
CROSSCUTTING PROGRAMS

3. HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING ANALYSIS

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, America has engaged in a broad, determined effort to thwart terrorism. The Administration has worked with the Congress to enact landmark legislation to reorganize the Federal Government, improve intelligence capabilities, acquire countermeasures to biological weapons, enhance security at our airports, seaports, land borders and local communities, and strengthen America's preparedness and response capabilities. Every level of government, the private sector, and individual citizens contribute to homeland security—the concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage from attacks that may occur. Since September 11th, homeland security has become a major policy focus for all levels of government, and one of the President's highest priorities.

To examine homeland security as a crosscutting Government-wide function, section 889 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 requires a homeland security funding analysis to be incorporated in the President's Budget. This analysis addresses that legal requirement. It covers the homeland security funding and activities of all Federal agencies, not only those carried out by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and discusses State, local, and private sector expenditures. In addition, not all activities carried out by DHS constitute homeland security funding (e.g., Coast Guard search and rescue activities), so DHS estimates in this section do not represent the entire DHS budget.

Federal Expenditures

The Federal spending estimates in this analysis utilize funding and programmatic information collected on the Executive Branch's homeland security efforts¹. Throughout the budget formulation process, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) collects three-year

funding estimates and associated programmatic information from all Federal agencies with homeland security responsibilities. These estimates do not include programs or funding within the Legislative or Judicial branches. Information in this chapter is augmented by a detailed appendix of account-level funding estimates, which is available on the *Analytical Perspectives* CD ROM.

To compile these data, agencies report information using standardized definitions for homeland security. The data provided by the agencies are developed at the "activity level," which is a set of like programs or projects that make up a coherent effort, at a level of detail sufficient to analyze governmental spending on homeland security. Agencies further categorize their funding data based on the critical mission areas defined in the *National Strategy for Homeland Security*: intelligence and warning, border and transportation security, domestic counterterrorism, protecting critical infrastructures and key assets, defending against catastrophic threats, and emergency preparedness and response. In all tables, classified funding for the Intelligence Community is combined with the Department of Defense and titled "Department of Defense."

To the extent possible, this analysis maintains programmatic and funding consistency with previous estimates. Some discrepancies from data reported in earlier years arise due to agencies' improved ability to extract terrorism-related activities from host programs and refine their characterizations. In addition, the Administration may refine definitions or mission area estimates over time based on additional analysis or changes in the way specific activities are characterized, aggregated, or disaggregated. Activities in many of the mission areas are closely related. For example, information gleaned from activities in the intelligence and warning category may be utilized to inform law enforcement activities in the domestic counterterrorism category. Augmentation of pharmaceutical stockpiles, categorized as emergency preparedness and response, may address agents that represent catastrophic threats.

¹All data in the Federal expenditures section are based on the President's policy for the 2005 Budget. Additional policy and baseline data is presented in the "Additional Tables" section and on the *Analytical Perspectives* CD ROM. Data in this section may not add to totals in other Budget volumes due to rounding.

Table 3–1. HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING BY AGENCY

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Agency	2003 Enacted	2003 Supplemental	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
Department of Agriculture	299.9	110.0	326.6	651.1
Department of Commerce	111.6	131.2	150.1
Department of Defense	8,442.0	7,024.0	8,023.1
Department of Education	5.7	8.0	7.7
Department of Energy	1,246.9	161.3	1,362.5	1,496.9
Department of Health and Human Services	4,002.4	142.0	4,109.0	4,276.1
Department of Homeland Security	18,652.4	4,411.0	¹ 23,492.3	27,214.5
Department of Housing and Urban Development	1.6	1.8	1.8
Department of the Interior	47.4	7.3	67.2	49.3
Department of Justice	1,892.5	456.9	¹ 2,165.8	2,581.1
Department of Labor	69.4	52.4	68.6
Department of State	632.7	1.4	701.3	954.8
Department of Transportation	382.8	283.5	242.6
Department of the Treasury	80.0	90.4	87.1
Department of Veterans Affairs	154.3	271.3	297.0
Corps of Engineers	36.0	39.0	103.4	84.0
Environmental Protection Agency	132.9	123.3	97.4
Executive Office of the President	41.0	35.0	35.0
General Services Administration	67.1	78.9	79.5
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	205.0	191.0	207.0
National Science Foundation	284.6	327.9	343.6
Office of Personnel Management	3.0	3.0	3.0
Social Security Administration	132.0	143.4	155.0
District of Columbia	25.0	19.0	15.0
Federal Communications Commission	1.0	1.0
Intelligence Community Management Account	1.0	72.4
National Archives and Records Administration	10.1	12.0	14.6
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	47.0	66.8	57.0
Securities and Exchange Commission	5.0	5.0	5.0
Smithsonian Institution	82.8	78.3	76.0
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum	8.0	8.0	8.0
Corporation for National and Community Service	16.3	22.8	31.6
Total, Homeland Security Budget Authority	37,118.2	5,329.0	41,307.1	47,385.7
Less Department of Defense	-8,442.0	-7,024.0	-8,023.1
Less BioShield	-885.0	-2,528.0
Non-Def. Homeland Security BA excluding BioShield	28,676.2	5,329.0	33,398.1	36,834.6
Less Fee-Funded Homeland Security Programs	-3,414.4	705.0	-3,655.1	-4,080.5
Less Mandatory Homeland Security Programs	-1,759.4	-1,948.0	-2,261.4
Net Non-Def. Disc. Homeland Security BA excluding BioShield	23,502.4	6,034.0	27,795.0	30,492.7
Obligation Limitations				
Department of Transportation Obligation Limitation	567.0	139.6	92.9

¹ 2004 Enacted does not include \$91 million for Coast Guard and \$16 million for FBI enacted as part of the FY 2004 Iraq supplemental.

Total funding for homeland security has grown significantly since the attacks of September 11, 2001. For 2005, the President's Budget includes \$47.4 billion for homeland security activities, a \$6.1 billion (15 percent) increase over the 2004 level. This is \$26.8 billion, or 130 percent, over the government's funding level for 2002. Excluding mandatory and fee funding, DOD, and DHS' Project Bioshield, the 2005 Budget provides an increase of \$2.7 billion (9.7 percent) over the 2004 level. A total of 32 Federal agencies include homeland security funding. Of those, five agencies—the Departments of Homeland Security (DHS), Defense (DOD), Health and Human Services (HHS), Justice (DOJ) and Energy (DOE)—account for approximately 92 percent of total Government-wide homeland security funding in 2005.

