



**NYS Division of Homeland Security and  
Emergency Services**

**Fiscal Year 2012**

**Urban Area Security Initiative**

**Nonprofit Security Grant Program**

**Request for Applications**

**NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services  
Homeland Security Assistance for Nonprofit Organizations  
Request for Applications  
Table of Contents**

SECTION	PAGE
I. What's New .....	1
II. Introduction.....	2
III. Program Objectives .....	2
IV. Eligibility .....	2
V. Authorized Program Expenditures.....	3
VI. Unallowable Costs.....	4
VII. Appropriation and Availability of Grant Funds .....	5
VIII. Required Application Submissions .....	5
IX. Application Review .....	6
A. NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services Review	
B. State Administrative Agency and Urban Area Workgroup Review	
X. Timeline .....	7
XI. Award of Funds .....	7
XII. Administration of Grant Contracts .....	7
A. Issuing Agency	
B. Filing an Application	
C. Reservation of Rights	
D. Term of Contract	
Attachments .....	12
A – E-Grants Instructions	
B – 2012 NSGP Investment Justification and Selection Criteria	
C – Application Review and Scoring Worksheet	
D – FY 2012 NSGP Priorities	

## **FY 2012 UASI-NSGP “What’s New?”**

- There is \$10,000,000 available nationally for this program, as compared to \$18,962,000 in FY 2011 and \$19,000,000 available in FY 2010.
- The Investment Justification Template (IJ) provided by DHS is in Microsoft Excel format and MUST be used.
- Only non-profit organizations located in the New York City Urban Area (includes Cities of New York and Yonkers and Counties of Westchester, Suffolk and Nassau) are eligible to apply this year.
- Applicants who have not previously been awarded funds may be eligible for up to 1 bonus point in the scoring criteria of their applications.
- Removed the establishment of local Citizen Corps Council membership as an eligibility requirement.
- Removed optional 25 percent (25%) cost match as part of the Investment Justification which was previously allowed under FY2011 NSGP.

# NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services Homeland Security Assistance for Nonprofit Organizations Request for Applications

## II. Introduction

The purpose of this Request for Applications is to solicit applications for federal grant funding made available from the US Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) Fiscal Year 2012 Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) Nonprofit Security Grant Program. This program provides funding support for target hardening activities to nonprofit organizations that are at high risk of terrorist attack. While this funding is provided specifically to high-risk nonprofit organizations, the program seeks to integrate nonprofit preparedness activities with broader state and local preparedness efforts. It is also designed to promote coordination and collaboration in emergency preparedness activities among public and private community representatives, as well as State and local government agencies.

## III. Program Objectives

The FY 2012 NSGP plays an important role in the implementation of Presidential Policy Directive 8 (PPD-8) by supporting the development and sustainment of core capabilities. Core Capabilities are essential for the execution of each of the five mission areas outlined in the *National Preparedness Goal* (NGP).

For additional details on priorities for this program, please refer to Appendix D FY 2012 NSGP Program-Specific Priorities.

## IV. Eligibility

To be considered for funding, eligible organizations must:

- Be designated as nonprofit organizations as described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code;
- Be registered, have recently applied for registration or be exempt from registering with the NYS Attorney General's Office, Charities Bureau;
- Be located within the New York City urban area which includes: the Cities of New York and Yonkers, and the Counties of Westchester, Nassau and Suffolk.
- Be at **high risk of a terrorist attack**
- The applicant must provide a DUNS number with their application. Organizations should verify that they have a DUNS number, or take

the steps necessary to obtain one, as soon as possible. Applicants can receive a DUNS number at no cost by calling the dedicated toll-free DUNS number request line at (866) 705-5711.

Criteria for determining eligible applicants who are at high risk of terrorist attack include, but are not limited to:

- Identification and substantiation (e.g. police reports or insurance claims) of prior threats or attacks against the nonprofit organization or closely related organizations (within or outside the U.S.) by a terrorist organization, network, or cell,
- Symbolic value of the site(s) as a highly recognized national or historical institution that renders the site a possible target of terrorism,
- Role of the applicant nonprofit organization in responding to or recovering from terrorist attacks,
- Findings from previously conducted risk assessments including threat or vulnerability.

**Not all organizations are guaranteed funding. Allocation decisions will be made based on risk and how well the applicant addresses program requirements through their investment justification submissions. Due to the competitive nature of this program, funding preference will be given to nonprofit organizations that have not received prior years funding.**

#### **V. Authorized Program Expenditures:**

**Equipment:** Allowable costs are focused on target hardening activities. Funding can be used for the acquisition and installation of security equipment on real property (including buildings and improvements) owned or leased by the nonprofit organization, specifically in prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack. This equipment is limited to two categories of items on the Authorized Equipment List (AEL):

- Physical Security Enhancement Equipment (Category 14)
- Inspection and Screening Systems (Category 15)

The two allowable prevention and protection categories and equipment standards for the FY 2012 NSGP are listed on the web-based version of the AEL on the Responder Knowledge Base (RKB), at <https://www.rkb.us>.

