

# **Coping with Homeland Security: Perceptions of City Officials in California and the United States**

**Mark Baldassare**

Public Policy Institute of California

**Christopher Hoene**

National League of Cities

Paper prepared for the Congress of Cities and Exposition  
National League of Cities  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
December 6, 2002

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

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

**Public Policy Institute of California**

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

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

info@ppic.org • www.ppic.org

---

## Summary

---

This report presents the results of the first comprehensive surveys of the ways in which city officials are responding to homeland security issues. The findings are based on two surveys conducted in July and August 2002. The U.S. survey by the National League of Cities was sent to 1,971 cities nationwide, and 725 surveys were completed and returned, for a 37 percent response rate. The California survey by the Public Policy Institute of California in conjunction with the National League of Cities survey was sent to all 478 cities in the state, and 317 surveys were completed and returned, for a 66 percent response rate.

This report addresses the following question: Are California's experiences with homeland security different from those in the rest of the nation? The importance of this issue is derived from California's status as the most populous state, as a major port of entry and immigrant destination, and as a state with a history of emergency preparedness for natural disasters. The surveys offer a "snapshot in time," when city officials are in the early stages of assessing the new realities confronting local governments one year 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 conclusions we draw from these surveys are presented below.

- Many city officials are concerned about homeland security, especially with respect to biological and chemical attacks and cyber-terrorism, yet issues such as crime and the economy are seen as more immediately important. The level of concern about terrorist attacks is lower in California and the West than it is nationwide.
- Most cities have addressed biological and chemical attacks in their contingency plans, but few have addressed cyber-terrorism, even though many believe the risk of cyber-terrorism is greater. City officials in California and the West are no more likely than officials in the country as a whole to say that terrorism is addressed in their emergency plans.
- City officials in California and nationwide are most likely to name water supplies, government buildings, transportation facilities, schools, hospitals, and information technology as needing protection from attacks. California officials are less likely than their U.S. counterparts to worry about protecting facilities in or near their cities.
- There appears to be greater cooperation within city agencies and between local, state, and federal governments since the terrorist attacks. Similar to trends in other western states, California city officials are less likely than officials in the United States as a whole to say that coordination has increased with the state and federal governments.
- Many city officials say that local spending on public safety and security has increased since September 11<sup>th</sup>, that they are thus less able to meet their city's financial needs, and that their local residents would not support higher taxes to increase terrorism readiness. The fiscal impacts appear to be less serious in California than in other large states and in the nation as a whole. California city officials are even less optimistic about support for new taxes than their U.S. counterparts.
- Most city officials in California and the nation place high priorities on receiving federal and state funding to train emergency response personnel, purchase emergency equipment, pay for threat prevention and detection efforts, and provide additional personnel support.



---

## Contents

---

<b>Summary</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Survey Results</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Survey Methodology</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix</b>	
<b>A. Survey Questionnaire: U.S Cities</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>B. Survey Questionnaire: California Cities</b>	<b>21</b>



---

## Introduction

---

The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks have imposed new realities on America's local governments in terms of providing for the safety of their residents through local homeland security. Such a broad task involves, among other things, finding additional resources to develop and update preparedness and response plans, maintaining higher security levels in public buildings and public spaces, and trying to facilitate seamless coordination of homeland security efforts across multiple layers of federal, state, and local government agencies. Throughout the nation, local governments are considering and planning for potential threats to public safety on a variety of fronts, including threats to bridges, airports, buildings, gathering places, power plants, and water supplies. This expansion of local government responsibilities is occurring at time when local governments are fiscally constrained and in an era of contentious intergovernmental relations.

There are several reasons for focusing on California's experiences in the U.S. context of increasing homeland security. The Golden State is the most populous state in the nation, a major port of entry for international goods and travelers, and a primary destination for immigrants from a variety of destinations. Over time, California's state agencies and local governments have developed a comprehensive plan of emergency preparedness for natural disasters – including earthquakes, fires, and floods – that should apply to many homeland security efforts. Yet the California system of state and local finance since the voters passed Proposition 13 and local tax limits in 1978 would also seem to constrain city and county abilities to raise revenues and may place the state at a disadvantage in expanding efforts for homeland security. Moreover, terrorist attacks aimed at eastern cities raise this fundamental question: Is homeland security a relevant issue for cities in California and the western states?

To gauge the concerns, preparedness, and needs of local governments, the National League of Cities (NLC) mailed a survey to 1,971 city officials in July and August 2002. Using NLC's established city sampling techniques, the survey was sent to all cities with a population of at least 50,000 and to a random sample of smaller cities (i.e., those with a population ranging between 10,000 and 50,000). A total of 725 questionnaires were returned, for a 37 percent response rate. In collaboration with the NLC survey, the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) sent the same questionnaire to city officials in all 478 California cities. A total of 317 questionnaires were returned, for a 66 percent response rate. Previous reports by NLC and PPIC have focused on response differences across the nation and within California. In this report, we compare the patterns of responses between city officials in California and the United States, other large states, western states, and cities with large and small populations. The surveys address the following questions involving homeland security:

- What are the specific concerns of city officials regarding the threats of terrorist attacks, and how do concerns about terrorism compare with other local issues?
- What types of terrorist attacks are addressed in city planning efforts, and what are the obvious gaps in preparedness given the specific threats perceived?
- How much collaboration do city officials think there is within their city's agencies and between their city and other city, county, state, and federal governments?
- How significant are the economic and fiscal implications of homeland security efforts, and do city officials believe that local voters would support higher taxes for homeland security?
- What do city officials consider to be their highest priorities for federal and state funding supporting their local homeland security efforts?



---

## Survey Results

---

### Terrorism and Security

One year after September 11<sup>th</sup>, city officials in California and across the United States are more concerned about cyber-terrorism and biological and chemical attacks than other terrorist threats. Half of the city officials across the nation say they are "very" or "moderately" concerned about biological (50%), chemical (48%), and cyber attacks (46%). California city officials are also most concerned about cyber (40%), biological (38%), and chemical attacks (35%). Nonetheless, California officials are less likely than their counterparts in the nation as a whole to say that any form of terrorist threat is of great or moderate concern.

Although the top three concerns are the same among city officials in all sizes of cities – cyber, biological, and chemical attacks – concern about terrorist threats increases with the size of a city's population in both California and the nation. In the largest cities (i.e., those with populations of 100,000 or more), two in three city officials in the nation (69%) and in California (65%) say they are at least moderately concerned about cyber attacks. In the largest cities nationwide, the threat of a car or truck bomb is also rated among the chief concerns (66%).