The growth in Federal homeland security funding is indicative of the robust efforts that have been initiated to secure our Nation. However, it should be recognized that fully developing the strategic capacity to protect America into the future is a complex effort. There is a wide range of potential threats and risks to the Nation. To optimize the use of limited resources and minimize the potential social costs to our free and open society, homeland security activities should be prioritized based on the highest threats and risks. Homeland security represents a partnership among the Federal Government, State and local governments, the private sector, and individual citizens.

The *National Strategy for Homeland Security* provides a framework for addressing these challenges. It

guides the highest priority requirements for securing the Nation. As demonstrated below, the Federal Government has used the *National Strategy* to guide its homeland security efforts. However, the *National Strategy* is not static; it represents a dynamic effort to measure progress. In some cases, progress may be easily measured. In others, Federal agencies, along with State and local governments and the private sector, are working together to develop measurable goals. Finally, in

some areas, Federal agencies and partners must work to develop a better understanding of risks and threats—the biological agents most likely to be used by a terrorist group, the highest-risk and consequence critical infrastructure targets—in order to develop benchmarks. The following table summarizes funding levels by the *National Strategy's* mission areas; more detailed analysis is provided in subsequent mission-specific sections.

Table 3–2. HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING BY NATIONAL STRATEGY MISSION AREA

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Agency	2003 Enacted	2003 Supplemental	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
Intelligence and Warning	125.1	86.0	268.7	474.1
Border and Transportation Security	15,170.8	1,859.0	15,322.5	17,074.6
Domestic Counterterrorism	2,509.2	522.6	2,994.1	3,419.8
Protecting Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets ..	12,893.1	388.3	12,571.0	14,060.0
Defending Against Catastrophic Threats	2,428.4	201.1	2,827.2	3,358.2
Emergency Preparedness and Response	3,873.2	2,272.0	7,132.5	8,802.4
Other	118.3	191.1	196.5
Total, Homeland Security Budget Authority	37,118.2	5,329.0	41,307.1	47,385.7

National Strategy Mission Area: Intelligence and Warning

The intelligence and warning mission area covers activities to detect terrorist threats and disseminate terrorist-threat information. The category includes intelligence collection, risk analysis, and threat-vulnerability integration activities for preventing terrorist attacks. It also includes information sharing activities among Federal, State, and local governments, relevant private sector entities (particularly custodians of critical infrastructure), and the public at large. It does not include most foreign intelligence collection, although this intelligence may inform homeland security activities. In 2005, the bulk of the funding for intelligence and warning is in DHS (61 percent in 2005), primarily in the Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection (IAIP) Directorate and the Secret Service. Other large contributors are DOJ (19 percent in 2005), primarily in the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and the

Intelligence Community (15 percent in 2005), for the Terrorist Threat Integration Center (TTIC).

The major requirements addressed in the intelligence and warning mission area include:

- Unifying and enhancing the Government's intelligence and analytical capabilities to ensure officials have the information they need to preempt attacks.
- Implementing the Homeland Security Advisory System to allow Federal, State, local, and private authorities to take action to prevent attacks and protect potential targets.

The Administration is addressing these homeland security requirements through a variety of efforts. Over the past year, significant steps have been taken to enhance coordination of information collection and analysis. The multi-agency TTIC, the Terrorist Screening Center (TSC), and DHS' IAIP Directorate were established. These new units are improving information sharing among agencies and reducing potential gaps

Table 3–3. INTELLIGENCE AND WARNING FUNDING

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Agency	2003 Enacted	2003 Supplemental	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
Department of Agriculture	0.8	0.8	19.8
Department of Homeland Security	86.3	239.9	290.3
Department of Justice	35.7	86.0	24.5	91.1
Department of the Treasury	2.3	2.5	0.6
Intelligence Community Management Account	1.0	72.4
Total, Intelligence and Warning	125.1	86.0	268.7	474.1

in intelligence. They were explicitly established as “hubs” to receive and share threat information with multiple Federal agencies and other entities. A further example of intelligence coordination is the Memorandum of Agreement signed by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Director of Central Intelligence to improve the flow of homeland security information between their agencies.

Announced by the President in the 2003 State of the Union, the multi-agency TTIC commenced operations on May 1st, 2003. TTIC’s interagency staff fully integrates terrorist threat-related information and analysis, and seeks to break down information “stovepipes” that have hindered intelligence efforts in the past. TTIC is co-located with counterterrorism elements from the Central Intelligence Agency and FBI to further improve communication and analysis.

To complement the TTIC, the Administration initiated the TSC, which began operations in December 2003. The TSC was formed to consolidate Government watch lists and provide operational support for thousands of Federal screeners across the country and around the world by making this consolidated information accessible to Federal, State and local agencies. Information provided by TSC will allow Government investigators, screeners and agents to act quickly when a suspected terrorist is screened or stopped. The TSC works closely with the TTIC to ensure that the single, consolidated list of terrorist suspects is accurate and regularly updated.

Enhancing the FBI’s analytical capability has been a major priority to improve the Government’s overall ability to deter, detect, and prevent terrorist attacks. The FBI has created an Office of Intelligence to establish intelligence requirements and coordinate information collection and sharing. The President’s Budget requests \$29 million for this new office.

IAIP was established as part of DHS to fill a new and unique role: mapping threat information against our nation’s vulnerabilities, and working with the Federal, State, and local government officials and private sector custodians of critical infrastructure to mitigate those vulnerabilities. Over the past year, the IAIP has made considerable strides by working with its partners within the intelligence community to become a focal point for integrating and disseminating operational and situational awareness information. For example, IAIP is partnering with homeland security directors of States

and territories to establish joint regional information exchange systems using DHS’ Homeland Security Operations Center. IAIP is working to not only eliminate barriers to information sharing but also create avenues to share information to its partners on specific threats, vulnerabilities, and responses to the threat.

