teams to 16 incidents, with seven consisting of a multi-agency Incident Response team. California also deployed a nine member Incident Response team to the State of Colorado to assist with a large scale cyber incident in that state.

The Cal-CSIC requires additional funding in order to quickly and effectively respond to new and evolving cyber threats, implement additional incident response capability, expand outreach and public education through online training, public service announcements, and print and online training and educational materials geared toward K-12 students, adults, and seniors.

- **Securing our Ports and Harbors:** Port and maritime security is a major priority for California, which is home to the largest port in the U.S. in Los Angeles/Long Beach. California's seaports handle approximately thirty-eight percent of the thirty-two million cargo containers shipped through U.S. ports each year. California is also home to a major naval station in San Diego, and is key coastline for the cruise ship industry.

Port maritime infrastructure and its associated transportation, communications, and information technology systems are targets of illicit activities, including a growing cyber component with vulnerabilities spread around the globe that impact security at California's ports. Ports continue to attract criminal activity, including drug and human trafficking, cargo theft, and contraband smuggling. They are also commonly chosen points of entry for those looking to enter the U.S. illegally. Moreover, TCOs operating out of Mexico continue their use of panga boats to exploit California's maritime transit routes to move illicit cargo (both people and drugs) into California for distribution across the nation.

Protecting California's ports and maritime environment from acts of terrorism and other crimes is of vital importance to both the state and the national economy and has a direct impact on the integrity of our national security.

- **Homegrown Violent Extremism:** California continues to face a threat from Homegrown Violent Extremists (HVE) and lone wolf actors inspired by foreign terrorist groups like ISIS and al-Qaida, and individuals inspired by domestic terrorism threats like White Supremacist ideological extremism. The 2015 San Bernardino terrorist attack, and several recent and ongoing HVE cases in California, such as the December 2017 arrest of an individual allegedly plotting to attack Pier 39 in San Francisco, underscore the ever-persistent threat and how individuals influenced by HVE can seek to inflict harm.

To address this threat, Cal OES has developed the Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE) Program to coordinate a statewide effort aimed at supporting and enriching community resilience against ideologically motivated violence. The Cal OES PVE Program leverages existing state,

federal, and private partner resources in order to support locally-led PVE programs and encourage further engagement in prevention efforts. The Cal OES PVE Program has identified, assessed, and connected California communities to relevant trainings, funding opportunities, social service programs, and education initiatives offered by state, federal, and private partners in California. In FY 2018, Cal OES funded five non-profit organizations with the PVE Pilot Non-Profit Grant Program, to allow these nonprofit agencies to enhance or build violence prevention projects within their communities. The Cal OES PVE Program also manages an online platform, equipped with an interactive community forum and a resource database, aimed at strengthening coordination and communication between stakeholders and communities.

- **Counterintelligence Threat to the State:** As the world's fifth largest economy, and a purveyor of new and growing intellectual property, California's public and private sectors are a top target for nation-states trying to gain global economic and military superiority. HSGP funds have been used in novel ways to establish counterintelligence-type programs to protect State of California people and facilities. These programs also provide advice to traveling state officials, providing another vantage point to safeguard California and thereby further bolstering national security efforts.

For example, academic environments in California offer valuable and viable targets for foreign espionage, as these environments have cutting-edge research and development data, as well as advanced technology. Some countries almost certainly will continue to acquire this intellectual property and proprietary information illicitly to advance their own economic and national security objectives, according to the Director of National Intelligence. College campuses provide adversarial foreign intelligence services with prime recruitment opportunities, according to FBI testimony to Congress. Foreign intelligence services allow students and scholars—often young and inexperienced—to conduct their U.S.-based academic pursuits, waiting to leverage them once they return to their home countries either during an academic break or at the end of their studies.

- **Criminal Organizations:** Multinational Transnational Criminal Organizations (TCO), street gangs, prison gangs, and organized criminal groups continue to represent among the top threat actors facing California. Gang-related violence and its associated criminal activity are pervasive in communities throughout California.