Compared to city officials in other large states, California's city officials are less concerned about nearly all types of terrorist attacks. For example, concern about biological attacks in Florida (56%) and Texas (54%) is considerably higher than in California (38%), as is also the case with concern about chemical attacks – Florida (58%), Texas (52%), and California (35%). Findings of lower levels of concern in California are consistent with findings in other western states, where biological (40%) and chemical (37%) attacks are rated about the same as in California.

Biological, chemical, and cyber attacks are also among the top concerns of city officials in different regions of the nation (see methodology for a list of states by region). However, while biological attacks are listed as the top concern in the Northeast (72%), Midwest (45%), and South (51%), cyber-terrorism is listed as the top concern of city officials in the West (55%).

**"How concerned are you about the threat of terrorist attacks in your city over the next year?"  
(% responding "very" or "moderately" concerned)**

	CA Cities	U.S. Cities
<b>Cyber-terrorism</b>	40%	46%
<b>Biological</b>	38	50
<b>Chemical</b>	35	48
<b>Car or truck bomb</b>	27	38
<b>Combination (dirty bomb)</b>	27	32
<b>Airplane used as bomb</b>	26	31
<b>Individual/suicide bomb</b>	25	32
<b>Radiological</b>	21	27
<b>Nuclear</b>	17	24

## Homeland Security in Context

Although terrorism is a significant municipal concern, city officials in California and the nation are more focused on other issues. While they are equally likely to say they are very or moderately concerned about crime (77% U.S., 78% California), California officials are more likely than those in the nation as a whole to worry about the threat of natural disasters (57% U.S., 63% California), and U.S. city officials are more likely than those in California to express concern about economic conditions, such as the loss of businesses (67% U.S., 56% California) and unemployment (67% U.S., 54% California).

To place the issue of homeland security into further context, four in ten city officials say they are concerned about acts of discrimination or hate crimes (42% U.S., California 39%) and the loss of public confidence (41% U.S., 39% California) – levels of concern about the same as those expressed for cyber-terrorism and biological and chemical attacks.

**"How concerned are you about ... ?"**  
 (% responding "very" or "moderately" concerned)

	CA Cities	U.S. Cities
<b>Crime</b>	78%	77%
<b>Natural disasters</b>	63	57
<b>Loss of businesses</b>	56	67
<b>Unemployment</b>	54	67
<b>Cyber-terrorism</b>	40	46
<b>Biological attack</b>	38	50
<b>Chemical attack</b>	35	48

Moreover, while terrorist concerns and emergency planning rate high among city officials' priorities, they are not among the three most important issues city officials say they are currently facing or expect to face in the coming two years. Public safety is listed by six in ten cities as the most important current issue (62% U.S., 64% California), followed by economic conditions (56% U.S., 47% California) and infrastructure (44% U.S., 38% California).

In contrast, terrorism prevention and preparedness is cited by one in four city officials in California (25%) and one in three city officials nationwide (34%) as one of the most important issues to address. Once again, national comparisons point to the fact that California city officials are less likely to rate homeland security as a major issue.

**"Which three issues are currently the most important to address in your city?"**

	CA Cities	U.S. Cities
<b>Public safety and crime</b>	64%	62%
<b>Economic conditions</b>	47	56
<b>Infrastructure investment</b>	38	44
<b>Terrorism</b>	25	34

The mention of terrorism as one of the most important issues increases with the size of a city's population. Among cities of 100,000 or more, terrorism is cited as the second most important issue by city officials in California (39%) and as the third most important issue by city leaders nationwide (51%).

One notable regional difference is that terrorism is ranked among the top three issues in the Northeast (42%).

Officials in California and other large states list the same three issues – crime, economics, and infrastructure – as their top concerns and are similar in their ranking of terrorism.

When asked about municipal issues to address over the next two years, city officials in California and the nation had similar responses. They thought that the issues they were currently concerned about would be the same issues they would have to worry about in the future – public safety (33% U.S., 39% California), infrastructure investment (38% U.S., 39% California), and economic conditions (37% U.S., 37% California). Terrorism came in a distant fourth, cited by 24 percent of city officials across the nation and 22 percent in California.

**"Which three issues will be the most important to address over the next two years?"**

	<b>CA Cities</b>	<b>U.S. Cities</b>
<b>Public safety and crime</b>	39%	33%
<b>Economic conditions</b>	37	37
<b>Infrastructure investment</b>	39	38
<b>Terrorism</b>	22	24

## Emergency Planning in Cities

Local officials in California do not seem to be as concerned as their counterparts in the nation about terrorist threats, and California cities are not more prepared for such threats than U.S. cities in general, despite the state's history of emergency planning for natural disasters.

City officials' levels of concern about specific types of terrorist attacks are generally reflected in their specific emergency planning efforts. In most cases, city officials are more likely to say that a specific type of terrorist threat is being addressed in planning efforts than to list the specific type of attack as a major concern. For example, in California, 63 percent of officials cite their city's efforts to address the threat of biological attacks, compared to 38 percent who say they are at least moderately concerned about this type of attack. Similarly, 58 percent of California city officials report that chemical attacks are addressed in their city's planning efforts, compared to 35 percent who list chemical attacks as a concern. The same trend is evident at the national level, with seven in ten city officials saying their city's planning efforts address biological (70%) and chemical (68%) terrorism, compared to five in ten who say they are concerned about biological (50%) and chemical (48%) attacks.

However, in both California and the nation, there is a significant gap between the level of concern about cyber-terrorism (46% U.S., 40% California) and plans for dealing with this threat (26% U.S., 22% California). The gap between concern about cyber attacks and emergency planning for such an event is apparent in all U.S. regions and is similar in large states such as California, Texas, and Florida.

In California, the gap between concern about cyber-terrorism and plans for dealing with it is particularly notable among cities with more than 100,000 population: 65 percent of city officials in large cities say they are at least moderately concerned about cyber-terrorism, yet only 39 percent say that this threat is addressed in their planning efforts. At the national level, 69 percent of the officials in cities over 100,000 in population list cyber-terrorism among their top concerns, but only 41 percent say that this threat is addressed in their plans.