In addition, IAIP is responsible for operating the Homeland Security Advisory System (HSAS), which communicates threat alerts to the general public and government entities. IAIP is working to refine the warning system. For 2005, the President requests \$10 million for the HSAS. The Federal Government is working to link other agency warning systems to the HSAS and to other public and private sector alert networks. DHS has been leading efforts to harmonize Federal systems, such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s all-hazards and weather radio system in the Department of Commerce, and has been working with State, local, and private sector entities to link systems, speed notification processes, and allow for more targeted warnings

National Strategy Mission Area: Border and Transportation Security

This mission area covers activities to protect border and transportation systems, such as screening airport passengers, detecting dangerous materials at ports overseas and at U.S. ports-of-entry, and patrolling our coasts and the land between ports-of-entry. The majority of funding in this mission area (\$15.9 billion, or 93 percent, in 2005) is in DHS, largely for the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), and the Coast Guard. Other DHS bureaus and other Departments, such as State and Agriculture, also play significant roles as well. The President’s 2005 request would increase funding for border and transportation security activities by 11 percent over the 2004 level.

Securing our borders and transportation systems is a complex task. The Administration’s “Smart Border” initiative targets resources toward the highest risks and threats while facilitating the legitimate flow of commerce. This is cornerstone of an effective border and transportation security strategy. The creation of DHS, which unified the Federal Government’s major border and transportation security resources, facilitates the integration of risk targeting systems and ensures greater accountability in border and transportation security.

Table 3–4. BORDER AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY FUNDING

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Agency	2003 Enacted	2003 Supplemental	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
Department of Agriculture	143.2	163.1	169.2
Department of Homeland Security	14,169.2	1,859.0	14,403.2	15,943.4
Department of Justice	25.4	20.1	24.4
Department of State	591.8	668.9	919.0
Department of Transportation	241.3	67.2	18.6
Total, Border and Transportation Security ...	15,170.8	1,859.0	15,322.5	17,074.6

Rather than having separate systems for managing the flow of goods, people, and agricultural products, one agency is now accountable for ensuring there is one cohesive border management system.

In the area of aviation security, the Federal Government has implemented the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001. While intelligence suggests that aviation remains a preferred instrument of terrorism, Federal actions have bolstered the Nation's defenses. The Federal Government funded the installation of reinforced, blast-resistant cockpit doors on all large commercial passenger aircraft. More than 7,000 screening devices have been installed in all 429 commercial airports. Screeners have been replaced or retrained at all airport checkpoints and all passengers on U.S. aircraft are pre-screened against terrorism watch lists. Aircraft and airport access controls have been tightened for all U.S. airports, and the Government is working with other nations to improve aviation security. DHS also recently implemented new air cargo security requirements so that high risk cargo may not be carried on passenger aircraft. The 2005 Budget supports substantial new investments in aviation security, including an increase of nearly \$900 million increase over 2004 for TSA. This funding will help ensure strong screening system performance through more training, improved technology, and explosive detection system replacement at high volume airports. In addition, \$60 million is provided to DHS to continue accelerated development of improved technologies to counter the threat of portable anti-aircraft missiles. The Budget also supports a regulatory enforcement program in CBP and TSA to ensure that the air cargo industry is complying with the higher security standards, and invests in research and development for better cargo screening technologies.

The security of our seaports is no less critical, since terrorists may seek to use them to enter the country or introduce weapons or other dangerous materials. With 95 percent of all U.S. cargo passing through the Nation's 361 ports, a terrorist attack on a seaport could be economically devastating. The Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) and its implementing regulations, issued by DHS in October 2003, require certain ports, vessels, and facilities to conduct security assessments. DHS will establish security standards for certain vessels and facilities, and require them to adopt security plans based on their assessments.

The 2005 Budget provides nearly \$2 billion for port security, including \$1.7 billion for Coast Guard activities such as Maritime Safety and Security Teams and Sea Marshals and nearly \$50 million for port security grants. This includes over \$100 million in new funding for the Coast Guard to develop and approve security plans, ensure foreign vessels arriving in the U.S. are in compliance with the new international port security standards, and enhance its intelligence and surveillance capabilities.

CBP is responsible for inspecting travelers at ports of entry for immigration, customs, and agriculture com-

pliance, as well as interdicting illegal crossers between ports of entry. DHS streamlined border operations by merging inspection forces formerly maintained by the Departments of the Treasury, Justice, and Agriculture. CBP also includes the Border Patrol, formerly maintained by the Department of Justice. The merging of the agencies responsible for ensuring that all goods and persons entering and exiting the United States do so legally has improved accountability by leveraging all of our border security assets; creating a clear chain of command; and allowing for a comprehensive, cohesive border security strategy.

To secure our borders while also maintaining openness to travel and trade, CBP utilizes a risk-based, layered security approach. Overall funding for CBP homeland security activities in 2005 would increase by almost \$200 million over the 2004 enacted level, with enhancements supporting additional inspectors at ports-of-entry, additional Border Patrol agents, inspection equipment, enhancements to tracking and targeting databases, and information technology upgrades. Further, through its Container Security Initiative (CSI), CBP has addressed an area of identified risk—the security of international shipping containers. CSI aims to push our borders outward by screening cargo containers at foreign ports before the containers are placed on ships bound for the United States. The 2005 Budget provides \$25 million in new funding for CSI. Another focus for CBP is new and improved inspection equipment. Nearly \$300 million has been directed for this endeavor since September 11th. The new equipment affords inspectors the ability to examine a larger percentage of containers more easily than in the past. The 2005 Budget provides over \$100 million to CBP for such equipment, including \$50 million in funding to defend against radiological and nuclear threats by deploying next-generation radiation detection technologies. Additionally, CBP will continue deployments of current Non-Intrusive Inspection technologies to expand radiation detection capability across our borders.

Another important element of a smart border strategy is managing the pre-entry, entry, stay, and departure of visitors. To do so, the 2005 Budget requests \$340 million in DHS' Border and Transportation Security Directorate to continue implementation of U.S. VISIT, an entry-exit control system to record the arrivals and departures of travelers. This program will provide specific information about who is entering the country and who is staying past their period of authorized admission.

