

*Local Homeland Security and Fiscal Uncertainty:  
Surveys of City Officials in California*

*Mark Baldassare  
Christopher Hoene*

Presented at the National League of Cities Congress of Cities and Exposition,  
Session on Local Homeland Security Costs,  
Nashville, Tennessee  
December 11, 2003

**Public  
Policy  
Institute of  
California**

The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) is a private operating foundation established in 1994 with an endowment from William R. Hewlett. The Institute is dedicated to improving public policy in California through independent, objective, nonpartisan research.

PPIC's research agenda focuses on three program areas: population, economy, and governance and public finance. Studies within these programs are examining the underlying forces shaping California's future, cutting across a wide range of public policy concerns, including education, health care, immigration, income distribution, welfare, urban growth, and state and local finance.

PPIC was created because three concerned citizens – William R. Hewlett, Roger W. Heyns, and Arjay Miller – recognized the need for linking objective research to the realities of California public policy. Their goal was to help the state's leaders better understand the intricacies and implications of contemporary issues and make informed public policy decisions when confronted with challenges in the future.

David W. Lyon is founding President and Chief Executive Officer of PPIC. Raymond L. Watson is Chairman of the Board of Directors.

Copyright © 2003 by Public Policy Institute of California  
All rights reserved  
San Francisco, CA

Short sections of text, not to exceed three paragraphs, may be quoted without written permission provided that full attribution is given to the source and the above copyright notice is included.

PPIC does not take or support positions on any ballot measure or on any local, state, or federal legislation, nor does it endorse, support, or oppose any political parties or candidates for public office.

Research publications reflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff, officers, or Board of Directors of the Public Policy Institute of California.

---

## Contents

---

<b>Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>The Fiscal Context in California and U.S. Cities</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>California Cities in 2002 and 2003</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Larger and Smaller California Cities</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>California's Major Metropolitan Areas</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>California's Coastal and Inland Cities</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix</b>	
<b>Survey Methodology</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Survey Questionnaire</b>	<b>25</b>



---

## Summary

---

This report presents the second in a series of comprehensive analyses of the ways in which California city officials and U.S. city officials are responding to homeland security issues. The findings are based on a statewide survey that was conducted in July and August 2003 by the League of California Cities. The League sent a direct mail survey to city officials in all of California's 478 cities. A total of 294 surveys were completed and returned, for a 62 percent response rate. This report compares responses in the 2003 survey to responses in a similar survey of California city officials conducted in July and August 2002 and to responses in a national survey of city officials conducted by the National League of Cities in 2003.

The survey results offer a “snapshot in time,” when city officials are in the process of continuing to implement ways to cope with the new realities confronting local governments two years after the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, D.C. As federal and state policymakers contemplate the future of homeland security, the opinions expressed in these surveys should prove helpful in identifying local issues and perceived needs. Some of the findings and the conclusions we draw from the California and U.S. surveys are presented below.

- ***The fiscal context in California and U.S. cities***
  - Large majorities of California and U.S. city officials say that their local economic and fiscal conditions are weaker this year than previously and that they will continue to weaken in the coming year.
  - California cities report more negative economic and fiscal conditions than U.S. cities as a whole.
- ***California cities in 2002 and 2003***
  - City officials are more pessimistic in 2003 than they were in 2002 about the likelihood of public support for local taxes and fees to pay for increased homeland security activities.
  - Many city officials continue to be concerned about homeland security, and larger percentages than in 2002 report that they have addressed various types of potential terrorist attacks in their planning efforts. There appears to be increased coordination across all levels of government since September 11<sup>th</sup>. Over the past year, coordination between cities and counties increased in particular, according to city officials.
- ***California cities: large (>100,000 people) and small (<100,000 people)***
  - Large cities are more likely than smaller cities to say that they are less able to meet financial needs.
  - Large cities are more likely than smaller cities to apply for and to receive federal aid for homeland security-related activities, and they are more optimistic about receiving future assistance. Large cities are more concerned than smaller cities about all types of terrorist attacks and are more likely to have addressed these possibilities in their emergency plans. Large cities report higher levels of coordination and collaboration with the state and federal governments.
- ***California's two major metropolitan areas***
  - San Francisco Bay area cities are more likely than other cities to report weakened economies, as well as a diminished ability to meet financial needs. Los Angeles area cities more often report receiving federal assistance and also anticipate receiving more assistance for homeland security.
  - San Francisco Bay area cities are more concerned about a variety of potential terrorist attacks. Cities in both large metropolitan areas are more likely than other cities to address these possibilities in their plans. Los Angeles area cities report higher levels of local coordination, and cities in both large metropolitan areas are more likely than cities elsewhere in the state to report improvements in their coordination efforts with the state.
- ***California's coastal and inland cities***
  - Cities in the coastal counties are more likely than other cities to say they have received federal assistance and to anticipate receiving additional assistance for homeland security.
  - Coastal cities are more concerned about potential terrorist attacks than inland cities and, to a greater extent, have addressed these possibilities in their emergency plans



---

## Introduction

---

Two years after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, local governments nationwide continue to confront new realities in the need to provide for local homeland security. Among the added responsibilities are finding additional resources to develop and update preparedness and response plans, maintaining higher security levels in public buildings and spaces, and trying to facilitate seamless coordination of homeland security efforts across multiple layers of federal, state, and local government agencies. In California, local governments are considering and planning for potential threats to public safety on a variety of fronts, including threats to bridges, airports, power plants, and the water supply. This expansion of local government responsibilities is occurring at a time when the national, state, and local governments are facing challenging fiscal environments and in an era of contentious federal-state-local relations.