**Comparison of responses to "How concerned are you about the threat of terrorist attacks in your city over the next year?" and "What types of terrorist attacks are addressed in your city's planning efforts?"**

	<u>CA Cities</u>		<u>U.S. Cities</u>	
	Very or Moderately Concerned	Addressed in Planning Efforts	Very or Moderately Concerned	Addressed in Planning Efforts
<b>Cyber-terrorism</b>	40%	22%	46%	26%
<b>Biological</b>	38	63	50	70
<b>Chemical</b>	35	58	48	68
<b>Car or truck bomb</b>	27	36	38	44
<b>Combination (dirty bomb)</b>	27	26	32	28
<b>Airplane used as bomb</b>	26	48	31	50
<b>Individual/suicide bomb</b>	25	25	32	30
<b>Radiological</b>	21	36	27	36
<b>Nuclear</b>	17	36	24	41

## Facilities to Protect

As city officials continue to refine their emergency plans, one of the key tasks is to identify facilities and infrastructure in the city and surrounding region that might be targets. Once again, concerns about threats to the city usually run higher in the nation as a whole than in California.

Among the facilities and infrastructure that need protection, water supplies receive the most mention from city officials across the country (81%) and in California (81%).

Most officials also cite the need to protect government buildings (77% U.S., 73% California), transportation facilities such as bridges, tunnels, and roads (66% U.S., 63% California), and schools and universities (66% U.S., 60% California). Information technology (61% U.S., 50% California) and hospitals (61% U.S., 48% California) are cited somewhat less often.

Other types of facilities that are mentioned much less frequently include ports (29% U.S., 17% California), high-rises and other large buildings (29% U.S., 16% California), power plants (26% U.S., 16% California), federal facilities (22% U.S., 11% California), military installations (17% U.S., 9% California), and stadiums and arenas (15% U.S., 15% California).

When asked about the need to protect facilities in nearby areas, city officials most often mentioned facilities that tend to be regional in their service provision: water supplies (39% U.S., 36% California), power plants (38% U.S., 33% California), ports of entry (36% U.S., 39% California), hospitals (35% U.S., 38% California), and transportation facilities (33% U.S., 36% California). Many city officials also cited the need to protect and secure nearby federal facilities (31% U.S., 21% California) and military installations (29% U.S., 30% California).

**"What facilities and infrastructure need to be secured and protected  
in your city or nearby in the surrounding area?"**

	<u>CA Cities</u>		<u>U.S. Cities</u>	
	<b>In City</b>	<b>Nearby</b>	<b>In City</b>	<b>Nearby</b>
<b>Water supplies</b>	81%	36%	81%	39%
<b>Government buildings</b>	73	29	77	25
<b>Transportation facilities</b>	63	36	66	33
<b>Schools/universities</b>	60	28	66	25
<b>Information technology</b>	50	30	61	26
<b>Hospitals</b>	48	38	61	35
<b>Ports of entry (airports, harbors)</b>	17	39	29	36
<b>Power plants</b>	16	33	26	38
<b>Hi-rises, landmarks, monuments</b>	16	20	29	22
<b>Stadiums, convention centers</b>	15	25	15	28
<b>Non-military federal facilities</b>	11	21	22	31
<b>Military facilities</b>	9	30	17	29
<b>International borders</b>	3	8	5	8

Altogether, the infrastructure and facilities mentioned most often as needing protection both within cities and around them are similar – water supplies, government buildings, transportation facilities, schools and universities, hospitals, and information technology.

Regardless of city population size and region, local water supplies top the list of facilities that city officials say need to be secured. However, nearly all of the facilities mentioned in the survey questionnaire are more prevalent in larger cities and are thus more likely to be referred to by officials in California's largest cities (i.e., 100,000 or more population) than by officials in the state's smallest cities (i.e., less than 10,000 population). This difference is especially clear when it comes to information technology infrastructure (65% to 26%), federal facilities (49% to 1%), stadiums and arenas (47% to 3%), other large buildings such as high-rises (47% to 4%), and power plants (37% to 6%). The same trend in larger versus smaller cities is evident at the national level, particularly for information technology (92% to 50%), hospitals (92% to 44%), ports (66% to 14%), and high-rises and other large buildings (64% to 15%).

Across different regions of the country, the trends are similar to those in California and in the United States as a whole: Water supplies, government buildings, schools, information technology, and hospitals are listed most often as facilities needing protection. Water supplies within cities are less likely to be cited by officials in the Northeast (67%) than in the South (84%) or West (84%). Transportation facilities are more likely to be listed in the Northeast (77%) than in other regions (58% Midwest, 68% South, and 68% West). Among the larger states, such as Texas and Florida, the facilities that top the list of concerns for security and protection are the same as those mentioned most often in California.

## Regional Collaboration and Local Coordination

City officials give high ratings to the collaborative efforts of governments, agencies, and other organizations in their region and even higher marks to the coordination between departments and agencies within their own city governments. However, California's cities appear to lag behind U.S. cities in both regional collaboration and local coordination.

Half of the city officials in the nation (53%) and in California (50%) rate coordination efforts across levels of government in their region as "high" or "very high." On this issue, the trends in California are similar to those in the nation as a whole. However, city officials in the largest cities (i.e., 100,000 or more population) are more likely at the national level than in California to give at least "high" ratings to regional coordination efforts (75% versus 51%). Nationally, city officials in the West (59%) are a little more likely to give at least "high" marks to regional coordination efforts, compared to the Northeast (52%), Midwest (54%), and South (51%). There are no significant differences between California, Texas, and Florida in ratings of regional coordination.

More than three in four city officials (83% U.S., 77% California) rate coordination efforts across city departments and agencies in their cities as either "high" or "very high." The largest cities – those with populations over 100,000 – are the most likely to give "very high" ratings to within-city coordination efforts, both in the nation (55%) and in California (45%). The ratings of U.S. city officials are somewhat more positive than those reported by California city officials, and the differences are even more pronounced when comparing the largest cities. Again, we could find no significant differences between California and other large states.

	CA Cities	U.S. Cities	U.S. Cities by Population Size			
			<10,000	10,000-49,999	50,000-99,999	>100,000
<b><i>How would you rate the extent of collaboration and coordination across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in your region?</i></b>						
Very low	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%
Low	9	10	11	11	6	5
Moderate	36	35	36	36	43	20
High	34	37	38	36	31	45
Very high	16	16	10	15	17	30
Don't know	3	1	4	0	2	0
<b><i>How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration among city departments and agencies in your city?</i></b>						
Very low	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%
Low	3	2	2	3	3	1
Moderate	19	14	16	15	13	7
High	37	36	39	34	37	37
Very high	40	47	39	48	45	55
Don't know	1	1	3	0	1	0

## Intergovernmental Coordination

Most city officials report an increase in coordination across all levels of government since the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks. However, California city officials are less likely than U.S. city officials as a whole to say that state and federal coordination has increased.