To ensure effective detention and removal of illegal aliens present in the U.S., the 2005 Budget also supports a nearly \$100-million increase for the Detention and Removal Program. This includes funding to expand the program to apprehend alien fugitives and to increase efforts to ensure that aliens convicted of crimes in the U.S. are deported directly from correctional institutions after their time is served.

National Strategy Mission Area: Domestic Counterterrorism

Funding in the domestic counterterrorism mission area covers Federal and Federally-supported efforts to identify, thwart, and prosecute terrorists in the United States. The Department of Justice (largely for the FBI) and DHS (largely for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE) are the largest contributors to the domestic counterterrorism mission, accounting for \$1.9 billion (57 percent) and \$1.4 billion (41 percent) in funding for 2005, respectively. The President's 2005 request would increase funding for domestic counterterrorism activities by 14 percent over the 2004 level.

Since the attacks of September 11th, preventing and interdicting terrorist activity within the United States has become a priority for law enforcement at all levels of government. The major requirements addressed in the intelligence and warning mission area include:

- Developing a proactive law enforcement capability to prevent terrorist attacks.
- Apprehending potential terrorists.
- Improving law enforcement cooperation and information sharing to enhance domestic counterterrorism efforts across all levels of government.

The FBI has transformed its focus into to one dedicated to preventing terrorist attacks. In a series of measures to support this transformation, resources have been shifted from lower priority programs; analytical capability has been enhanced; additional field in-

vestigators have been hired; and headquarters oversight and management of terrorism cases has been strengthened. Overall, FBI resources in the domestic counterterrorism category have increased from \$0.9 billion in 2003 to \$1.3 billion in 2005, with the 2005 Budget providing an increase of approximately \$300 million over the 2004 level. This increase will support a range of activities, such as counterterrorism investigations and countering cyber crime.

By merging existing immigration and customs enforcement functions into ICE, the Department of Homeland Security created one of America's most robust law enforcement agencies. The Nation is better prepared to apprehend potential terrorists because the information and resources to identify and investigate illegal activities, such as smuggling, identity theft, money laundering, and trafficking in dangerous materials are combined. The 2005 Budget provides an increase of \$160 million over the 2004 level for these enforcement activities.

Cooperation among law enforcement agencies assumes its most tangible operational form in the Joint Terrorism Task Forces (JTTFs) that are currently established in 66 cities. These task forces are devised to prevent and investigate terrorism. They combine the national and international investigative resources of the FBI and other Federal agencies with the street-level expertise of local law enforcement agencies. This "cop-to-cop" cooperation has proved successful in disrupting terrorist activity. The 2005 Budget provides funding to support 18 additional JTTFs.

Table 3-5. DOMESTIC COUNTERTERRORISM FUNDING

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Agency	2003 Enacted	2003 Supplemental	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
Department of Homeland Security	1,012.6	171.7	1,246.2	1,410.1
Department of Justice	1,455.0	350.8	1,677.7	1,938.3
Department of Transportation	1.0	21.0	21.0
Department of the Treasury	40.6	45.2	46.0
Social Security Administration	4.0	4.4
Total, Domestic Counterterrorism	2,509.2	522.6	2,994.1	3,419.8

National Strategy Mission Area: Protecting Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets

Funding in the protecting critical infrastructure and key assets mission area captures the efforts of the U.S. Government to secure the Nation's infrastructure, including information infrastructure, from terrorist attacks. Protecting the Nation's key assets is a complex challenge because more than 85 percent are not Federally-owned. DOD reports the largest share of funding in this category for 2005 (\$7.6 billion, or 54 percent, in 2005), and includes programs focusing on physical security and improving the military's ability to prevent or mitigate the consequences of attacks against soldiers and bases. DHS has overall responsibility for prioritizing and executing infrastructure protection activities at a national level and accounts for \$2.6 billion (18 percent) of 2005 funding. A total of 26 other agencies report funding to protect their own assets and to work with States, localities, and the private sector to reduce vulnerabilities in their areas of expertise. The President's 2005 request increases funding for activities to protect critical infrastructure and key assets by \$1.5 billion (12 percent) over the 2004 level, of which \$1 billion is for DOD.

Securing America's critical infrastructure and key assets is a complicated task. The major requirements include:

- Unifying disparate efforts to protect critical infrastructure across the Federal Government, and with State, local, and private stakeholders.
- Building and maintaining a complete and accurate assessment of America's critical infrastructure and key assets and prioritizing protective action based on risk.
- Enabling effective partnerships to protect critical infrastructure.
- Reducing threats and vulnerabilities in cyberspace.

The IAIP Directorate, as part of DHS, is responsible for prioritizing and addressing these requirements at

a national level. One of the first tasks undertaken by IAIP involved cataloguing critical infrastructure and key assets of national-level importance. IAIP leverages tactical intelligence with a risk-based strategy that identifies critical infrastructures in the targeted areas that might be affected by a terrorist incident, works to understand the vulnerabilities of that infrastructure, and recommends protective measures. In addition, IAIP trains State and local officials to improve security in the areas surrounding up to 1,000 key infrastructures sites per year. The FY 2005 Budget provides \$287 million for the broad range of IAIP's infrastructure protection activities.

Cyberspace security is a key element of infrastructure protection because the internet and other computer systems link many infrastructure sectors. The consequences of a cyber attack could cascade across the economy, imperiling public safety and national security. In response, DHS has established the National Cyber Security Division (NCSA) to identify, analyze and reduce cyber threats and vulnerabilities, coordinate incident response, and provide technical assistance. Since its formal establishment in 2003, NCSA has worked with the private sector to improve security of the Nation's information infrastructure. For example, it coordinated the response and mitigation of the Blaster worm and SoBig virus. \$80 million is requested for the NCSA in 2005.

Even with the creation of IAIP, the Government continues to utilize the infrastructure protection efforts of other Federal agencies to ensure the delivery of essential goods and services and maintain public safety and security. A number of agencies rely on specialized expertise and long-standing relationships with industry to assist them.