Mexico-based TCOs drive homicides in Mexico, particularly in states such as Baja California, where regional dominance of previously uncontested TCOs have weakened, leading to power grab attempts for major drug trafficking routes by rival TCOs. California, as a result, sees spill-over violence at the border related to this TCO activity. There were more than 33,000 homicide victims in Mexico in 2018—a 15 percent increase from 2017's 28,866 homicides— according to official Mexican government statistics. 2018 homicide levels are the highest number since the country began keeping records. However, given the changing nature and impact of the TCO threat, combatting this threat requires a comprehensive, collaborative intra-county response ranging from the border with Mexico, to Northern California, mirroring the operational footprint of most TCOs.

In California, transnational criminal actors take advantage of relationships with local street gangs to enhance their local operating capabilities. California's gang population contains approximately 500,000 members, mostly concentrated in urban areas. However, gang culture continues to expand from inner-city and urban areas to suburban and more rural areas. These gangs continue to propagate their dangerous and disruptive behaviors upon communities across California and the nation, while actively seeking to recruit new members from local communities.

California combats the prevalence of prison gangs with an initiative that embeds California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation (CDCR) personnel into the STAC, among other operations.

- **California/Mexico Border Security:** Sustained funding for border states like California is vital for state and local law enforcement and security agencies to coordinate their efforts across jurisdictions and against diverse threats.

Operation Stonegarden, part of HSGP, provides funding to coordinate border protection efforts at the local level, which has resulted in multiple drug smuggling and human trafficking interdictions through enhanced communication and information sharing amongst other southwest border states. However, the current construct of Operation Stonegarden grant funding, part of HSGP, does not promote state participation in coordinating these activities; rather it mandates that funds be awarded directly to local jurisdictions and to federally-recognized tribal governments. This limits state public safety agencies' full involvement and incorporation into a statewide border security strategy. By allowing Operation Stonegarden funds to be utilized at the state level for law enforcement functions, California will be able to better secure our border with Mexico, our largest trading partner, and enhance collaboration

between state and local jurisdictions.

#### B) Impact to the State

The proposed reductions in funding to the HSGP and the proposed 25 percent non-federal cost match would negatively impact the operations of public safety personnel, critical safety systems, and related state and local programs. Any reduction in funding would also reduce the strength of critical infrastructure programs, including decreasing the ability of state and UASI-funded offices to conduct security and resiliency assessments of key critical infrastructures, and impairing the ability of public safety personnel to provide risk-related information to decision makers. These critical programs protecting the public will suffer, ultimately weakening national security and the overall safety of tourists, business visitors, and the 40 million residents who call California home.

In its 2018 report, the President's Council of Economic Advisers estimated malicious cyber activity in 2016 cost the U.S. economy between \$57 billion and \$109 billion. The cost to California in particular is substantial – studies indicate the average cost of cybercrime increased by an average of 12 percent from 2017 to 2018 and has increased 72 percent over the last five years. California leads the nation in economic loss, with a claimed \$214 million in 2017. Given federal warnings of increased cyber-criminal activity, if funding is not maintained or increased, it would be expected that these losses would increase year-to-year. Federal dollars spent on cyber prevention and interdiction activities at the state level have a direct nexus in preventing economic harm to the receiving states.

#### C) Amount of the Request

The FY 2018 HSGP guidance from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) dictated to states and Urban Area Security Initiatives (UASIs) that they must each dedicate one of their ten investment justifications to enhancing cybersecurity. States and UASIs have been able to determine all of their own HSGP justifications in the past. This was the first year that DHS dictated a mandatory investment justification, essentially telling states and UASIs how they must spend a significant portion of their federal funding. However, this mandate came with no additional funding. California's nationwide request for FY 2020 HSGP is for a 25 percent addition to be made to the FY 2019 enacted funding levels, which would cover the funding necessary to implement DHS' cybersecurity mandate.