Intergovernmental coordination has increased the most at the local level, with three in four city officials reporting increased coordination between their cities and other city governments, both in the nation as a whole (75%) and in California (77%). Similarly, city officials report increased coordination with county governments across the United States (80%) and in California (77%).

A majority of city officials report increased coordination with state and federal agencies. Seventy percent of California city officials and 79 percent of city officials around the nation report increased coordination with state government. Similarly, a majority (56%) of California city officials report greater coordination with the federal government, compared to two in three city officials nationally (67%).

Overall, the levels of intergovernmental coordination are higher in larger cities for all levels of government, with the largest differences reported being with the federal government. Greater coordination with the federal government was reported by four in ten city officials from cities under 10,000 in population in California and six in ten city officials from similarly sized cities nationally, compared to seven in ten city officials from cities over 100,000 in population in California (69%) and nine in ten city officials (90%) nationally.

City officials in the West were least likely to report higher levels of coordination with their state governments (73%) compared to city officials in the Northeast (86%), Midwest (79%), and South (80%). Officials in the West (66%) and Midwest (64%) were less likely to report increased federal coordination than cities in the Northeast (70%) and South (69%). County-level coordination levels were lowest in the Northeast (62%); however, this may be partly explained by the fact that the county form of government is less prevalent in that region.

Among the large states, California city officials are less likely to cite increased coordination with the state and federal governments. City officials in Florida (81%) and Texas (80%) say that coordination has increased at least a fair amount with their state governments, compared to 70 percent in California. Similarly, seven in ten city officials in Florida (71%) and Texas (68%) cite increased coordination with the federal government, compared to 56 percent in California. Part of this difference may be explained by state-local and federal-local relationships in the West.

"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")

	CA Cities	U.S. Cities	U.S. Cities by Regions			
			Northeast	Midwest	South	West
Other cities	77%	75%	81%	77%	75%	77%
County	77	80	62	84	84	80
State	70	79	86	79	80	73
Federal	56	67	70	64	69	66

## Fiscal Impact of 9-11

Forty-two percent of city officials nationally report that their cities are less able to meet financial needs since September 11<sup>th</sup> – undoubtedly reflecting a downturn in the economy as well as the effects of the terrorist attacks and homeland security issues. Almost half of the city officials in the United States say that public safety and security spending has increased over the same period (47%), and nearly six in ten say that spending on public safety will likely increase in the future (58%).

The fiscal impact on California cities appears to be less pronounced than for cities nationwide. Thirty-one percent of California city officials report that they are “less able to meet financial needs” since September 11<sup>th</sup>. Four in ten (39%) report that public safety and security spending have increased, and similar proportions (43%) say that this spending will likely increase in the future.

Overall, the largest cities report having felt the greatest fiscal impact, with California again slightly lagging the nation: 61 percent of the cities in California with a population over 100,000 (and 66 percent of such cities throughout the nation) report increased levels of spending for public safety after September 11<sup>th</sup>.

Cities in the Northeast report larger fiscal impacts than other regions. Three in five city officials in the Northeast (61%) report increased spending on public safety, compared to 41 percent in the Midwest, 48 percent in the South, and 48 percent in the West. City officials in the Northeast (54%) were also the most likely to report being less able to meet financial needs.

Further evidence that California cities may have been more insulated from fiscal impacts is indicated by the responses of other large states. City officials in Texas (43%) and Florida (39%) are more likely than officials in California (31%) to say they are less able to meet financial needs since September 11<sup>th</sup>, that spending on public safety has increased (50% Texas, 62% Florida, 39% California), and that this spending will increase in the future (61% Texas, 60% Florida, 43% California).

**"What was the impact of September 11<sup>th</sup> on your local government's ability to meet its financial needs ... its spending on public safety and security ... its spending on safety and security in the future?"**

	CA Cities	U.S. Cities	U.S. Cities by Region			
			Northeast	Midwest	South	West
"Government less able to meet its financial needs"	31%	42%	54%	37%	40%	49%
"Spending on public safety has increased since 9-11"	39	47	61	41	48	48
"Spending on public safety will increase in the future"	43	58	67	53	59	55

## Support for New Taxes and Fees

While city officials report increased fiscal stress on both the revenue and expenditure side of their budgets, they are not optimistic – especially in California – about public support for additional local taxes and fees to fund homeland security efforts.

One in four city officials nationally (24%) thinks that public support for new taxes is likely, compared to one in six in California (16%). Two in three California city officials (64%) say it is unlikely that their residents would support tax increases, compared to three in five city officials nationally (58%).

In a similar vein, few city officials think that public support is likely for additional fees in California (20%) or in the nation as a whole (25%) to pay for homeland security. Similar to trends for higher taxes, city officials in California (59%) are more likely than those in the United States generally (53%) to think that the public will not support additional fees to pay for homeland security.

The perception of a lack of support for new taxes and fees is pervasive across cities of all sizes and in all regions of the country, but it is particularly strong in the smallest cities (i.e., those with a population of less than 10,000). Two in three city officials (66%) in the smallest cities nationwide say that support for new taxes is unlikely or very unlikely, and 70 percent say the same for the prospect of raising fees. In California, 70 percent of city officials in cities under 10,000 in population say that support is unlikely or very unlikely for higher taxes, and 71 percent say the same with respect to fees.

Comparing the larger states, a higher percentage of city officials in California (64%) than in Florida (45%) say that support for new taxes is unlikely, but this percentage is only slightly higher than the percentage of city officials in Texas (59%) and other western states (58%), who feel there is little public support for increasing taxes to fund homeland security.

**"What is the likelihood that your city's residents would support additional local taxes for homeland security?"**

	CA Cities	U.S. Cities	U.S. Cities by Population Size			
			<10,000	10,000-50,000	50,000-100,000	>100,000
<b>Very likely</b>	2%	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%
<b>Likely</b>	14	22	21	23	24	18
<b>Unlikely</b>	42	42	48	41	35	44
<b>Very unlikely</b>	22	16	18	16	16	15
<b>Don't know</b>	20	18	12	17	22	21

## Priorities for Federal and State Support

City fiscal stress and the perceived lack of public support for additional taxes and fees would suggest that city officials need additional federal and state funding for homeland security. Asked what their priorities would be for such funding, city officials say their top priorities would be training emergency response personnel (65% California, 62% U.S.), purchasing emergency equipment (63% California, 70% U.S.), threat prevention and detection (54% California, 51% U.S.), and personnel support (53% California, 48% U.S.). California city officials are less likely than their counterparts throughout the nation to mention funding for emergency equipment, but otherwise appear to have the same concerns as city officials elsewhere when it comes to funding priorities.