Sector-specific agencies outside of DHS are pursuing infrastructure protection efforts. The Department of Energy is coordinating protection activities within the energy sector as any prolonged interruption of energy supply—be it electricity, natural gas, or oil products—could be devastating to the Nation. The Department of Trans-

Table 3-6. PROTECTING CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND KEY ASSETS FUNDING

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Agency	2003 Enacted	2003 Supplemental	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
Department of Agriculture	60.5	86.5	166.0
Department of Defense	8,124.0	6,543.8	7,550.7
Department of Energy	1,126.0	77.3	1,254.9	1,397.7
Department of Health and Human Services	182.3	164.6	173.8
Department of Homeland Security	1,739.7	250.3	2,413.1	2,558.2
Department of Justice	341.8	13.0	413.4	484.0
Department of Transportation	128.0	180.1	189.0
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	205.0	191.0	207.0
National Science Foundation	257.6	300.9	316.6
Social Security Administration	132.0	139.4	150.6
Other Agencies	596.3	47.7	883.4	866.4
Total, Protecting Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets	12,893.1	388.3	12,571.0	14,060.0

portation is working with local transit agencies to test and deploy integrated intrusion detection technologies in tunnels and open track areas in cities with major transit systems. The Department of Agriculture (USDA) is protecting agricultural resources, a source of essential commodities, through research and testing programs.

To maintain public safety and security, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and DHS are working with the chemical industry to enhance measures in place to ensure the safety of facilities and to prevent accidental releases. Companies representing more than 90 percent of chemical production have adopted a comprehensive security code that includes mandatory inspections. EPA has also provided grants and technical support to help drinking water systems complete vulnerability assessments. To protect Federal facilities that could be exploited by terrorists, the Army Corps of Engineers is addressing identified vulnerabilities at its highest-priority dams. To protect the Nation's nuclear weapons complex, as well as nuclear weapons and their components while in transit between facilities, the Department of Energy has revised its assumptions of threats and requirements. The 2005 Budget includes a \$166-million increase to address additional security.

A major component of ensuring public safety and security is protecting Federal employees and Federally-owned, leased, or occupied buildings from terrorist attack. The largest share of funding in this area is for DOD (\$7.6 billion for 2005). This includes programs focusing on physical security and improving the military's ability to prevent or mitigate the consequences of attacks against soldiers and bases.

National Strategy Mission Area: Defending Against Catastrophic Threats

The defending against catastrophic threats mission area covers activities to research, develop, and deploy technologies, systems, and medical measures to detect and counter the threat of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) weapons. The agencies with the most significant resources in this category are HHS (\$1.9 billion, or 57 percent, of the 2005 total), largely for research in the National Institutes of

Health, and in DHS' Directorate of Science and Technology (S&T) (\$0.9 billion, or 26 percent, of the 2005 total), to help develop and field technologies to counter CBRN threats. The President's 2005 request would increase funding for activities defending against catastrophic threats by 19 percent over the 2004 level.

The major requirements addressed in this mission area include:

- Developing countermeasures, including broad spectrum vaccines, antimicrobials, and antidotes.
- Preventing terrorist use of CBRN weapons through detection systems and procedures.

A key element in addressing these requirements as a whole is developing and maintaining adequate countermeasures for a CBRN attack. This not only means stockpiling those countermeasures that are currently available, but developing new countermeasures for agents that currently have none, and next-generation countermeasures that are safer and more effective than those that presently exist. Also, unlike an attack with conventional weapons, an attack with many CBRN weapons may not be immediately apparent. Working to ensure earlier detection and characterization of an attack is another way to protect and save lives.

The Federal Government is addressing these requirements. Primarily through the National Institutes of Health, HHS has conducted a research and development to develop next-generation diagnostics, vaccines and therapeutics to identify, prevent and treat the diseases caused by biological agents of terror. The 2005 Budget continues this effort by investing \$1.7 billion, an increase of \$128 million over 2004 and \$1.4 billion over level prior to September 11th, including funding for a new program to focus on countermeasures against the threat of radiological and nuclear weapons. These investments have yielded results. For example, in November of 2003, NIH began the first human trial of vaccine designed to prevent Ebola infection. When proven effective, this vaccine will provide a life-saving advance in countries where the disease occurs naturally, and a medical tool to discourage and counteract the use of Ebola virus as an agent of bioterrorism. DHS' Project BioShield, categorized as emergency prepared-

Table 3-7. DEFENDING CATASTROPHIC THREATS FUNDING

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Agency	2003 Enacted	2003 Supplemental	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
Department of Agriculture	44.6	110.0	20.8	227.0
Department of Commerce	63.9	60.0	69.5
Department of Defense	105.0	146.8	161.3
Department of Energy	84.0
Department of Health and Human Services	1,664.4	1,754.5	1,930.3
Department of Homeland Security	491.0	774.0	886.0
Department of Justice	23.6	7.1	27.9	41.0
National Science Foundation	27.0	27.0	27.0
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	8.9	16.2	16.1
Total, Defending Against Catastrophic Threats	2,428.4	201.1	2,827.2	3,358.2

ness and response because it will be utilized to augment pharmaceutical stockpiles, will also spur the development new biological countermeasures.

In order to decrease the gap in time between a bioterrorist attack and the implementation of Federal, State, and local response protocols, the 2005 Budget includes a \$274-million biosurveillance initiative. The initiative will help to build a comprehensive detection architecture by augmenting and integrating existing surveillance in the areas of human health, food supply, agriculture, and environmental monitoring, and then integrating those elements with each other and with other terrorist-threat information in real time. Improvements to these surveillance capabilities will be supported by investing an additional \$130 million for HHS' Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, an additional \$15 million for HHS' Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Agriculture, and a total of \$118 million for DHS S&T in 2005. The Budget also provides \$11 million for the IAIP Directorate to integrate this information.

As part of the Biosurveillance Initiative, the BioWatch program in DHS' S&T Directorate will be expanded. BioWatch continuously monitors the air for biological agents that might be released by terrorists. The 2005 Budget provides an additional \$47 million to expand the program by adding scores of detectors in the top high-threat cities and at high-value targets such as stadiums and transit systems. To facilitate enhancements in the system, the budget provides \$31 million in new funding for DHS to develop the next-generation of biological sensors, new detection systems at critical food nodes, and a model to enable better synthesis of biological incident data when assessing the extent of an actual attack.