To gauge the preparedness of local governments, the League of California Cities and the Public Policy Institute of California sent a survey to the city managers or other chief administrative officers of all 478 California cities. A total of 294 questionnaires were returned in July and August 2003, for a 62 percent response rate.

The survey was designed to seek answers to the following questions:

- What are the current fiscal and economic conditions of cities in California today, and how significant are the economic and fiscal implications of homeland security efforts? Do city officials believe that local voters would support higher taxes and fees to increase homeland security efforts?
- What are the specific concerns of city officials regarding the threats of terrorist attacks? What types of terrorist attacks are addressed in city government planning efforts, and what are the obvious gaps in preparedness, given the specific threats perceived?
- Have cities received federal funding for homeland security, are they applying for such funding, and do they anticipate receiving assistance in the future? What do city officials consider to be their highest priorities for federal and state funding supporting their local efforts?
- How much collaboration do city officials think there is within their city's agencies and between city, county, state, and federal governments? Has government coordination increased since September 11<sup>th</sup>?

The responses from city officials in the 2003 California survey are analyzed for differences with a national survey of city officials in 2003 and for changes over time in responses since the 2002 California survey. For the 2003 California survey, we compare responses from larger cities (100,000 people or more) with responses from smaller cities (fewer than 100,000 people), from the state's two major metropolitan regions (i.e., the Los Angeles and San Francisco Bay areas), and from cities located in the coastal counties with those in the inland regions of the state.



---

## The Fiscal Context in California and U.S. Cities

---

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, cities in the California and the rest of the nation have taken on new responsibilities in the area of anti-terrorism and homeland security. These new responsibilities have come at a time when economic conditions have been declining and appear likely to continue declining.

Nearly four in five California city officials (77%) say that their city's local economy is weaker this fiscal year than last fiscal year, slightly higher than among city officials nationwide (73%). A smaller percentage, but still a solid majority (64%), predict that their city's local economy will be weaker next fiscal year. Nationwide, city officials are less pessimistic, with 57 percent predicting their economy will be weaker.

As economic conditions have declined, so have cities' fiscal conditions, particularly in California. More than eight in ten California city officials (85%) report that their city governments are less able to meet financial needs this fiscal year than last fiscal year, compared to three in four cities nationwide (74%). City officials in California and nationwide predict that fiscal conditions in their cities will continue to struggle in the next year, with 84 percent of California cities predicting they will be less able to meet financial needs, compared to 73 percent of cities nationwide.

**“Overall, would you say that the local economy of your city is weaker or stronger this fiscal year than last fiscal year? Will your local economy be weaker or stronger next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?”**

	CA	U.S.*
<b>Weaker than last year</b>	77%	73%
<b>Stronger than last year</b>	23	27
<b>Weaker next year</b>	64	57
<b>Stronger next year</b>	36	43

\* Source: National League of Cities national survey of cities, 2003.

**“Overall, would you say that your city government is better able or less able to meet financial needs this fiscal year than last fiscal year? Will your city government be better able or less able to meet financial needs next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?”**

	CA	U.S.*
<b>Less able this year</b>	85%	74%
<b>Better able this year</b>	15	26
<b>Less able next year</b>	84	73
<b>Better able next year</b>	16	27

\* Source: National League of Cities national survey of cities, 2003.



---

## California Cities in 2002 and 2003

---

### Support for Tax and Fee Increases

One option for helping cities cope with increased fiscal stress and homeland security responsibilities might be to increase local taxes or fees. However, city officials are not optimistic about public support for such an option. In fact, California city officials are even less optimistic about voter support than they were in 2002.

Only 6 percent of city officials think that public support for new *taxes* is likely, compared to 16 percent in 2002; 78 percent believe it is unlikely, compared to 64 percent in 2002. Only 9 percent believe the public would support additional *fees*, compared to 20 percent in 2002; 74 percent believe it is unlikely, compared to 59 percent in 2002.

**“What is the likelihood that your city’s residents would support additional local taxes for security?”**

	2002*	2003
<b>Very likely</b>	2%	1%
<b>Likely</b>	14	5
<b>Unlikely</b>	42	49
<b>Very unlikely</b>	22	29
<b>Don’t know</b>	20	16

\* Source: PPIC survey of California city officials, 2002.

**“What is the likelihood that your city’s residents would support additional local fees for security?”**

	2002*	2003
<b>Very likely</b>	3%	1%
<b>Likely</b>	17	8
<b>Unlikely</b>	39	46
<b>Very unlikely</b>	20	28
<b>Don’t know</b>	21	17

\* Source: PPIC survey of California city officials, 2002.

## Terrorism Concerns and Planning

City officials in California express equal levels of concern in 2002 to 2003 about terrorist threats but, in 2003, report they are better prepared in terms of addressing various types of attacks in their emergency planning efforts. They continue to be most concerned about cyberterrorism and biological and chemical attacks: In 2003, four in ten say they are very or moderately concerned about these threats (41% cyberterrorism, 39% biological, and 39% chemical), similar to responses in 2002 (40% cyberterrorism, 38% biological, and 35% chemical). One in three (32%) considers a car or truck bomb to be at least a moderate security concern, representing an increase in concern since the 2002 survey (27%).

More cities report having addressed a variety of terrorist threats in their emergency plans in 2003. Three in ten cities (30%) address cyberterrorism in their plans in 2003, compared to 22 percent in 2002. Similar increases are reported with respect to planning for a car or truck bomb (49% to 36%), an individual or suicide bomb (37% to 25%), and radiological threats (46% to 36%).

