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Purpose PSG Program

• Majority of US infrastructure owned by state, local, and private sector
• Part of larger strategy of supporting homeland security (HLS) preparedness
• Implements objectives addressed in laws, national strategies, and plans
• To quote National Strategy for HLS: “a strategic objective is to deter terrorist threat by decreasing likelihood of success of a terrorist attack on critical infrastructure.”
Port Area Groupings

- 91 named port areas:
  - 7 Group I, 48 Group II, 36 Group III
  - CT deep draft ports
  - Long Island Sound ports
- Groups represent 95% total international waterborne commerce in U.S.
- Ports aggregated by common waterways, shared risk
Investment Strategy and Priorities

• Overall Investment Strategy:
  - Risk-based funding
  - Regional security cooperation (emphasis on port wide risk management plan started FY07 supplemental)

• PSGP Priorities:
  - Enhancing Maritime Domain Awareness
  - Enhancing IED and WMD prevention, protection, response, recovery capabilities
  - Training and Exercises
  - Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) implementation efforts
Risk Drives Groupings

- Changes to port groups
  - Continued regionalization of planning
    - Allows for development of 8 (new Group II port areas) Port Wide Risk Mitigation/Management Plans
    - 47% of Risk represented in Group I
    - 93.5% of aggregate risk allocated in Groups I & II
    - 8 port areas new to Group II
    - 21 port areas new to Group III
- All Other Ports (AOP) can receive funding from their geographically proximate higher Group if projects have regional impact across entire port area, but can’t receive funding from both higher group and AOP allocation
Field Review Process

- **Groups I & II:**
  - ensure projects are in compliance with the Plan(s)

- **Group III & All other Ports & Ferry Systems:**
  - scored for compliance with grant criteria in FY08 PSGP guidelines

- Ferry Systems: undergo both Field & National Reviews

- COTP’s assign total score, ranked highest to lowest based on risk reduction & cost effectiveness

- COTP’s will identify entities within the port with similar capabilities & if needed, necessity for redundancy, if needed

- All applications undergo a review by the National Review Panel
Port Wide Risk
Mitigation/Management Plans

• Plan should develop strategy and framework
  - for investing in vulnerability reductions
  - resiliency enhancements
• Establishes a prioritized 5-year planning cycle
• Request funding through future grant applications
• Structure deliverables so not redundant
Connecticut’s Deep Water Ports
Connecticut Maritime Overview

• Cargo & Goods Movement
  – CT Ports handle approx 18 million tons of cargo annually
  – 16.6 million tons of cargo at 3 major ports
  – Waterborne transport keeps 950,000 trucks off of CT highways annually
  – $5 Billion in business output within the State

• Economic Driver