USDA, HHS, and DHS will also work together to improve the inputs into the biosurveillance system and protect the safety of the Nation's food and agriculture systems from terrorist attacks. This effort spans across mission area categories, including efforts to detect catastrophic agents, improve warning systems, better protect the food and agriculture sectors from these threats on a regular basis, and, when necessary, implement response protocols. The 2005 Budget includes an in-

crease of \$357 million to expand laboratory capacity, conduct research, and improve surveillance of the food and agriculture supply. This funding will support the complete renovation and modernization of the national animal disease and diagnostic facility at Ames, Iowa. In addition, \$15 million from the Biosurveillance initiative is specifically dedicated to improving food and agriculture surveillance.

National Strategy Mission Area: Emergency Preparedness and Response

The Emergency Preparedness and Response mission area covers agency efforts to prepare for and minimize the damage from major incidents and disasters, particularly terrorist attacks that would endanger lives and property or disrupt government operations. The mission area encompasses a broad range of agency incident management activities, as well as grants and other assistance to States and localities for similar purposes. DHS maintains the largest share of funding in this category (\$5.9 billion, or 68 percent, for 2005), mostly for preparedness grant assistance to State and local first responders and Project BioShield. HHS, the second largest contributor (\$2.2 billion, or 25 percent, in 2005), also assists to States and localities to upgrade their public health capacity. A total of 18 other agencies include emergency preparedness and response funding. A number maintain specialized response assets that may be called upon in select circumstances. In the President's 2005 Budget, funding for emergency preparedness and response activities would increase by \$1.7 billion (23 percent) over the 2004 level.

Major requirements addressed in the emergency preparedness and response mission area include:

- Integrating separate Federal response plans into a single all-discipline incident management plan.
- Establishing measurable goals for national preparedness and ensuring that federal funding supports these goals
- Ensuring that Federal programs to train and equip States and localities are coordinated and complementary.

Table 3-8. EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE FUNDING

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Agency	2003 Enacted	2003 Supplemental	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
Department of Energy	120.9	107.6	99.2
Department of Health and Human Services	2,155.7	142.0	2,189.8	2,172.0
Department of Homeland Security	1,126.0	2,130.0	4,268.0	5,965.5
Other Agencies	470.6	567.0	565.8
Total, Emergency Preparedness and Response	3,873.2	2,272.0	7,132.5	8,802.4
Less BioShield	-885.0	-2,528.0
Total, Emergency Preparedness and Response excluding BioShield	3,873.2	2,272.0	6,247.5	6,274.4

- Encouraging standardization and interoperability of first responder equipment, especially for communications.
- Building a national training, exercise, evaluation system.
- Creating a national incident management system.
- Preparing health care providers for catastrophic terrorism.
- Augmenting America's pharmaceutical and vaccine stockpiles.

Many of the key elements of the national emergency response system are already in place. However, we must ensure that the investments made since September 11th to enhance Federal, State and local preparedness capabilities have actually resulted in a higher level of preparedness. Key elements in doing so are identifying capability gaps, establishing national preparedness goals, and improving response and recovery efforts at all levels of government. A related challenge is ensuring that investments in State and local preparedness are focused on new response capabilities for major events, and not supplanting normal operating expenses. DHS is leading an interagency effort to better match federal resources with achieving national preparedness goals.

From 2001 through 2004, the Federal Government has allocated \$13.4 billion in State and local terrorism preparedness grant funding from the Departments of Homeland Security, Health and Human Services, and Justice, increasing spending from an annual level of approximately \$300 million in 2001 to \$5.0 billion in the 2005 request. The funding growth has been directed to Federal assistance for State and local preparedness and response activities, including equipping and training first responders and preparing the public health infrastructure for a range of terrorist threats. The Federal Government has also taken steps to rationalize and simplify the distribution of State and local assistance. For example, DHS now maintains a website that contains information on homeland security and public safety grant opportunities offered by DHS and other agencies across the Federal Government. In addition, DHS' Project SAFECOM has established consistent technical criteria for Federally-funded communications equipment, and is developing a strategic plan to encourage progress on standardizing equipment and protocols.

In 2004, DHS will complete a National Response Plan and begin to implement a comprehensive National Incident Management System. By the end of 2004, over 500,000 first responders will have received terrorism preparedness and response training through the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security. Over 480 terrorism preparedness exercises will have been conducted, including the largest preparedness exercise in American history (TOPOFF II). The 2005 Budget continues to provide coordinated terrorism preparedness training and equipment for State and local responders across the various responder agencies. The 2005 request includes \$3.6 billion for terrorism preparedness grants, training, and exercises administered by the Office for

Domestic Preparedness within DHS. DHS will also administer a new, \$20 million program for planning and exercises associated with medical surge capabilities. Of this amount, \$5 million is for planning and \$15 million is for two pilot projects to evaluate fixed and mobile medical surge facilities capabilities.

In addition, the Budget includes \$2.5 billion, \$1.6 billion over the 2004 level, for Project BioShield. BioShield is designed to stimulate the development of the next generation of countermeasures by allowing the Federal Government to buy critically needed vaccines and medications for biodefense as soon as experts agree they are safe and effective enough to be added to the Strategic National Stockpile. This program provides an incentive to manufacture these countermeasures. BioShield is a shared responsibility, joining the intelligence capabilities of DHS with the medical expertise of HHS.

To take full advantage of that medical expertise, the Budget proposes to transfer funding for the Stockpile to HHS. The Budget includes \$400 million to maintain and augment this supply of vaccines and other countermeasures that can be made available within 12 hours in the event of a terrorist attack or other public health emergency. The Budget also includes flexible authority to increase funding to augment the supply of antibiotics to protect the public against exposure to anthrax. HHS has the lead role in preparing public health providers for catastrophic terrorism. For 2005, HHS will provide \$476 million to continue improvements for hospital infrastructure and mutual aid through the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), and \$829 million for States through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for upgrades to State and local public health capacity. This investment will bring the total assistance provided by HHS to States, local governments and health care providers since 2001 to \$5.8 billion.

Non-Federal Expenditures

Since September 11th, State and local governments and the private sector have also devoted extensive resources to the task of defending against terrorist threats. Some spending represents one-time costs; other spending is likely to be ongoing. In their roles as first responders, States and localities have hired more personnel, increased overtime for police, firefighters, and other emergency personnel, purchased new security equipment, activated and upgraded emergency operations centers, and invested in security-focused training.