Except for cyberterrorism, most of the concerns about specific types of terrorist attacks seem to be addressed in the emergency planning efforts of cities – i.e., the percentage of city officials who say that a specific type of terrorist threat is addressed in their city's planning efforts is larger than the percentage of officials who say they are concerned about that threat. For example, 67 percent of city officials say their plans address the threat of biological attacks, compared to 39 percent who say they are at least moderately concerned about this type of attack. The findings were similar for the 2002 survey.

However, in 2002 a significant gap was evident between city plans for dealing with cyberterrorism and the level of concern surrounding this threat: Only 22 percent of city officials said cyber attacks were included in their planning efforts, compared to 40 percent who said they were at least moderately concerned about such attacks. This gap still exists in 2003 but has decreased: 30 percent of city officials say cyber attacks are included in their emergency planning efforts, compared to 41 percent who list such attacks as a moderate or serious concern.

**“How concerned are you about the following terrorist attacks over the next year in your city?”**  
**“What types of threats or emergencies are addressed in your city government’s planning efforts?”**

	<u>2002*</u>		<u>2003</u>	
	<b>Very or Moderately Concerned</b>	<b>Addressed in Planning Efforts</b>	<b>Very or Moderately Concerned</b>	<b>Addressed in Planning Efforts</b>
<b>Cyberterrorism</b>	40%	22%	41%	30%
<b>Biological</b>	38	63	39	67
<b>Chemical</b>	35	58	38	66
<b>Car or truck bomb</b>	27	36	32	49
<b>Airplane used as bomb</b>	26	48	18	53
<b>Individual/suicide bomb</b>	25	25	23	37
<b>Radiological</b>	21	36	22	46
<b>Nuclear</b>	17	36	13	43

\* Source: PPIC survey of California city officials, 2002.

Cities in California are also more likely to have integrated the U.S. Homeland Security Advisory System—the five color-coded alert system developed by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security—into their planning efforts in the past year. One in two cities (48%) report using the system in 2003, nearly doubling this effort over the last year (25% in 2002). The number of cities reporting that they have not integrated the system dropped from 41 percent in 2002 to 26 percent in 2003.

**“Has your city integrated the National Homeland Security Advisory System into its planning efforts?”**

	2002*	2003
<b>Yes</b>	25%	48%
<b>No</b>	41	26
<b>Working on it</b>	22	21
<b>Don't know</b>	12	5

\* Source: PPIC survey of California city officials, 2002.

**Intergovernmental Coordination**

California city officials continue to report increased coordination among levels of government in dealing with homeland security needs. Results from the 2002 survey revealed that the terrorist attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup> seemed to have inspired a new respect in cities for the value of coordination across levels of government. That respect continues in 2003, with a particular increase in coordination between cities and counties.

Although most city officials report increased levels of coordination across all levels of government since September 11<sup>th</sup>, coordination has increased the most at the local level: 92 percent of city officials report increased coordination with counties, and 82 percent report increased coordination between their cities and other city governments. The increase in coordination with counties today is noteworthy because it is considerably higher than the percentage reporting increased coordination in 2002 (77%). Seven in ten city officials also report that they have increased their coordination with the state government (72%). Although coordination between city governments and the federal government has increased the least, a majority of city officials (55%) report an increase in cooperation.

Similar to survey results a year ago, city officials say their greatest need for federal grants and other funding for homeland security is for training (74%), equipment (72%), overtime (51%), and permanent salaries (43%).

**“Since September 11<sup>th</sup>, how much has your city increased its coordination with the following?”  
(% responding ‘a fair amount,’ ‘a good amount,’ or ‘a great deal’)**

	2002*	2003
<b>Other cities</b>	77%	82%
<b>Counties</b>	77	92
<b>State</b>	70	72
<b>Federal</b>	56	55

\* Source: PPIC survey of California city officials, 2002.



---

## Larger and Smaller California Cities

---

### Economic and Fiscal Conditions

Larger cities (those with 100,000 or more people) and smaller cities (those with less than 100,000 people) are confronting deteriorating economic and fiscal conditions, with fiscal stress particularly evident among larger cities.

With regard to general economic conditions, both large and small cities (75% and 77%, respectively) report that their local economies are weaker this fiscal year than last fiscal year. While a majority of cities predict that their local economies will be weaker next fiscal year, smaller cities are more pessimistic (65%) than larger cities (58%).

Nearly all larger cities in California (96%), and most smaller cities as well (83%), report that they are less able to meet financial needs this fiscal year. Looking forward to next year, larger cities (95%) overwhelmingly predict they will be less able to meet their financial needs, compared to four in five smaller cities (82%).

**“Overall, would you say that the local economy of your city is weaker or stronger this fiscal year than last fiscal year? Will your local economy be weaker or stronger next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?”**

	>100,000	<100,000
<b>Weaker than last year</b>	75%	77%
<b>Stronger than last year</b>	25	23
<b>Weaker next year</b>	58	65
<b>Stronger next year</b>	42	35

**“Overall, would you say that your city government is better able or less able to meet financial needs this fiscal year than last fiscal year? Will your city government be better able or less able to meet financial needs next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?”**

	>100,000	<100,000
<b>Less able this year</b>	96%	83%
<b>Better able this year</b>	4	17
<b>Less able next year</b>	95	82
<b>Better able next year</b>	5	18

## Federal Funding for Homeland Security

Larger cities are much more likely than other cities to have received federal assistance and to apply for federal funding for homeland security activities. Larger cities are also more optimistic about receiving federal funding in the future. Six in ten larger cities (58%) report having received federal assistance, compared to one in three (35%) smaller cities. Applications for federal funding from larger cities are nearly ubiquitous (93%), while nearly two in three smaller cities (64%) have applied or will apply for funding. Three in four larger cities (77%) and one in two smaller cities (50%) anticipate that they will receive some federal assistance in the future.