However, the *2020 Major Savings and Reforms* document released by the White House proposes reductions in HSGP by implementing a 25 percent non-federal cost match for HSGP, particularly for the State Homeland Security Program and the Urban Area Security Initiative funding. This cost match would be detrimental to state and regional government because this would inherently make less funding available for investments such as prevention activities, exercises,

mitigation, and other activities towards which the state currently commits its funding to prevent, prepare for, respond, and recover to all-hazards incidents.

**Additionally, the Department of Homeland Security's FY 2020 Budget in Brief includes no funding for Operation Stonegarden. As mentioned above, Operation Stonegarden has a proven record in providing valuable support to border jurisdictions for interdictions of drug smuggling, human trafficking, and other illicit activities. This funding should be maintained at the FY 2019 level.**

Ultimately, reductions in HSGP or a 25 percent non-federal cost match would cripple initiatives that provide risk-related information to decision makers, state and local organizations, and other partners. The ability to analyze state significant infrastructure that incorporates the latest sector updates, threat information, and current known vulnerabilities is essential to state and national security.

California's allocation for HSGP is based on risk methodology and minimum allocation thresholds. Past allocations are as follows:

Year	Amount
2012	\$153,916,694
2013	\$177,664,417
2014	\$188,643,826
2015	\$192,752,500
2016	\$194,236,500
2017	\$192,017,500
2018	\$193,335,000

California's allocation for FY 2019 will be identified when the federal solicitation is released.

**CA Request:** \$1.27 billion nationwide (This figure represents the 2019 enacted amounts for the State Homeland Security Program and the Urban Area Security Initiative, plus 25 percent to fund DHS' cybersecurity requirement).

**FY 20 Request:** State Homeland Security Program and Urban Area Security Initiative: \$758 million nationwide (Operation Stonegarden's proposed budget is zeroed out).

**FY 19 Enacted:** State Homeland Security Program, Urban Area Security Initiative, and Operation Stonegarden: \$1.1 billion nationwide.

## **2. Nonprofit Security Grant Program**

### A) Status/Background



The Nonprofit Security Grant Program (NSGP) provides funding to support physical security enhancements and other security activities to nonprofit organizations that are at high risk of a terrorist attack. The program seeks to integrate the preparedness activities of nonprofit organizations that are at high risk of a terrorist attack with broader state and local preparedness efforts. The NSGP also promotes emergency preparedness coordination and collaboration activities between public and private community representatives as well as state and local government agencies.

NSGP is competitive and the amount awarded to each State varies depending on successful applications in the competitive process.

#### B) Impact to the State

NSGP funds approximately 58 sub-awards and 300 projects across California each year. Over 39 million people reside in California, and there are many different faiths represented within the State. With the increase of terrorist threats worldwide, most recently seen in the tragic shooting attacks on two mosques in New Zealand, individual organizations need this funding to safeguard their organizations.

Nonprofit organizations are entities that do not often have the necessary funds available to safeguard their vulnerabilities. Due to their ideologies, beliefs, or missions, they are at high risk for terrorist attacks, and have been exploited as evidenced by the frequency of attacks and mass shootings. The NSGP focuses on target hardening and physical security enhancements to make organizations safer. Therefore, the need of the NSGP is vitally important.

**The Department of Homeland Security's FY 2020 Budget in Brief provides for no funding for the NSGP, despite the ongoing threat of violence to the non-profit and faith-based sector.** In the past three federal grant cycles, California has submitted 366 NSGP applications and on average, DHS/FEMA has only funded 30 percent of California applicants. NSGP funding should not only be provided for in the FY 2020 budget, it should be increased to meet the needs of the non-profits seeking this funding.

#### C) Amount of the Request

Year	Amount
2012	\$1,561,000
2013	\$2,315,444
2014	\$2,111,525
2015	\$1,899,326
2016	\$297,950

2017	\$4,178,039
2018	\$5,828,885

The FY 2019 enacted funding level for NSGP is \$60 million.

**CA Request:** \$15 million for California. This increase would fund the over 90 applications not funded per year through the competitive process.