About half of city officials say that federal and state assistance other than funding should focus on technical assistance for emergency preparedness (52% California, 49% U.S.), coordinating region-wide planning efforts (51% California, 47% U.S.), and threat prevention and detection (44% California, 44% U.S.). Once again, California cities express needs similar to those cited by other U.S. cities.

Larger cities in California (i.e., 100,000 population or more) are more likely than smaller cities (i.e., under 10,000 population) to place a greater emphasis on funding for equipment (69% to 57%), training (74% to 61%), and personnel needs (63% to 46%). Nationally, large cities are more likely than small cities to rank equipment (77% to 65%) and personnel (62% to 41%) as priorities, while there are no differences with respect to training and protecting infrastructure.

As for differences in priorities for other types of federal and state assistance, larger California cities were more likely than smaller ones to mention technical assistance for emergency preparedness (61%), coordinating regional planning (59%), and threat prevention and detection (57%). For the nation as a whole, larger cities were more likely than others to say that coordinating regional planning efforts (56%) should be a top priority for federal and state assistance.

Few differences are evident in city officials' rankings for federal and state funding and other types of assistance across different regions of the country or between the large states (California, Texas, and Florida).

"What should be the highest priorities for future federal and state funding to support homeland security?"

"Outside of funding, in what areas could the federal and state government focus other types of assistance?"

	<u>CA Cities</u>		<u>U.S. Cities</u>	
	Federal and State Funding	Other Types of Assistance	Federal and State Funding	Other Types of Assistance
Training for local emergency response personnel	65%	35%	62%	35%
Emergency equipment and apparel	63	21	70	19
Threat prevention and detection	54	44	51	44
Personnel support (additional personnel, overtime)	53	23	48	25
Protecting infrastructure	40	35	42	39
Coordinating region-wide planning efforts	30	51	30	47
Technical assistance on preparedness planning	23	52	24	49



---

## Survey Methodology

---

### National Survey

The results of the national survey are from the *State of America's Cities Survey*, which is directed by Chris Hoene, Research Manager at the National League of Cities (NLC), with research assistance from Christiana Brennan. A special survey on homeland security issues was conducted in July and August 2002. Using NLC's established sampling techniques, the survey was sent via direct mail and fax to city officials in 1,971 U.S. cities, including all cities over 50,000 in population and a random sample of cities between 10,000 and 50,000 in population. The survey was sent to elected officials, who were asked to direct the survey toward the primary city staff member in charge of emergency planning and coordination.

The number of usable responses nationally was 725, for a response rate of 37 percent. The survey is not fully representative of the responses of city officials in cities nationwide, although it does offer a good cross-section of responses from a large number of city officials. The preponderance of small cities in the national distribution of cities led to sampling techniques designed to ensure an adequate number of responses from larger cities. As a result, the survey responses over-represent larger cities. Moreover, because of the low number of responses from cities in the Northeast (10%), any conclusions regarding these cities remain tentative.

Population size	% of U.S. sample	Region	% of U.S. sample
<10,000	22%	Northeast	10%
10,000 - 49,999	43	Midwest	29
50,000 - 99,999	19	South	41
>100,000	16	West	20

The questionnaires for the national survey and California survey were returned to the Survey Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois at Chicago where they were compiled and coded. The survey data for this report were analyzed at the NLC and PPIC.

Throughout the report, we refer to cities in California and the United States by population size: less than 10,000; 10,000 - 49,999; 50,000 - 99,999; and 100,000 or more. We also make regional comparisons. At the national level, we compare four U.S. Census-defined regions – Northeast, Midwest, South, and West – which include cities in the following states:

Northeast	Midwest	South	West
Connecticut	Illinois	Alabama	Alaska
Maine	Indiana	Arkansas	Arizona
Massachusetts	Iowa	Delaware	California
New Hampshire	Kansas	District of Columbia	Colorado
New Jersey	Michigan	Florida	Hawaii
New York	Minnesota	Georgia	Montana
Pennsylvania	Missouri	Kentucky	Nevada
Rhode Island	Nebraska	Louisiana	New Mexico
Vermont	North Dakota	Maryland	Oregon
	Ohio	Mississippi	Utah
	South Dakota	North Carolina	Washington
	Wisconsin	Oklahoma	Wyoming
		South Carolina	
		Tennessee	
		Texas	
		Virginia	
		West Virginia	

## California Survey

A survey of local officials in California cities on homeland security issues was conducted at the same time as the national survey. The California survey was commissioned by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) and co-sponsored by the League of California Cities and the California State Association of Counties. The California survey was directed by Mark Baldassare, Research Director and Senior Fellow at PPIC, with assistance from the PPIC Statewide Survey staff, including Jon Cohen, Lisa Cole, and Caroline Burnett.

The California findings in this report are based on a direct mail and fax survey of city officials in all 478 cities in California. In California, the survey on homeland security issues was sent to city managers, at the suggestion of the League of California Cities. City managers were chosen for this survey because they hold the highest administrative position in the city and are therefore charged with overseeing emergency planning. The same survey questionnaire that was mailed to city officials throughout the United States was used in California.

A total of 317 California city officials completed and returned the survey, for a response rate of 66 percent. This included 53 surveys from the national survey sample and 264 surveys from the separate survey of all California cities. The survey is representative of the responses of city officials in cities across California. The survey responses are closely comparable to the distribution of cities across the state by population size and region. The findings do not change significantly when we use statistical weighting to correct for a slight over-representation of cities of 100,000 or more.

City population	% of 478 CA cities	% of 317 CA responses
<10,000	26%	22%
10,000 - 49,999	44	42
50,000 - 99,999	18	20
>100,000	12	16

Region	% of 478 CA cities	% of 317 CA responses
Central Valley	19%	19%
SF Bay Area	21	22
Los Angeles	19	22
Other Southern California	23	20
Other	18	17

When comparisons are made between California and the United States, the U.S. sample includes all 725 responses to the national survey, including the 53 received from California. The 264 responses to the California survey are thus excluded from the U.S. results.