	>100,000	<100,000
<b>Received federal funding</b>	58%	35%
<b>Have applied or will apply for federal funding</b>	93	64
<b>Anticipate receiving federal funding</b>	77	50

## Intergovernmental Coordination

Large and small cities report similar levels of improvement in coordination at the local level: More than four in five (85% and 81%, respectively) report better coordination with other cities, and at least nine in ten also report increased coordination with county governments (95% for larger cities, 91% for smaller cities).

Beyond the local level, larger cities are more likely to report improved collaboration. Nearly nine in ten larger cities (88%) report increased collaboration with state government, compared to seven in ten smaller cities (70%). Three in four larger cities (73%) also report increased coordination with the federal government, compared to half of smaller cities (51%).

**“Since September 11<sup>th</sup>, how much has your city increased its coordination with the following?”**  
 (% responding ‘a fair amount,’ a good amount,’ or ‘a great deal’)

	>100,000	<100,000
<b>Other cities</b>	85%	81%
<b>Counties</b>	95	91
<b>State</b>	88	70
<b>Federal</b>	73	51

## Terrorism Concerns and Planning

California's larger cities are considerably more likely than smaller cities to express concern about various types of terrorist attacks and to have addressed those concerns in their emergency planning efforts.

Larger cities are far more likely than smaller cities to say they are very or moderately concerned about the threat of a car or truck bomb (63% to 25%), a biological attack (57% to 35%), or a chemical attack (56% to 33%). Larger cities are also more than twice as likely to say they are very or moderately concerned about an airplane being used as a bomb (35% to 14%), an individual or suicide bomb (43% to 18%), or radiological attack (44% to 18%).

In all cases but cyberterrorism, more cities report having addressed different terrorist threats than the percentage reporting that they are very or moderately concerned about that threat. However, larger cities are more likely than smaller cities to say they have addressed all types of terrorist threats in their city planning efforts. The difference between larger and smaller cities is widest for the threat of a car or truck bomb (73% to 44%), an individual or suicide bomb (60% to 31%), and a radiological attack (76% to 39%).

The cyberterrorism gap between cities' concern and planning efforts is evident in both types of cities, but the gap is wider for the larger cities. While five in ten larger cities (52%) say they are very or moderately concerned about cyberterrorism, only one in three (36%) have addressed this threat in their planning efforts.

**“How concerned are you about the following terrorist attacks over the next year in your city?”**  
**“What types of threats or emergencies are addressed in your city government's planning efforts?”**

	<u>&gt;100,000</u>		<u>&lt;100,000</u>	
	<b>Very or Moderately Concerned</b>	<b>Addressed in Planning Efforts</b>	<b>Very or Moderately Concerned</b>	<b>Addressed in Planning Efforts</b>
<b>Cyberterrorism</b>	52%	36 %	38%	28%
<b>Biological</b>	57	84	35	64
<b>Chemical</b>	56	84	33	63
<b>Car or truck bomb</b>	63	73	25	44
<b>Airplane used as bomb</b>	36	64	14	50
<b>Individual/suicide bomb</b>	43	60	18	31
<b>Radiological</b>	44	76	18	39
<b>Nuclear</b>	21	58	11	40



---

## California's Major Metropolitan Areas

---

### Economic and Fiscal Conditions

While cities across California report weaker economic and fiscal conditions, the severity of the problem differs between California's two largest metropolitan areas (the nine-county San Francisco Bay metropolitan area and the five-county Los Angeles metropolitan area) and between these metropolitan areas and other cities. Cities in the San Francisco Bay area (96%) are overwhelmingly more likely than cities in the Los Angeles area (72%) or elsewhere in California (72%) to report that their local economy is weaker this fiscal year than last year. San Francisco Bay Area cities (73%) are also more likely than cities in the rest of the state (61%) to predict that their local economy will be even weaker next fiscal year.

High levels of fiscal stress are reported in cities across California, but more so in the San Francisco Bay area. Cities in the San Francisco Bay area are more likely than cities in the Los Angeles area to report that they are less able to meet financial needs this year (89% to 82%) and to predict that they will struggle to meet financial needs next fiscal year (89% to 79%).

**“Overall, would you say that the local economy of your city is weaker or stronger this fiscal year than last fiscal year? Will your local economy be weaker or stronger next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?”**

	SF Bay Area	LA Area	Other
<b>Weaker than last year</b>	96%	72%	72%
<b>Stronger than last year</b>	4	28	28
<b>Weaker next year</b>	73	61	61
<b>Stronger next year</b>	27	39	39

**“Overall, would you say that your city government is better able or less able to meet financial needs this fiscal year than last fiscal year? Will your city government be better able or less able to meet financial needs next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?”**

	SF Bay Area	LA Area	Other
<b>Less able this year</b>	89%	82%	86%
<b>Better able this year</b>	11	18	14
<b>Less able next year</b>	89	79	86
<b>Better able next year</b>	11	21	14

## Federal Funding for Homeland Security

Cities in the Los Angeles metropolitan area are the most likely to have received financial assistance from the federal government for homeland security-related activities. Forty-five percent of the cities in the Los Angeles area say they have received federal assistance, compared to one in three cities in the San Francisco Bay area (35%) or cities elsewhere in California (35%).

A majority of cities in all three categories report that they have applied or will apply for federal funding. Cities in the Los Angeles area (76%) are more likely to have applied than cities in the San Francisco Bay area (64%) or elsewhere (63%). However, Los Angeles area cities (60%) are only slightly more likely than cities in the San Francisco Bay area (55%) to say that they anticipate receiving funding as a result of their applications.