**FY 20 Request:** \$0 nationwide.

**FY 19 Enacted:** \$60 million nationwide.

### **3. Emergency Management Performance Grant**

#### A) Status/Background

Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) funding enables state, local, and tribal governments to prepare for all hazards through planning, training, exercises, and developing professional expertise. It also supports response capabilities, emergency operation centers, mutual aid agreements, and public outreach campaigns, as well as community alert and warning notification systems. Together, in synergy with other forward-leaning measures, California has leveraged these EMPG funds to help build preparedness at the local, tribal, and state level – steps which have undoubtedly reduced the impacts and costs of recent disasters.

EMPG requires a dollar-for-dollar match requirement by state, local, and tribal governments. Therefore, each grant cycle local, tribal, and state governments demonstrate their continued commitment to preparedness by sharing in the investment in EMPG, thereby doubling the return on the federal investment in the program.

All 50 states receive a base amount of 0.75 percent of the total available funding appropriated for the EMPG. The balance of the funds appropriated for EMPG are distributed on a population-share basis. Then, local allocations are determined using a \$125,000 base award, with the remaining funds being distributed using the per capita figures identified in the California Department of Finance's yearly report called: E-1: City/County Population Estimates with Annual Percent Change.

#### B) Impact to the State

In California, EMPG funds approximately 58 sub-awards and 260 projects. EMPG and California's funding match have supported investments that improve the ability of jurisdictions nationwide to prevent a threatened or actual act of terrorism; protect our citizens, residents, visitors, and assets; mitigate the loss of life and property by lessening the impact of future disasters; respond quickly to

save lives, protect property and the environment, and meet basic human needs in the aftermath of a catastrophic incident; and recover through a focus on the timely restoration, strengthening, and revitalization of infrastructure, housing, and a sustainable economy, as well as the health, social, cultural, historic, and environmental fabric of communities affected by a catastrophic incident.

EMPG supports critical projects within California, including, but not limited to:

- Support of over 351 emergency managers across the state of California
- Emergency Alert and Warning Systems that assist with public information and warning to communities across the state
- Training and exercise support to emergency managers across the state
- Critical equipment to Emergency Operations Centers across the state

### C) Amount of the Request

California strongly supports an increase in EMPG program funding—at a minimum, increasing EMPG funding by 25 percent. Without an ongoing commitment by the federal government to support state, local, and tribal emergency management through their continued investment in the EMPG program, the very foundation of the state's emergency management system to effectively and efficiently respond to and recover from all hazards is threatened.

Additionally, because disasters in California have become more destructive, costly, and frequent over the past few years, as demonstrated by the increase in major disaster declarations, state and local governments are investing more than ever before into their share of Stafford Act response and recovery funding. The dollar-for-dollar match is becoming more difficult for California jurisdictions to invest in. However, EMPG funding and investments are critical for the state as they allow for the state to buy down disaster costs before disasters even occur. Therefore, California requests that the dollar-for-dollar match be reduced to a 25 percent cost match.

California's allocation for the EMPG Program is based on population. Past allocations are as follows:

Year	Amount
2016	\$27,897,964
2017	\$27,838,209
2018	\$27,827,857

**CA Request:** \$34.8 million for California (this number represents California's 2018 funding level + 25 percent increase).

**FY 20 Request:** \$279 million nationwide.

**FY 19 Enacted:** \$350 million nationwide.



#### **4. Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program and Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Program**

##### A) Status/Background

Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) and Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) funding are imperative to California's efforts to buy down risk ahead of an increasing pattern of more frequent disasters with greater consequences. This source of annual mitigation funding allows many states to continue to staff and manage mitigation programs between major disasters and subsequent post-disaster mitigation funding.

##### B) Impact to the State

As a result of a historic, multi-year drought, compounded impacts including tree mortality, dry wells, and high wildland fire risks, continue to persist in California. Consequently, in FY 2018, California again experienced a record fire season resulting in widespread damage from the largest fire disaster in the state's history, the Camp Fire. These extreme weather impacts are only expected to increase. California legislation passed in 2015 (Chapter 608) and 2016 (Chapter 587) require safety elements and/or Local Hazard Mitigation Plans to be reviewed and updated as necessary to address climate adaptation and resiliency strategies to help mitigate their impacts. PDM funding continues to be a crucial source of funding for these updates, and to implement wildfire mitigation in vulnerable communities throughout the state.