For regional comparisons (e.g., West versus Northeast) the responses of city officials from California are included only for those 53 cities responding to the national survey. The responses from city officials in the California survey are excluded from this analysis.

When comparisons are made between California and “other western states,” we include the 12 other states (see list on previous page) and exclude California from the latter category.

We also contrast the responses of city officials in California to the responses of city officials in two other large states—Texas and Florida. We were unable to include comparisons involving New York, Illinois, or Pennsylvania on homeland security issues in large states.

## Appendix A. Survey Questionnaire: U.S Cities



### NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES Survey of America's Cities on Homeland Security

**[Note: Responses from 725 city officials in July and August 2002]**

The objective of this survey is to accurately gauge the perceptions of local officials on Homeland Security. Without your help, we cannot present a complete picture. If you have any questions about the questionnaire, contact Dr. Christopher Hoene at hoene@nlc.org, or 202-626-3172.

#### HOMELAND SECURITY AND LOCAL CONDITIONS

6. How **concerned** are you about the following possibilities over the next year **in your locality** (very concerned, moderately concerned, mildly concerned, or not very concerned)? *(check one in each row)*

	<u>Very</u>	<u>Moderately</u>	<u>Mildly</u>	<u>Not Very</u>
a. Threat of terrorist attack				
1. Car or truck bomb	11%	27%	31%	31%
2. Biohazard/biological	14	36	32	18
3. Chemical	16	32	32	20
4. Nuclear	7	17	30	46
5. Radiological	8	19	34	39
6. Combination (dirty bomb)	9	23	34	34
7. Cyber-terrorism	12	34	33	21
8. Individual/suicide bomb	12	20	23	45
9. Airplane used as bomb	10	21	29	40
b. Traditional crime	33	44	17	5
c. Job layoffs and unemployment	31	36	21	12
d. Business shutdowns/decline	32	35	13	10
e. Natural disaster	21	36	29	14
f. Acts of discrimination/hate crimes	12	30	36	22
g. Loss of public confidence	18	23	31	28

7. Of the issues listed below, which three are currently most important to address in your locality and which will be the most important to address over the next two years? *(check three boxes in each column, circle "most important")*

	<u>Currently</u>	<u>Next 2 Years</u>
a. Investing in terrorism prevention, preparedness, and training	34%	24%
b. Investing in general public safety and crime prevention	62	33
c. Improving economic conditions	56	37
d. Increasing the availability of affordable housing	12	17
e. Revitalizing and redeveloping neighborhoods	23	28
f. Supporting local and regional development strategies	26	28
g. Investing in infrastructure (roads/transit, water, sewer)	44	38
h. Investing in public education and other supports for children, youth, families	23	24
i. Protecting natural resources and local environmental quality	16	18
j. Cost and availability of health services	14	15
k. Local relations with the community	22	12
l. Relationship with state and federal government	18	12

---

## Homeland Security Planning

8. Has your local government integrated the national Homeland Security Advisory System (the color-coded system developed by the U.S. Office of Homeland Security) into its planning efforts? *(check one)*
- 19% Yes                      36% No                      33% We are working on it                      12% Don't know
9. What types of terrorist attacks are addressed in your local government's planning efforts? *(check all that apply)*
- |                             |     |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| a. Car or truck bomb        | 44% |
| b. Biohazard/biological     | 70  |
| c. Chemical                 | 68  |
| d. Nuclear                  | 41  |
| e. Radiological             | 36  |
| f. Combination (dirty bomb) | 28  |
| g. Cyber-terrorism          | 26  |
| h. Individual/suicide bomb  | 30  |
| i. Airplane crash           | 50  |
10. What facilities and infrastructure need to be secured and protected in your locality or nearby in the surrounding area? *(check all that apply in each column)*
- |  | <u>Locality</u> | <u>Nearby</u> |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| a. Water supplies  | 81%             | 39%           |
| b. Ports of entry (airports, harbors)                                  | 29              | 36            |
| c. Transportation infrastructure (roads, bridges, rail lines, tunnels) | 66              | 33            |
| d. Military facilities   | 17              | 29            |
| e. Other federal facilities (buildings, nuclear plants, research labs) | 22              | 31            |
| f. Schools/universities  | 66              | 25            |
| g. International borders   | 5               | 8             |
| h. Government buildings (city, county, state, or federal)              | 77              | 25            |
| i. Stadiums, arenas, and convention centers                            | 15              | 28            |
| j. Other large buildings (high-rises), landmarks, monuments            | 29              | 22            |
| k. Communications and technology infrastructure                        | 61              | 26            |
| l. Power plants  | 26              | 38            |
| m. Hospitals/medical facilities  | 61              | 35            |
11. Have Homeland Security concerns begun to affect and change local government activities in areas other than security planning (such as, for example, economic development)? *(check one)*
- 17% Yes                                      61% No                                      22% Don't know

---

## Collaboration and Coordination

12. How would you rate the extent of collaboration and coordination across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in your region? *(check one)*
- 1% Very low      10% Low      35% Moderate      37% High      16% Very high      1% Don't know
13. How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration among local departments and agencies in your local government? *(check one)*
- 0% Very low      2% Low      14% Moderate      36% High      47% Very high      1% Don't know

14. How would you rate the efforts to coordinate and collaborate by each of the following levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in your region? (*check one per row*)

	<u>Very low</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Very high</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
a. City governments	1%	7%	25%	36%	29%	2%
b. County governments	2	12	31	33	16	6
c. State government	2	11	39	32	11	5
d. Federal government	5	19	36	24	9	7
f. MPOs/COGs	3	11	25	11	6	44
g. Nonprofits	7	19	24	17	3	30
h. Private sector/business	8	24	30	17	5	16
i. Neighborhoods	11	24	30	15	6	14
j. Civic groups	11	20	32	17	5	15
k. Media	6	20	31	22	6	15

15. Since September 11<sup>th</sup>, how much has your local government increased its coordination with the following? (*check 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>
a. Other cities	9%	25%	41%	19%	6%
b. Other counties	10	31	39	13	7
c. State government	9	27	43	16	5
d. Federal government	8	20	39	25	8
f. MPOs/COGs	3	11	21	25	40
g. Nonprofits	1	10	26	38	25
h. Business/Private sector	3	14	36	31	16
i. Neighborhoods	2	15	29	21	33
j. Civic groups	2	14	35	33	16
k. Media	4	21	35	27	13

16. What is the likelihood of increased collaboration and coordination across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in the following activities? (*check one per row*)

	<u>Very likely</u>	<u>Likely</u>	<u>Unlikely</u>	<u>Very unlikely</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
a. Evacuation	38%	50%	6%	2%	4%
b. Transportation routing	36	52	6	2	4
c. Public health facilities	38	49	7	2	4
d. Communications capacity	39	50	6	2	3
e. Technology systems	23	54	13	2	8
f. Protecting infrastructure	33	52	9	1	5
g. Working with media	24	57	12	1	6
h. Public information efforts	33	55	6	1	5

---

### Local Government and the Public

17. Does your local government have a formal plan for informing the public and disseminating information in future emergencies?