In the private sector, firms have devoted more resources to enhance security and ensure the continuity of operations in the event of an attack. Private sector spending has focused on strengthening information systems, reinforcing security and protection, improving surveillance, and establishing and improving backup systems and inventory management so that activities can be maintained in the event of a major disruption of normal operations.

In order to estimate expenditures for homeland security activities by State and local governments and the private sector for the prior fiscal year and the current fiscal year, a number of methodological issues need to be addressed. Unlike the Federal Government, many State and local governments and private sector firms do not have budget systems that uniformly separate homeland security spending from other spending. Even when homeland security spending is tracked at the level of individual governmental units or firms, there is no organized data collection system for aggregating spending and for estimating spending for entities that do not collect homeland security data. This leads to a number of concerns with State, local, and private sector estimates that have been developed for, or are related to, homeland security:

- Entities that have reported estimates may not have used a uniform definition of homeland security activities. For example, private firms have difficulty separating expenditures primarily motivated by the threat of terrorism from other security expenses, and State and local governments may not have separated general public safety costs from activities more clearly motivated by the threat of terrorism, such as purchases of bullet proof vests versus specialized training for incidents involving weapons of mass destruction. Furthermore, the large number of Federal, State, local, and private entities that perform homeland security activities makes it difficult to collect estimates and ensure uniformity.
- Funding estimates may not have been categorized in a uniform way. For example, it is unclear whether certain estimates have reflected amounts budgeted versus amounts expended, or that certain estimates have been normalized to conform to a uniform fiscal year.
- Expenditures for homeland security may be double-counted. For example, the ramp-up in State and local expenditures since September 11th may be attributed to the increase in Federal grant

funding for homeland security activities (see discussion below). The same applies to funding transfers among States and counties or cities. Although some estimates have attempted to control for this, uniform estimates that differentiate between where funding originated versus where it is ultimately expended are not available at this time. The possibility that fiscal substitution may have occurred—that one governmental entity lowered what it planned to spend based on anticipated funds from another source—is also a problem.

- Many of the homeland security spending estimates generated since September 11th focus exclusively on increases, without accounting for pre-existing activities. A valid comparison must capture these historical costs in a logical way. For example, while public safety spending related to terrorism may have increased, it is problematic to assert that there were no homeland security activities at the State and local level before September 11th. Conversely, not all State and local and local public safety spending since that date may be attributed to homeland security. Furthermore, because some homeland security expenditures may be one-time costs or costs that occur infrequently (e.g., purchasing additional security cameras), some of the expenditures that occurred in the wake of September 11th may be one-time or infrequent costs.

Given these issues, it is not surprising that there is a wide range of plausible estimates of non-Federal homeland security spending.

Two private consulting firms have published estimates based on responses to surveys they conducted of a sample of States, localities, and private-sector firms. The estimates are shown in the table below. The wide range between the low and high estimates developed by Deloitte Consulting, and the wider range between those estimates and the estimates developed by International Horizons Unlimited attests to the difficulty of accurately estimating non-Federal homeland security spending.

The estimates by International Horizons Unlimited are on a Federal fiscal year basis. The Deloitte Consulting estimates are on a fiscal year basis appropriate to the reporting entity. For States and localities, the fiscal year most often, but not always, begins July 1; for corporations, there are several common starting dates for fiscal years, including July 1, October 1, and January 1. For State and local spending, both sets of estimates attempted, as best as possible, to remove spending that was funded by Federal grants to avoid

any double counting of spending that was reported by the Federal Government. Federal grants to States and localities for homeland security activities totaled \$5.2 billion in FY 2003 and are estimated to be \$5.5 billion in 2004.

The Administration will work closely with other public and private entities in the coming year to improve estimates of homeland security spending for inclusion in the 2006 Budget.

Table 3–9. ESTIMATES OF NON-FEDERAL HOMELAND SECURITY EXPENDITURES

(funding estimates, in billions of dollars)

	2003	2004
States and localities		
International Horizons Unlimited	6.5	7.5
Deloitte Consulting	14.6 to 29.2	around 15
Private Sector		
International Horizons Unlimited	4.5	4.8
Deloitte Consulting	45.9 to 76.5	around 46

Sources: "The Homeland Security Market," Aviation Week/Deloitte Consulting, June 2002

Additional Tables

The tables in the Federal expenditures section above present data based on the President's policy for the 2005 Budget. The tables below present additional policy

and baseline data, as directed by the Homeland Security Act of 2002.

Estimates by Agency

Table 3–10. DISCRETIONARY FEE-FUNDED HOMELAND SECURITY ACTIVITIES BY AGENCY

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Agency	2003 Enacted	2003 Supplemental	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
Department of Energy	1.2	1.2	1.2
Department of Homeland Security	2,571.0	–705.0	2,701.0	2,875.0
Department of Labor	4.0	14.9	16.1
Department of State	591.8	649.0	898.0
General Services Administration	61.5	72.8	73.2
Social Security Administration	132.0	143.4	155.0
Federal Communications Commission	1.0	1.0
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	47.0	66.8	57.0
Securities and Exchange Commission	5.0	5.0	5.0
Total, Discretionary Homeland Security Fee-Funded Activities	3,414.4	–705.0	3,655.1	4,080.5

Table 3-11. MANDATORY HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING BY AGENCY

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Agency	2003 Enacted	2003 Supplemental	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
Department of Agriculture	119.0	133.0	140.0
Department of Commerce	9.5	9.5	10.8
Department of Energy	10.0	11.0	11.0
Department of Health and Human Services	13.6	13.7	14.6
Department of Homeland Security	1,603.6	1,777.6	2,082.4
Department of Labor	3.7	3.2	2.6
Total, Homeland Security Mandatory Pro- grams	1,759.4	1,948.0	2,261.4

Table 3-12. BASELINE ESTIMATES—TOTAL HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING BY AGENCY