	SF Bay Area	LA Area	Other
<b>Received federal funding</b>	35%	45%	35%
<b>Have applied or will apply for federal funding</b>	64	76	63
<b>Anticipate receiving federal funding</b>	55	60	45

## Intergovernmental Coordination

Cities in the Los Angeles metropolitan area are more likely than cities in the San Francisco Bay area or elsewhere in California to report an increase in intergovernmental coordination. Los Angeles area cities are especially more likely to report higher levels of coordination with other city governments (87%), compared to cities in the San Francisco Bay area (80%) and elsewhere (77%). Cities in both large metropolitan areas report greater increases in coordination with the state government (73% in the San Francisco Bay area, 76% in the Los Angeles area), compared to cities elsewhere in the state (68%). However, coordination with the federal government is lower in the San Francisco Bay area (50%) than in the Los Angeles area (57%) and elsewhere (56%).

**“Since September 11<sup>th</sup>, how much has your city increased its coordination with the following?”**  
 (% responding ‘a fair amount,’ ‘a good amount,’ or ‘a great deal’)

	SF Bay Area	LA Area	Other
<b>Other cities</b>	80%	87%	77%
<b>Counties</b>	92	95	91
<b>State</b>	73	76	68
<b>Federal</b>	50	57	56

## Terrorism Concerns and Planning

Cities in the San Francisco Bay area are more likely than other cities to express concern about various types of terrorist attacks, while cities in the two large metropolitan areas are both more likely than cities elsewhere in California to report that they have addressed these terrorist threats in their planning efforts.

San Francisco Bay area cities are more likely than Los Angeles area cities to say they are very or moderately concerned about the threat of a biological attack (50% to 30%) or chemical attack (49% to 32%). In fact, cities in the Los Angeles area are less concerned than cities elsewhere in California about either threat (30% to 42% for biological, 32% to 36% for chemical). However, cities in the two larger metropolitan areas express higher levels of concern about the prospect of an individual or suicide attack (27% San Francisco, 25% Los Angeles, 18% other), radiological attack (29% San Francisco, 27% Los Angeles, 14% other), or airplane being used as a bomb (23% San Francisco, 19% Los Angeles, 14% other).

For all of the listed terrorist threats except cyberterrorism, all three categories of cities have higher percentages of cities reporting that they have addressed these threats in their planning efforts than say they are concerned about them. For example, 69 percent of the cities in the San Francisco Bay and Los Angeles areas and 62 percent of other cities say they have addressed chemical threats in their planning efforts, compared to smaller percentages reporting at least moderate concern about such threats (49% San Francisco, 32% Los Angeles, 36% other). San Francisco Bay area cities (76%) are more likely than cities in the Los Angeles area (66%) and other cities (62%) to say they have addressed biological threats in their planning efforts. Cities in the two larger metropolitan areas are much more likely than other cities to say they have addressed the threat of an individual or suicide bomb (42% San Francisco, 40% Los Angeles, 31% other), radiological threat (51% San Francisco, 52% Los Angeles, and 36% other), or nuclear threat (46% San Francisco, 48% Los Angeles, and 37% other).

The cyberterrorism gap between cities' concern and planning efforts is evident in all three groups of cities, but San Francisco Bay area cities (36%) are more likely to say they have addressed cyberterrorism in their emergency plans than cities in the Los Angeles metropolitan area (29%) or elsewhere in the state (26%).

**“How concerned are you about the following terrorist attacks over the next year in your city?”  
“What types of threats or emergencies are addressed in your city government’s planning efforts?”**

	<u>San Francisco Bay Area</u>		<u>Los Angeles Area</u>		<u>Other</u>	
	<b>Very or Moderately Concerned</b>	<b>Addressed in Planning Efforts</b>	<b>Very or Moderately concerned</b>	<b>Addressed in Planning Efforts</b>	<b>Very or Moderately Concerned</b>	<b>Addressed in Planning Efforts</b>
<b>Cyberterrorism</b>	41%	36%	42%	29%	42%	26%
<b>Biological</b>	50	76	30	66	42	62
<b>Chemical</b>	49	69	32	69	36	62
<b>Car or truck bomb</b>	32	49	33	52	31	46
<b>Airplane used as bomb</b>	23	55	19	57	14	48
<b>Individual/suicide bomb</b>	27	42	25	40	18	31
<b>Radiological</b>	29	51	27	52	14	36
<b>Nuclear</b>	14	46	15	48	12	37



---

## California's Coastal and Inland Cities

---

### Economic and Fiscal Conditions

While a majority of California cities report weaker local economies, cities located in California's coastal counties (83%) are more likely than inland cities (68%) to report that their economies are weaker this year than last year. Looking forward to next fiscal year, similar percentages of coastal and inland cities predict that their economies will be weaker (65% and 61% respectively).

California cities are even more pessimistic about meeting their financial needs. Coastal and inland cities alike report high levels of fiscal stress, both over the last year and in looking forward to next year. More than four in five coastal (85%) and inland (86%) cities say they are less able to meet financial needs this year than last year, and similar percentages (85% and 83%, respectively) predict that they will be less able to meet their financial needs next year.