68% Yes      8% No      20% A strategy is being developed      4% Don't know

18. To what extent are local residents involved in discussions and decisions about Homeland Security activities?

2% A great deal      10% A good amount      50% Only a fair amount      30% None at all      8% Don't know

19. Since September 11<sup>th</sup>, has there been a change in the level of public concern expressed about any of the following? (*check one per row*)

	Increased <u>concern</u>	Decreased <u>concern</u>	No <u>change</u>	Don't <u>know</u>
a. Infringing upon civil liberties	19%	5%	68%	8%
b. Racial and ethnic profiling	22	8	63	7
c. Tension among racial and ethnic groups	12	3	76	9

### Economic and Fiscal Implications

20. What was the impact of September 11<sup>th</sup> on your local government's ability to meet its financial needs? (*check one*)

42% less able      1% better able      52% little or no change      5% Don't know

21. What was the impact of September 11<sup>th</sup> on local government spending on public safety and security? (*check one*)

6% significantly increased      41% increased      48% little or no change      3% decreased      2% Don't know

22. Compared to public safety and security spending prior to September 11<sup>th</sup>, what will be the impact of September 11<sup>th</sup> on local spending on public safety and security in the future? (*check one*)

8% significantly increase      50% increase      36% little or no change      2% decrease      4% Don't know

23. What is the likelihood that local residents would support additional local taxes and/or fees for Homeland Security? (*check one in each row*)

	Very <u>likely</u>	Likely	Unlikely	Very <u>unlikely</u>	Don't <u>know</u>
a. Taxes	2%	22%	42%	16%	18%
b. Fees	3	22	39	14	22

### Future Needs

24. Where should be the highest priorities for future federal and state funding to support local Homeland Security? Outside of funding, in what areas could federal and state government focus other types of assistance? (*check three in each column*)

	<u>Funding</u>	<u>Other Assistance</u>
a. Threat prevention and detection	51%	44%
b. Emergency equipment and apparel	70	19
c. Protecting infrastructure	42	39
d. Training for local emergency response personnel	62	35
e. Technical assistance on local preparedness planning	24	49
f. Personnel support (additional personnel and overtime)	48	25
g. Coordinating region-wide planning efforts	30	47

25. We would like to hear from you about **the specific needs of your locality**. Please attach additional information and fax, mail, or email to Chris Hoene using the information below.

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!!**

## Appendix B. Survey Questionnaire: California Cities



**NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES  
LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES  
CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES**

**[Note: Responses from 317 city officials in July and August 2002]**

The objective of this survey is to accurately gauge the perceptions of local officials on Homeland Security. Without your help, we cannot present a complete picture. If you have any questions about the questionnaire, contact Dr. Christopher Hoene at hoene@nlc.org, or 202-626-3172.

### HOMELAND SECURITY AND LOCAL CONDITIONS

6. How **concerned** are you about the following possibilities over the next year **in your locality** (very concerned, moderately concerned, mildly concerned, or not very concerned)? *(check one in each row)*

	<u>Very</u>	<u>Moderately</u>	<u>Mildly</u>	<u>Not Very</u>
a. Threat of terrorist attack				
1. Car or truck bomb	11%	16%	37%	36%
2. Biohazard/biological	10	28	39	23
3. Chemical	8	27	39	26
4. Nuclear	3	14	35	48
5. Radiological	4	17	35	44
6. Combination (dirty bomb)	4	23	36	37
7. Cyber-terrorism	13	27	39	21
8. Individual/suicide bomb	8	17	31	44
9. Airplane used as bomb	5	21	31	43
b. Traditional crime	27	51	16	6
c. Job layoffs and unemployment	21	33	31	15
d. Business shutdowns/decline	22	34	28	16
e. Natural disaster	19	44	27	10
f. Acts of discrimination/hate crimes	9	30	42	19
g. Loss of public confidence	14	25	31	30

8. Of the issues listed below, which three are currently most important to address in your locality and which will be the most important to address over the next two years? *(check three boxes in each column, circle "most important")*

	<u>Currently</u>	<u>Next 2 years</u>
a. Investing in terrorism prevention, preparedness, and training	25%	22%
b. Investing in general public safety and crime prevention	64	39
c. Improving economic conditions	47	37
m. Increasing the availability of affordable housing	18	23
n. Revitalizing and redeveloping neighborhoods	21	21
o. Supporting local and regional development strategies	15	21
p. Investing in infrastructure (roads/transit, water, sewer)	38	39
q. Investing in public education and other supports for children, youth, families	17	23
r. Protecting natural resources and local environmental quality	13	14
s. Cost and availability of health services	9	8
t. Local relations with the community	22	12
u. Relationship with state and federal government	11	13

---

## Homeland Security Planning

8. Has your local government integrated the national Homeland Security Advisory System (the color-coded system developed by the U.S. Office of Homeland Security) into its planning efforts? *(check one)*
- 25% Yes                      41% No                      22% We are working on it                      12% Don't know
9. What types of terrorist attacks are addressed in your local government's planning efforts? *(check all that apply)*
- |                             |     |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| a. Car or truck bomb        | 36% |
| b. Biohazard/biological     | 63  |
| c. Chemical                 | 58  |
| d. Nuclear                  | 36  |
| e. Radiological             | 36  |
| f. Combination (dirty bomb) | 26  |
| g. Cyber-terrorism          | 22  |
| h. Individual/suicide bomb  | 25  |
| i. Airplane crash           | 48  |
10. What facilities and infrastructure need to be secured and protected in your locality, or nearby in the surrounding area? *(check all that apply in each column)*
- |  | <u>Locality</u> | <u>Nearby</u> |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| a. Water supplies  | 81%             | 36%           |
| b. Ports of entry (airports, harbors)                                  | 17              | 39            |
| c. Transportation infrastructure (roads, bridges, rail lines, tunnels) | 63              | 36            |
| d. Military facilities   | 9               | 30            |
| e. Other federal facilities (buildings, nuclear plants, research labs) | 11              | 21            |
| f. Schools/universities  | 60              | 28            |
| g. International borders   | 3               | 8             |
| h. Government buildings (city, county, state, or federal)              | 73              | 29            |
| i. Stadiums, arenas, and convention centers                            | 15              | 25            |
| j. Other large buildings (high-rises), landmarks, monuments            | 16              | 20            |
| k. Communications and technology infrastructure                        | 50              | 30            |
| l. Power plants  | 16              | 33            |
| m. Hospitals/medical facilities  | 48              | 38            |
11. Have Homeland Security concerns begun to affect and change local government activities in areas other than security planning (such as, for example, economic development)? *(check one)*
- 7% Yes                      70% No                      23% Don't know