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Agency	2004 Enacted ¹	Baseline				
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Department of Agriculture	326	336	315	324	334	345
Department of Commerce	131	135	141	142	149	152
Department of Defense	7,025	7,221	7,425	7,646	7,883	8,131
Department of Education	8	8	8	8	8	9
Department of Energy	1,362	1,380	1,388	1,411	1,439	1,468
Department of Health and Human Services	4,108	4,169	4,241	4,320	4,409	4,503
Department of Homeland Security ²	23,492	25,946	23,892	24,449	25,059	27,878
Department of Housing and Urban Development	2	2	2	2	2	3
Department of the Interior	66	66	69	70	74	74
Department of Justice	2,166	2,229	2,296	2,368	2,444	2,527
Department of Labor	53	53	50	52	53	55
Department of State	702	710	722	734	748	763
Department of Transportation	285	292	302	311	320	331
Department of the Treasury	91	93	95	100	104	106
Department of Veterans Affairs	271	275	280	285	290	297
Corps of Engineers	103	104	106	108	110	112
Environmental Protection Agency	123	124	125	130	133	135
Executive Office of the President	35	35	36	37	37	38
General Services Administration	79	79	82	82	83	86
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	191	193	196	199	204	208
National Science Foundation	327	331	336	342	348	355
Office of Personnel Management	3	3	3	3	3	3
Social Security Administration	139	141	143	145	148	151
District of Columbia	19	19	19	20	21	21
Federal Communications Commission	2	2	2	2	2	2
Intelligence Community Management Account	1	1	1	1	1	1
National Archives and Records Administration	12	12	12	13	13	13
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	67	69	71	74	75	78
Securities and Exchange Commission	5	5	5	5	5	5
Smithsonian Institution	78	81	85	89	91	96
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum	8	8	8	8	8	9
Corporation for National and Community Service	23	23	23	24	25	25
Total, Homeland Security Budget Authority	41,307	44,145	42,479	43,504	44,623	47,980
Less Department of Defense	-7,025	-7,221	-7,425	-7,646	-7,883	-8,131
Less BioShield	-885	-2,528	-2,175
Non-Def. Homeland Security BA excluding BioShield	33,398	34,396	35,054	35,858	36,740	37,674
Less Fee-Funded Homeland Security Programs	-3,651	-3,688	-3,744	-3,810	-3,885	-3,963
Less Mandatory Homeland Security Programs	-1,948	-2,262	-2,204	-2,222	-2,243	-2,264
Net Non-Def. Disc. Homeland Security BA excluding BioShield	27,795	28,446	29,106	29,826	30,612	31,447
Obligations Limitations						
Department of Transportation Obligations Limitation	133	135	137	139	143	145

¹ Details may not add to totals due to rounding differences.² DHS baseline estimates include BioShield funding in 2004 (\$885M), 2005 (\$2,528M), and 2009 (\$2,175M).

Estimates by Budget Function

Table 3-13. HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING BY BUDGET FUNCTION

(budget authority, in millions of dollars)

	2003 Enacted ¹	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
National Defense	10,461	9,098	10,368
International Affairs	634	702	955
General Science Space and Technology	533	555	608
Energy	91	109	99
Natural Resources and the Environment	274	319	258
Agriculture	402	313	614
Commerce and Housing Credit	106	110	126
Transportation	9,481	7,997	9,206
Community and Regional Development	3,601	2,974	3,147
Education, Training, Employment and Social Services	166	151	174
Health	4,231	5,082	6,864
Medicare	10	13	14
Income Security	7	6	7
Social Security	132	143	155
Veterans Benefits and Services	154	271	297
Administration of Justice	11,543	12,829	13,800
General Government	623	634	690
Total, Homeland Security Budget Authority	42,447	41,307	47,386
Less DoD (National Defense)	-8,442	-7,025	-8,022
Less BioShield	-885	-2,528
Total non-Defense Homeland Security BA excluding BioShield	34,005	33,398	36,836
Less Fee-Funded Homeland Security Programs	-2,709	-3,655	-4,080
Less Mandatory Homeland Security Programs	-1,760	-1,948	-2,262
Net Non-Defense Disc. Homeland Security BA excluding BioShield	29,536	27,795	30,493

¹ FY 2003 Enacted includes supplemental funding; details may not add to totals due to rounding differences.

Table 3-14. BASELINE ESTIMATES—HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING BY BUDGET FUNCTION

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

Budget Authority	2004 Enacted ¹	Baseline				
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
National Defense	9,098	9,321	9,556	9,812	10,091	10,385
International Affairs	702	710	722	734	748	763
General Science Space and Technology	555	562	570	580	591	603
Energy	109	111	103	106	108	111
Natural Resources and the Environment	319	321	328	336	346	351
Agriculture	313	323	302	310	320	331
Commerce and Housing Credit	111	115	120	121	127	129
Transportation	7,997	8,440	8,604	8,798	9,009	9,236
Community and Regional Development	2,974	3,013	3,060	3,111	3,171	3,235
Education, Training, Employment and Social Services	151	154	158	165	169	177
Health ²	5,082	6,788	4,332	4,414	4,504	6,775
Medicare	13	13	14	14	15	15
Income Security	6	6	3	3	3	4
Social Security	139	141	143	145	148	151
Veterans Benefits and Services	271	275	280	285	290	297
Administration of Justice	12,829	13,211	13,532	13,906	14,305	14,724
General Government	634	641	652	664	678	693
Total, Homeland Security Budget Authority	41,307	44,145	42,479	43,504	44,623	47,980
Less DoD (National Defense)	-7,025	-7,221	-7,425	-7,646	-7,883	-8,131
Less BioShield	-885	-2,528	-2,175
Total non-Defense Homeland Security BA, excluding BioShield	33,398	34,396	35,054	35,858	36,740	37,674
Less Fee-Funded Homeland Security Programs	-3,651	-3,688	-3,744	-3,810	-3,885	-3,963
Less Mandatory Homeland Security Programs	-1,948	-2,262	-2,204	-2,222	-2,243	-2,264
Net non-Def. Disc. Homeland Security BA excluding BioShield	27,795	28,446	29,106	29,826	30,612	31,447

¹ Details may not add to totals due to rounding differences.

² Health function baseline estimates include BioShield funding in 2004 (\$885M), 2005 (\$2,528M), and 2009 (\$2,175M).

Detailed Estimates by Budget Account

An appendix of account-level funding estimates, organized by *National Strategy* mission area, is available on the *Analytical Perspectives* CD ROM.