In March 2019, California experienced significant rainfall resulting in flooding of several hundred homes in Sonoma County. Since 1995, PDM and FMA funding have helped to support the Sonoma County Flood Elevation Program, which provides assistance to homeowners to elevate their homes above base flood elevation. This allows homeowners to mitigate against damages from repetitive flooding events along the Russian River. Cal OES is currently undertaking an analysis to determine the value of damages that were avoided by investing in mitigation. Preliminary assessments demonstrate that approximately \$24 million dollars in damages were avoided in one event through flood mitigation and elevating homes. Since the inception of Sonoma County's program, there have been 10 state and federally declared flood events.

##### C) Amount of the Request

##### **The President's FY 2020 budget proposes completely eliminating PDM funding.**

This elimination would be devastating to the state, as well as the federal government, because this PDM significantly reduces response and recovery costs when disasters occur. The Department of Homeland Security's FY 2020 *Budget in Brief* clarifies that the elimination of PDM will be covered by a parallel

program called National Public Infrastructure Disaster Hazard Mitigation Assistance (NPIDHMA), codified by the Disaster Recovery Reform Act in 2018. Predisaster mitigation must be provided for, whether by the existing PDM program or by the new NPIDHMA. Predisaster mitigation projects have proven value, as demonstrated by the published results of a January 2018 FEMA national study on mitigation investments titled "Natural Hazard Mitigation Saves". The results of this study demonstrate a national benefit of six dollars for every dollar invested in mitigation.

PDM and FMA funds to California have regularly declined over the years. As a result, demand greatly outweighs resources available to undertake critical risk reduction projects such as fire and flood prevention, and seismic retrofits. If these programs are reduced or eliminated, communities hit hardest by repetitive disaster events will be unable to break the cycle of loss.

In 2017, California requested over \$38,000,000 in PDM funds but only received \$575,000 that was used to develop Local Hazard Mitigation Plans. California requested over \$12,000,000 in FMA funds but was not awarded any competitive funds under FMA in 2017. In 2018, California requested over \$35,000,000 in PDM funds and over \$43,000,000 in FMA funds to reduce risks to life and property through mitigation projects. As of March 2019, FEMA obligations have not been announced for FY 2018.

**CA Request:** \$35 million for PDM for California/ \$43 million for FMA for California.

**FY 20 Request:** \$0 nationwide. Due to the enactment of the Disaster Recovery Reform Act, which established the National Public Infrastructure Predisaster Hazard Mitigation program, which will serve a parallel purpose, PDM has been eliminated.

**FY 19 Enacted:** \$250 million nationwide for PDM / \$175 million nationwide for FMA.

## **5. Assistance Programs for Firefighters**

### A) Status/Background

The primary goal of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG) is to meet the firefighting and emergency response needs of fire departments and nonaffiliated emergency medical service organizations. Since 2001, AFG has helped firefighters and other first responders obtain critically needed equipment, protective gear, emergency vehicles, training and other resources necessary for protecting the public and emergency personnel from fire and related hazards.

In 2005, the Staffing for Adequate Fire & Emergency Response (SAFER) program, was created to provide funding directly to fire departments and volunteer

firefighter interest organizations to help them increase or maintain the number of trained, "front line" firefighters available in their communities. The goal of SAFER is to enhance the local fire departments' abilities to comply with staffing, response and operational standards established by the National Fire Protection Association. These grants play a vital role in allowing our fire departments to build, sustain, and deliver core capabilities within their communities and to implement the National Preparedness System.

The Fire Prevention and Safety (FP&S) Grants are part of the Assistance to Firefighters Grants (AFG) and support projects that enhance the safety of the public and firefighters from fire and related hazards. The primary goal is to reduce injury and prevent death among high-risk populations. In 2005, Congress reauthorized funding for FP&S and expanded the eligible uses of funds to include Firefighter Safety Research and Development.