---

## Collaboration and Coordination

12. How would you rate the extent of collaboration and coordination across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in your region? *(check one)*
- 2% Very low      9% Low      36% Moderate      34% High      16% Very high      3% Don't know
13. How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration among local departments and agencies in your local government? *(check one)*
- 0% Very low      3% Low      19% Moderate      37% High      40% Very high      1% Don't know

14. How would you rate the efforts to coordinate and collaborate by each of the following levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in your region? (*check one per row*)

	<u>Very low</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Very high</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
a. City governments	1%	6%	30%	38%	25%	0%
b. County governments	1	8	31	35	20	5
c. State government	3	17	46	23	8	3
d. Federal Government	7	29	34	16	8	6
f. MPOs/COGs	3	13	21	15	4	44
g. Nonprofits	10	21	29	17	2	21
h. Private sector/business	11	25	32	16	2	14
i. Neighborhoods	12	24	33	21	4	6
j. Civic groups	12	22	32	21	3	10
k. Media	8	20	33	22	5	12

15. Since September 11<sup>th</sup>, how much has your local government increased its coordination with the following? (*check 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>
a. Other cities	7%	24%	46%	21%	2%
b. Other counties	12	25	40	19	4
c. State government	6	22	42	26	4
d. Federal government	6	16	34	37	7
f. MPOs/COGs	2	6	20	32	40
g. Nonprofits	2	6	29	48	15
h. Business/Private sector	3	9	33	42	13
i. Neighborhoods	4	17	36	38	5
j. Civic groups	4	14	36	39	7
k. Media	4	13	35	41	7

16. What is the likelihood of increased collaboration and coordination across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in the following activities? (*check one per row*)

	<u>Very likely</u>	<u>Likely</u>	<u>Unlikely</u>	<u>Very unlikely</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
a. Evacuation	32%	52%	10%	2%	4%
b. Transportation routing	30	53	10	3	4
c. Public health facilities	32	51	10	2	5
d. Communications capacity	32	54	7	3	4
e. Technology systems	19	56	16	2	7
f. Protecting infrastructure	25	55	13	1	6
g. Working with media	18	58	16	2	6
h. Public information efforts	26	57	9	2	6

---

### Local Government and the Public

17. Does your local government have a formal plan for informing the public and disseminating information in future emergencies?

74% Yes      8% No      16% A strategy is being developed      2% Don't know

18. To what extent are local residents involved in discussions and decisions about Homeland Security activities?

1% A great deal      9% A good amount      44% Only a fair amount      40% None at all      6% Don't know

19. Since September 11<sup>th</sup>, has there been a change in the level of public concern expressed about any of the following? (*check one per row*)

	Increased <u>concern</u>	Decreased <u>concern</u>	No <u>change</u>	Don't <u>know</u>
d. Infringing upon civil liberties	20%	4%	71%	5%
e. Racial and ethnic profiling	24	5	67	4
f. Tension among racial and ethnic groups	14	2	78	6

**Economic and Fiscal Implications**

20. What was the impact of September 11<sup>th</sup> on your local government's ability to meet its financial needs? (*check one*)

31% less able      1% better able      3% little or no change      5% Don't know

21. What was the impact of September 11<sup>th</sup> on local government spending on public safety and security? (*check one*)

5% significantly increased      34% increased      58% little or no change      2% decreased      1% Don't know

22. Compared to public safety and security spending prior to September 11<sup>th</sup>, what will be the impact of September 11<sup>th</sup> on local spending on public safety and security in the future? (*check one*)

5% significantly increase      38% increase      50% little or no change      2% decrease      5% Don't know

23. What is the likelihood that local residents would support additional local taxes and/or fees for Homeland Security? (*check one in each row*)

	Very <u>likely</u>	<u>Likely</u>	<u>Unlikely</u>	Very <u>unlikely</u>	Don't <u>know</u>
a. Taxes	2%	14%	42%	22%	20%
b. Fees	3%	17%	39%	20%	21%

**Future Needs**

24. Where should be the highest priorities for future federal and state funding to support local Homeland Security? Outside of funding, in what areas could federal and state government focus other types of assistance? (*check three in each column*)

	<u>Funding</u>	<u>Other Assistance</u>
a. Threat prevention and detection	54%	44%
b. Emergency equipment and apparel	63	21
c. Protecting infrastructure	40	35
d. Training for local emergency response personnel	65	35
e. Technical assistance on local preparedness planning	23	52
f. Personnel support (additional personnel and overtime)	53	23
g. Coordinating region-wide planning efforts	30	51

25. We would like to hear from you about **the specific needs of your locality**. Please attach additional information and fax, mail, or email to Chris Hoene using the information below.

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!!**

# PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

## Board of Directors

**Raymond L. Watson, Chairman**

*Vice Chairman of the Board  
The Irvine Company*

**William K. Coblentz**

*Senior Partner  
Coblentz, Patch, Duffy & Bass, LLP*

**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*

**A. Alan Post**

*Former State Legislative Analyst  
State of California*

**Constance L. Rice**

*Co-Director  
The Advancement Project*

**Thomas C. Sutton**

*Chairman and CEO  
Pacific Life Insurance Company*

**Cynthia A. Telles**

*Department of Psychiatry  
UCLA School of Medicine*

**Carol Whiteside**

*President  
Great Valley Center*

**Harold M. Williams**

*President Emeritus  
The J. Paul Getty Trust  
and Of Counsel  
Skadden, Arps, Slate,  
Meagher & Flom, LL*

## Advisory Council

**Clifford W. Graves**

*Vice Chancellor, Physical Planning  
University of California, Merced*

**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, Berkeley  
Office of the President*

**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  
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)