**“Overall, would you say that the local economy of your city is weaker or stronger this fiscal year than last fiscal year? Will your local economy be weaker or stronger next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?”**

	Coastal	Inland
<b>Weaker than last year</b>	83%	68%
<b>Stronger than last year</b>	17	32
<b>Weaker next year</b>	65	61
<b>Stronger next year</b>	35	39

**“Overall, would you say that your city government is better able or less able to meet financial needs this fiscal year than last fiscal year? Will your city government be better able or less able to meet financial needs next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?”**

	Coastal	Inland
<b>Less able this year</b>	85%	86%
<b>Better able this year</b>	15	14
<b>Less able next year</b>	85	83
<b>Better able next year</b>	15	17

## Federal Funding for Homeland Security

To date, California’s coastal cities are more likely to have received financial assistance from the federal government for homeland security activities: Four in ten (43%) report receiving federal assistance, compared to three in ten (32%) inland cities.

Similarly, while coastal and inland cities are equally likely to say that they have applied or will apply for federal funding, coastal cities are more likely to say that they anticipate receiving funding as a result of their applications. Thus, while seven in ten coastal (67%) and inland (70%) cities report that they have applied or will apply for federal assistance, nearly six in ten coastal cities (58%) say they anticipate receiving funding, compared to 46 percent of inland cities.

	Coastal	Inland
<b>Received federal funding</b>	43%	32%
<b>Have applied or will apply for federal funding</b>	67	70
<b>Anticipate receiving federal funding</b>	58	46

## Intergovernmental Coordination

Federal assistance is just one example of coordination taking place across levels of government. Both coastal and inland cities report increased levels of coordination with other levels of government since September 11<sup>th</sup>. As with cities overall, coordination has increased most at the local level: 92 percent of coastal cities and 91 percent of inland cities report increased coordination with counties; 83 percent of coastal cities and 80 percent of inland cities report increased coordination between their cities and other city governments. At least seven in ten city officials also report increased coordination with the state government, and a majority of officials in both types of cities report improved coordination with the federal government (55%). In all of these responses, there are no major differences between inland and coastal cities.

**“Since September 11<sup>th</sup>, how much has your city increased its coordination with the following?”**  
 (% responding ‘a fair amount,’ ‘a good amount,’ or ‘a great deal’)

	Coastal	Inland
<b>Other cities</b>	83%	80%
<b>Counties</b>	92	91
<b>State</b>	74	70
<b>Federal</b>	55	55

## Terrorism Concerns and Planning

California’s coastal cities are more likely than inland cities to express concerns about various types of terrorist attacks and to have addressed those concerns in their emergency planning efforts.

Coastal cities are particularly more likely than inland cities to say they are very or moderately concerned about the threat of a car or truck bomb (36% to 26%), an individual or suicide bomb (29% to 14%), a radiological threat (27% to 15%), or an airplane used as a bomb (21% to 13%). However, inland cities are about equally likely to say that they are very or moderately concerned about cyberterrorism and biological threats.

For both types of cities, more cities report having addressed each type of terrorist threat than the percentage reporting that they are very or moderately concerned, except for in the case of cyberterrorism. For example, 71 percent of coastal cities and 61 percent of inland cities say they have addressed biological threats in their city planning efforts, compared to smaller numbers reporting concern about such threats (40% for coastal cities and 37% for inland cities). Coastal cities are, however, more likely than inland cities to say they have addressed all types of terrorist threats in their city planning efforts. The difference between coastal and inland cities is largest for radiological (52% and 35%, respectively) and nuclear (49% and 34%, respectively) threats.

The cyberterrorism gap between cities’ concern and planning efforts is evident in both types of cities; however, it is larger for inland cities. While four in ten coastal (42%) and inland (41%) cities report being very or moderately concerned about cyberterrorism, only one in four inland cities (24%) have addressed this threat in their planning efforts, compared to one in three coastal cities (33%).

**“How concerned are you about the following terrorist attacks over the next year in your city?”**  
**“What types of threats or emergencies are addressed in your city government’s planning efforts?”**

	<u>Coastal</u>		<u>Inland</u>	
	Very or Moderately Concerned	Addressed in Planning Efforts	Very or Moderately Concerned	Addressed in Planning Efforts
<b>Cyberterrorism</b>	42%	33%	41%	24%
<b>Biological</b>	40	71	37	61
<b>Chemical</b>	40	70	34	61
<b>Car or truck bomb</b>	36	52	26	45
<b>Airplane used as bomb</b>	21	57	13	47
<b>Individual/suicide bomb</b>	29	39	14	34
<b>Radiological</b>	27	52	15	35
<b>Nuclear</b>	15	49	11	34



# Appendix

---

## Survey Methodology

---

The results of the city officials survey are from the *Homeland Security Survey*, a national survey conducted by the League of California Cities with assistance from the National League of Cities. The survey of local officials in California cities on homeland security issues was commissioned by the Public Policy Institute of California and cosponsored by the League of California Cities. The findings in this report are based on a direct mail and fax survey sent in July and August 2003 to city officials in all 478 cities in California. The survey was sent to city managers. City managers were chosen for this survey because they hold the highest administrative position in the city and are highly familiar with the city’s day-to-day operations and budgetary issues. In many instances, the survey was completed by emergency services directors at the request of the city managers. The survey builds upon a similar survey effort conducted in July and August 2002, with many of the same questions asked in both the 2002 and 2003 surveys. Questionnaires were returned to the National League of Cities, where they were compiled and coded. The survey data were analyzed at the National League of Cities and the Public Policy Institute of California.

A total of 294 surveys were completed and returned, for a response rate of 62 percent. Throughout the report, we refer to cities of two different population sizes— “smaller cities,” defined as those with populations of less than 100,000, and “larger cities,” defined as those with populations of 100,000 or more. We compare responses from two large metropolitan areas—the San Francisco Bay metropolitan area and the Los Angeles metropolitan area—and “other” cities, relying on the definitions used in previous PPIC surveys. The “San Francisco Bay” metropolitan area includes nine counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma. The “Los Angeles” metropolitan area includes five counties: Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura. “Other” includes cities in all other counties. We also draw comparisons between coastal and inland cities. “Coastal” includes cities in the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Del Norte, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Marin, Mendocino, Monterey, Napa, Orange, San Diego, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma, and Ventura. “Inland” includes all other cities.