The U.S. Fire Administration's mission is to provide national leadership to foster a solid foundation for our fire and emergency services stakeholders in prevention, preparedness and response; therefore, the State is requesting continued support of this administration. The State of California and local firefighters rely heavily on the U.S. Fire Administration's (USFA) National Incident Reporting System, State Fire Training Grants, and the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation Memorial. Each year, fires in the United States kill over 3,000 citizens, and injure over 16,000. Firefighters also pay a price for fire seasons with the deaths of approximately 100 on-duty firefighters each year. The U.S. Fire Administration's Strategic Plan for FY 2014-2018 outlines five goals to reduce fire and life safety risk through preparedness, prevention, and mitigation. The strategic plan promotes response, local planning and preparedness for all hazards, advancing the professional development of fire service personnel and of other people engaged in fire prevention and control, and sustaining USFA as a dynamic organization. Congress is urged to maintain funding and support of the USFA, and support the whole-community approach to Emergency Management.

#### B) Impact to the State

The California fire service relies heavily on these grants to maintain the minimum level of service in their communities and the ability to respond when requested through the Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid System. The state continues to face adverse impacts from climate change resulting in devastating wildfires and floods. Having the equipment and personnel, coupled with strong fire prevention programs, allows for the fire service to respond effectively to all-hazards emergencies.

Although California represents nearly 12 percent of the national population, the state receives a much smaller percentage of AFG funds. If California received a share proportionate to its population and needs, fire departments could further



invest in all-hazard fire engines and similarly critical resources. The per capita disparity should be corrected, while the grant funding levels maintained or enhanced to provide greater support to first responders and firefighters.

#### C) Amount of the Request

While the state does not administer these grants, it fully supports maintaining or increasing their funding levels for local first responders.

**CA Request:** Maintain nationwide FY 2019 enacted funding level.

**FY 20 Request:** \$689 million nationwide total for AFG and SAFER.

**FY 19 Enacted:** \$750 million nationwide total for AFG and SAFER.

### **6. National Urban Search & Rescue System**

#### A) Status/Background

The National Urban Search & Rescue (US&R) Response System consists of 28 state/national Urban Search & Rescue Task Forces, eight of which are based in California, and are a component of the State Fire & Rescue Mutual Aid System. Modeled after California US&R System, the federal US&R System was established under the Federal Emergency Management Agency in 1991 to serve as a framework for organizing federal, state and local partner emergency response teams as integrated federal disaster response task forces that can provide rapid response to any state in the nation and all U.S. territories.

Calendar year 2018 provides an illustrative snapshot of that broad flexibility and a unique life-saving capability that makes the US&R Response System a model for the world. In 2018, all eight California-based state/national US&R Task Forces were deployed to disasters in other states (including Hurricanes Florence, Michael, Olivia, and Lane).

#### B) Impact to the State

California has the largest population of any state, with millions of people at risk from constant threat of earthquakes, tsunamis, landslides, floods, mud and debris flows, volcanoes, hazardous material accidents, transportation disasters, avalanches, terrorist attacks, and other hazards. US&R Task Forces serve as a critical component to California's disaster response system and can be utilized throughout the nation in any of these types of events, and more.

Each of the eight California-based US&R Task Forces are hosted by a strategically-located, state-aided sponsoring local government fire department that also receive state and local funding to make up budgetary gaps in the system. Continued reductions in funding will be detrimental to the readiness and maintenance of the national US&R System, which provides life-saving capabilities to communities experiencing disasters.

### C) Amount of the Request

The Administration's proposed cut of \$7.7 million, a greater than 20 percent cut, will further transfer the burden of maintaining this system to the state and local government sponsoring agency fire departments. This could damage the system if the burden for any given sponsoring agency becomes too daunting for local agencies to invest in. This system is a critical component to the National Response Framework that inevitably will be tested again in future disasters in California and across the United States, and should be fully funded.