The survey is representative of the responses of city officials in cities across California. Responses are closely comparable to the distribution of cities across the state by population size, metropolitan area, and coastal-inland distinctions. The findings do not change significantly when we use statistical weighting to correct for a slight overrepresentation of cities with a population of 100,000 or more and a slight underrepresentation of cities with a population of less than 100,000.

City Population	% of 478 Cities Statewide	% of 294 Survey Responses
<100,000	88	84%
>100,000	12	16

Metropolitan area	% of 478 Cities Statewide	% of 294 Survey Responses
San Francisco Bay Area	21	23
Los Angeles	38	38
Other	41	39

Coastal/Inland	% of 478 Cities Statewide	% of 294 Survey Responses
Coastal	61	61
Inland	39	39



**LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES**  
**Homeland Security Survey**

**[Note: Responses from 294 city officials in July and August 2003]**

The objective of this survey is to gauge the perceptions of California city officials and the costs of city and county activities with respect to homeland security. The Director of Homeland Security in the governor's office has asked for our help in estimating these costs to help make the case for more federal support for the State of California and local governments. Without your help, we cannot present a complete picture.

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Title \_\_\_\_\_  
 3. Name of your city or county \_\_\_\_\_  
 4. Phone number: ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_ 5. E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL CONDITIONS**

6. Overall, would you say that the local economy of your city/county...*(circle one in each row)*

	<u>Weaker</u>	<u>Stronger</u>
a. is <b>weaker</b> or <b>stronger</b> this fiscal year than last fiscal year?	77%	23%
b. will be <b>weaker</b> or <b>stronger</b> in the next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?	64%	36%

7. Overall, would you say that your city/county government is better or less able to ...  
*(circle one in each row)*

	<u>Better</u>	<u>Less</u>
	<u>Able</u>	<u>Able</u>
a. meet <b>financial needs</b> this fiscal year than last fiscal year?	15%	85%
b. address its <b>financial needs</b> in the next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?	16%	84%

8. What has been the impact of September 11 on city/county government **spending on public safety and security?** *(circle one)*

4% significantly increased    42% increased    51% little or no change    2% decreased    1% don't know

9. Does your city/county government increase **public safety/security activities** when the U.S. Homeland Security Advisory System (the 5-color coded system developed by the Department of Homeland Security) is elevated, such as when it was raised from yellow to orange during the war in Iraq?

52% yes    46% no    2% don't know

10. What is the likelihood that your city's/county's residents would support additional local taxes and/or fees for Homeland Security? *(circle one in each row)*

	<u>Very</u> <u>likely</u>	<u>Likely</u>	<u>Unlikely</u>	<u>Very</u> <u>unlikely</u>	<u>Don't</u> <u>know</u>
a. Taxes	1%	5%	49%	29%	16%
b. Fees	1%	8%	46%	28%	17%

**11.** How much has your city/county government spent on homeland security-related activities in the following areas in FY2002 and FY2003? How much does your city anticipate spending (budgeted) on these activities in FY2004?

	<u>FY2001-2002</u> (07/01/01 – 06/30/02)	<u>FY2002-2003</u> (07/01/02 – 06/30/03)	<u>FY2003-2004</u> (07/01/03 – 06/30/04)
a. Permanent Salaries	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
b. Temporary Help	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
c. Overtime	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
d. Benefits	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
e. Supplies	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
f. Training	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
g. Equipment	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
h. Travel	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000

**12.** If the federal government were to provide your city/county with a **grant or other funding for homeland security activities**, in what **three areas** does your city/county government have the greatest need?

- a. Permanent salaries      43%
- b. Temporary help            6
- c. Overtime                    51
- d. Benefits                     9
- e. Supplies                    30
- f. Training                     74
- g. Equipment                 72
- h. Travel                        3

**13.** Has your city/county government received **any financial assistance** from the federal government for Homeland Security-related activities? (*circle one*)

39% yes      55% no (*skip to q. 14*)      6% don't know (*skip to q. 14*)

a. If "yes," how much? \_\_\_\_\_,000

The federal government has recently approved additional funding for states and localities through a series of grants for **state homeland security, high-threat urban areas, state critical infrastructure, communications interoperability, and other activities.**

**14.** Has or will your city/county government **apply for federal funding** under any of these programs? (*circle one*)

68% yes      15% no      17% don't know

**15.** Does your city/county government **anticipate receiving federal funding** as part of any of these programs? (*circle one*)

54% yes      21% no      25% don't know

16. Since the start of FY2002, has your city/county had to **lay off public safety personnel**, or will your city/county have to do so in this fiscal year? *(circle one)*

17% yes    72% no    11% don't know

**HOMELAND SECURITY AND OTHER LOCAL CONCERNS**

17. As a city/county official, how **concerned** are you about the following possibilities over the next year **in your city/county** (very concerned, moderately concerned, mildly concerned, or not very concerned)? *(circle one)*

	<u>Very</u>	<u>Moderately</u>	<u>Mildly</u>	<u>Not Very</u>
a. Car or truck bomb	8%	24%	28%	40%
b. Biohazard/biological	8	31	36	25
c. Chemical	10	28	35	27
d. Nuclear	4	9	21	66
e. Radiological (dirty bomb)	5	17	34	44
f. Cyber-terrorism	13	28	31	28
g. Individual/suicide bomb	7	16	30	47
h. Airplane used as bomb	4	14	28	54