**CA Request:** Maintain nationwide FY 2019 nationwide funding levels.

**FY 20 Request:** Not yet available.

**FY 19 Enacted:** \$35 million (nationwide) + \$10 million (nationwide) for equipment cash recapitalization.

## **7. Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness**

### A) Status/Background

The Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) Grant is intended to increase effectiveness in safely and efficiently handling hazardous materials accidents and incidents, enhance implementation of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986, and encourage a comprehensive approach to emergency training and planning. HMEP allows grantees the flexibility to implement training and planning programs based on local demographics, emergency response capabilities, commodity flow studies, and hazard analyses.

The HMEP Grant is a critical component of emergency preparedness for agencies across the State of California. Larger agencies rely on HMEP to augment ongoing planning and training for potential Hazardous Materials (HazMat) emergencies and disasters. For smaller jurisdictions, HMEP is often the only source of funding available for these purposes. The HMEP planning grant funds Area Plan development and revision, exercises, commodity flow studies, and support of annual HazMat responder forums such as the Continuing Challenge (considered the largest HazMat conference in the nation) and the Certified Unified Public Agencies (CUPA) Conference. Cal OES funded four planning subgrant projects in the 2017-2018 grant cycle. The HMEP training grant provides critically needed HazMat training to the state's public agency responders so that they are able to safely and effectively respond to HazMat transportation incidents. Through direct HMEP-funded courses and its outreach program, the California Specialized Training Institute provided specialized training through fully funded and partially funded courses to 16,045 responders in the 2017-2018 grant cycle.

### B) Impact to the State

Although the HMEP funding is relatively small compared to other federal grants, its funding is crucial for the State of California to maintain safe transportation for its citizens. California leads the nation with innovative planning and exceptional training and, with this funding, California has successfully implemented planning and training programs that serve as a model for other states.

Due to the federal sequestration and U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration's (PHMSA) updated risk formula, California has received a decrease in HMEP funding. As planning and training dollars diminish, it is imperative HMEP be provided with enough funding to restore sufficient allocations to California. Further reductions in HMEP funding will have a direct impact on the training responders and future planning activities. As a result, California will have difficulty maintaining a quick and effective response to transportation related hazards if funding cannot support planning and training needs.

### C) Amount of the Request

California anticipates requesting federal funds in the amount of \$1,014,395 for FY 2019-2020, \$1,021,000 for FY 2020-2021, and \$1,021,000 for FY 2021-2022. These amounts are based on allocations received from DOT/PHMSA. The allocations are calculated with the HMEP Grant formula that the PHMSA implemented in 2016. Historically, the formula used data from:

- U.S. Census population;
- State highway miles;
- Truck Inventory Use Survey (TIUS); and
- SARA 302 and Tier II Facilities to determine allocations.

The new formula is a combination of a base allocation and a risk based formula that uses data from:

- Incident frequency;
- Average cost of incident by transport mode; and
- 2010 U.S. Census state-level population density.

US DOT/PHMSA provided a ceiling of \$1.5 million that each state can be allotted, regardless of the amount determined using the new formula. Based on this new formula, California's allocation for FY 2019 is \$1,014,395. This is a total reduction of \$853,800, or about 46 percent, since FY 2012-2013. Essentially, since this new formula is based on incident frequency and cost, it punishes California for safely handling hazardous materials on its transportation systems. A revision to this formula is extremely important to the State of California as these HMEP funds should incentivize safe handling of hazardous materials and reward states that are producing the ideal outcomes for these grant dollars.



**CA Request:** Restore California funding to FY 2012 levels (approximately \$1.86 million).

**FY 20 Request:** \$1,014,395 for California.

**FY 19 Enacted:** \$28.3 million nationwide.

## **8. Emergency Management Assistance Compact**

### A) Status/Background

The Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) was established in 1996 and is the cornerstone of the nation's mutual aid system. EMAC is the first national disaster-relief compact since the Interstate Civil Defense and Disaster Compact of 1950 to be ratified by Congress. Since it was signed into law (Public Law 104-321), every state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam and the United States Virgin Islands have enacted legislation to become EMAC members. EMAC offers assistance during governor-declared states of emergency through a responsive system that allows states to send personnel, equipment, and commodities to help disaster relief efforts in other states.

EMAC depends upon its governance structure; its relationship with federal organizations, states, counties, territories, and regions; the willingness of states and response and recovery personnel to deploy; and the ability to move any resource one state wishes to utilize to assist another state. Once the conditions for providing assistance to a requesting state have been set, the terms constitute a legally binding contractual agreement that makes affected states responsible for reimbursement. EMAC solves the problems of liability and responsibilities of cost and allows for credentials, licenses, and certifications to be honored across state lines, which frees up states to send or receive emergency assistance quickly, when they will do the most good.

States helping each other in responding to a disaster in lieu of sending federal assets drives down disaster costs. Additionally, deploying resources through EMAC leverages federal grant dollars such as the State Homeland Security Grant Program and the Emergency Management Performance Grant. Those federal programs, by their very nature, strengthen state and local emergency management capabilities by training public safety personnel and enabling the purchase of equipment and resources. In turn, those same trained personnel and equipment can be utilized to support other states and U.S. territories in their time of need.

Each year, California sends resources, such as firefighting equipment, rescue aircraft, search teams, emergency managers, and other specialized personnel and equipment to assist other states during disasters. California has also

received critical emergency assistance from other states through EMAC in response to disasters such as floods, earthquakes, and firestorms.

**EMAC Resources Provided by California**

Event	Impacted State
Alaska Earthquake (2018)	Alaska
Hurricane Florence (2018)	North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia
Kilauea East Rift Zone Event (2018)	Hawaii
Cyber Incident (2018)	Colorado
Hurricane Maria (2017)	Puerto Rico
Las Vegas Shooting (2017)	Nevada
Hurricane Irma (2017)	Florida
Hurricane Harvey (2017)	Texas
Solar Eclipse (2017)	Oregon
Chetco Bar Fire (2017)	Oregon
Hurricane Matthew (2016)	Florida
Law Enforcement, RNC (2016)	Ohio
Hurricane Iselle (2014)	Hawaii
Oso Landslide (2014)	Washington
Colorado Flooding (2014)	Colorado
New Mexico Flooding (2013)	New Mexico
Colorado Flooding (2013)	Colorado
Alaska Flooding (2013)	Alaska
Tropical Storm Isaac (2012)	Louisiana
Hurricane Sandy (2012)	Connecticut, New Jersey, & New York
Silvertip Pipeline (2011)	Montana
Hurricane Irene (2011)	New York
Deepwater Horizon (2010)	Florida

**EMAC Resources Received for California**

Event	Sending State(s)
November Statewide Fires (2018)	Alaska, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Utah
July Statewide Fires (2018)	Arizona, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Washington

December Statewide Fires (2017)	Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas, Utah,
October Statewide Fires (2017)	Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Virginia, Washington
Severe Winter Storms (2017)	Colorado, New Jersey
September Wildfires (2015)	Alaska, Arizona, Florida, Maine
August Fires (2014)	New Mexico
Midyear Fires (2008)	Various
Southern CA Fires (2007)	Various

As the number and severity of disasters in the U.S. grows, the EMAC system is being taxed. Expanding EMAC from \$2 million to \$4 million annually will allow for modernization, integration, and expansion of EMAC and the national program of "neighbor helping neighbor."

#### B) Impact to the State

Wildfires and winter storms have hit California hard over the last decade, particularly the last two years. Our state is overdue for a catastrophic earthquake. Though California is investing in many mitigation and preparedness efforts, we know these extreme weather events and no-notice disasters are a part of our future, and we will need to rely on a robust EMAC system. We ask that Congress also invest in emergency management by increasing the administrative funding for EMAC to \$4 million.

#### C) Amount of the Request

**CA Request:** \$4 million.

**FY 20 Request:** Not yet available.

**FY 19 Enacted:** Not yet available.