18. Of the issues listed below, **which three are most important** to address in your city/county? *(check three)*

	<u>Currently</u>	<u>2 years</u>
a. Investing in terrorism prevention, preparedness, and training	27%	22%
b. Investing in general public safety and crime prevention	69	52
c. Improving the capacity of the public health system to respond to emergencies	15	16
d. Improving economic conditions	59	50
e. Increasing the availability of affordable housing	13	17
f. Revitalizing and redeveloping neighborhoods	15	13
g. Supporting local and regional development strategies	16	20
h. Investing in infrastructure (roads/transit, water, sewer)	45	38
i. Investing in public education, other supports for children, youth, and families	13	14
j. Protecting natural resources and local environmental quality	8	10
k. Relationship with state and federal government	9	3
m. Other <i>(please list)</i> _____		

**HOMELAND SECURITY PLANNING**

19. Has your city/county government integrated the national **Homeland Security Advisory System** (the color coded system developed by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security) into its planning efforts? *(circle one)*

48% yes    26% no    21% we are working on it    5% don't know

20. What types of **threats or emergencies** are addressed in your city/county government's planning efforts? *(check all that apply)*

a. Car or truck bomb	49%
b. Biohazard/biological	67
c. Chemical	66
d. Nuclear	43
e. Radiological (dirty bomb)	46
f. Cyber-terrorism	30
g. Individual/suicide bomb	37
h. Airplane crash	53
i. Other <i>(please list)</i> _____	

21. Does your city/county government have a formal **plan for informing the public** and disseminating information in future emergencies? (*circle one*)

63% yes    11% no    23% a strategy is being developed    3% don't know

22. Has your city/county government **shifted resources from other departments** or areas of city/county government to cover increasing Homeland Security-related needs and costs? (*circle one*)

15% yes    80% no    5% don't know

23. Has your city/county government shifted **resources from/within other public safety departments** (police, fire, EMS) to cover increasing Homeland Security-related needs and costs? (*circle one*)

23% yes    71% no    6% don't know

**COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION**

24. How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations **statewide**? (*circle one*)

17% low    48% moderate    24% high    7% very high    4% don't know

25. How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations **in your region**? (*circle one*)

3% low    35% moderate    37% high    23% very high    2% don't know

26. How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration among departments and agencies **in your city/county government**? (*circle one*)

5% low    22% moderate    39% high    33% very high    1% don't know

27. Since September 11, how much has your city/county government increased its coordination with the following? (*circle one per row*)

	<u>A great deal</u>	<u>A good amount</u>	<u>A fair amount</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Don't know</u>	<u>N/A</u>
a. City governments	15%	30%	37%	13%	2%	3%
b. County governments	15	37	40	5	3	0
c. State government	5	20	47	23	4	1
d. Federal government	5	13	37	37	7	1
e. Public health agencies	4	26	39	21	8	2

28. Has your city/county taken action on the Patriot Act? (*circle one*)

3% action to affirm/support    6% action to denounce    72% no action    19% don't know

All information will be shared with state and federal agencies involved with homeland security unless anonymity is requested, and will otherwise be kept confidential. **29. Keep my city/county information anonymous** 35%

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION**

The National League of Cities is providing research support to this survey. Please return the survey using the stamped, pre-addressed envelope or mail to Chris Hoene, Research Manager, National League of Cities, 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20004.

# PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

## Board of Directors

**Raymond L. Watson, *Chairman***

Vice Chairman of the Board  
The Irvine Company

**Edward K. Hamilton**

Chairman  
Hamilton, Rabinovitz & Alschuler, Inc.

**Walter B. Hewlett**

Director  
Center for Computer Assisted Research  
in the Humanities

**David W. Lyon**

President and CEO  
Public Policy Institute of California

**Cheryl White Mason**

Chief, Civil Liability Management  
Los Angeles City Attorney's Office

**Arjay Miller**

Dean Emeritus  
Graduate School of Business  
Stanford University

**Ki Suh Park**

Design and Managing Partner  
Gruen Associates

**Constance L. Rice**

Co-Director  
The Advancement Project

**Thomas C. Sutton**

Chairman & CEO  
Pacific Life Insurance Company

**Cynthia A. Telles**

Department of Psychiatry  
UCLA School of Medicine

**Carol Whiteside**

President  
Great Valley Center

## Advisory Council

**Mary C. Daly**

Research Advisor  
Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco

**Clifford W. Graves**

General Manager  
Department of Community Development  
City of Los Angeles

**Elizabeth G. Hill**

Legislative Analyst  
State of California

**Hilary W. Hoynes**

Associate Professor  
Department of Economics  
University of California, Davis

**Andrés E. Jiménez**

Director  
California Policy Research Center  
University of California  
Office of the President

**Norman R. King**

Executive Director  
San Bernadino Associated Governments

**Daniel A. Mazmanian**

C. Erwin and Ione Piper Dean and Professor  
School of Policy, Planning, and Development  
University of Southern California

**Dean Misczynski**

Director  
California Research Bureau

**Rudolf Nothenberg**

Chief Administrative Officer (Retired)  
City and County of San Francisco

**Manuel Pastor**

Professor, Latin American & Latino Studies  
University of California, Santa Cruz

**Peter Schrag**

Contributing Editor  
*The Sacramento Bee*

**James P. Smith**

Senior Economist  
RAND

**PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA**

500 Washington Street, Suite 800 • San Francisco, California 94111

Phone: (415) 291-4400 • Fax: (415) 291-4401

[www.ppic.org](http://www.ppic.org) • [info@ppic.org](mailto:info@ppic.org)