**Training:** Nonprofit organization security personnel may use NSGP funds to attend security-related training courses and programs in the United States. Allowable training-related costs under NSGP are limited to attendance fees for training, and related expenses, such as materials, supplies, and/or equipment. **Overtime, backfill, and/or travel expenses are not allowable costs.** Allowable training topics are limited to the protection of critical infrastructure key resources, including physical and cyber security, target hardening, and terrorism awareness/employee preparedness. Training conducted using NSGP funds must address a specific threat and/or vulnerability, as identified in the nonprofit's Investment Justification.

**Proposed attendance at training courses and all associated costs leveraging the NSGP must be included in the nonprofit organization's Investment Justification. Any training attendance, to include curricula, requires prior approval by DHSES.**

**Management and Administration (M&A).** A maximum of up to five percent (5%) of funds awarded may be retained by the State, and any funds retained are to be used solely for management and administrative purposes associated with the NSGP award. Sub-grantees may also use up to five percent (5%) of the FY 2012 NSGP funds awarded to them by the State to be used solely for M&A purposes associated with the award. M&A costs include the following categories of activities:

- Hiring of full-time or part-time staff or contractors/consultants:
  - To assist with the management of NSGP funds
  - To assist with design, requirements, and implementation of the NSGP
  - Meeting compliance with reporting/data collection requirements, including requests for additional information

#### **VI. Unallowable Costs:**

The following projects and costs are considered **ineligible** for award considerations:

- **Hiring of Public Safety Personnel.**
- **Construction and Renovation.**
- **General-use Expenditures.**
- **Overtime and Backfill.**

Additionally, the following initiatives and costs are **ineligible** for award consideration:

- Initiatives that do not address the implementation of programs/initiatives to build prevention and protection-focused capabilities directed at identified facilities and/or the surrounding communities.
- The development of risk/vulnerability assessment models
- Initiatives that fund risk or vulnerability security assessments or the development of the Investment Justification
- Initiatives in which Federal agencies are the beneficiary or that enhance Federal property
- Initiatives which study technology development
- Proof-of-concept initiatives
- Initiatives that duplicate capabilities being provided by the Federal government
- Organizational operating expenses
- Reimbursement of pre-award security expenses

Any other activities unrelated to the implementation of the FY 2012 NSGP, items not in accordance with the AEL, or previously identified as ineligible within this guidance and are not allowable costs.

## **VII. Appropriation and Availability of Grant Funds**

Award of funds is subject to State Budget appropriation authority and the actual award of funds to the State of New York from US Department of Homeland Security. Each nonprofit organization may submit an application for up to \$75,000 in grant funds.

## **VIII. Required Application Submissions**

To be considered for funding, eligible nonprofit organization must submit an application using the State's Electronic Grants (E-Grants) System (see Attachment A – E-Grants Instructions) which includes the following:

- Investment Justification Template (Submitted as an Attachment – see details outlined below)
- Contact Information
- Proposed Project Workplan Information
- Budget Request Information
- Certification to Accept the Assurances as noted below
- **Signed** Grantee Responsibility Questionnaire

### **Investment Justification**

As part of the FY 2012 NSGP application process, 501(c)(3) organizations within eligible Urban Areas must develop a formal Investment Justification (IJ) that addresses each initiative proposed for funding. These Investment Justifications must demonstrate how proposed projects address gaps and deficiencies in current programs and capabilities, as well as how the investment supports the building or sustaining of core capabilities within the *National Preparedness Goal* (NPG). Additionally, the IJ must demonstrate the ability to provide enhancements consistent with the purpose of the program and guidance provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Applicants must ensure that the IJ is consistent with all applicable requirements outlined in this application kit. Applicants may only submit one IJ on behalf of their nonprofit organization in order to be considered for funding.

FEMA has developed guidelines that establish the required IJ content and helps ensure that submissions are organized in a consistent manner while addressing key data requirements. **Failure to address these data elements in the prescribed format, including the strict formatting guidelines, could potentially result in the rejection of the Investment Justification from review consideration.**

Applicants must use the FEMA-provided Excel-based NSGP IJ template (OMB Number 1660-0110/FEMA Form 089-25) for their FY 2012 NSGP application submission. If using a more recent version of Excel (e.g., Excel

2007), applicants are required to save the final version of the IJ in the Excel 97-2003 format before submitting, Excel 2007 or PDF formats cannot be accepted. The NSGP IJ template can be found at <http://www.fema.gov/grants> or <http://www.dhSES.ny.gov>.

For detailed instructions on completing the IJ Template see Attachment B of this RFA.

## IX. Application Review

The following outlines the review process that will be followed for this solicitation.

### A. NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services (DHSES) Review:

DHSES staff will conduct an initial review of each application submitted to ensure that each of the following questions have been answered positively. If any of the answers are “no,” the application will be disqualified without further review and consideration for DHS review.

1. Was the application submitted by 11:59 p.m. on April 16, 2012?
2. Is the application complete?
3. Does the applicant organization currently have IRS IRC 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status?
4. Is the applicant organization registered, has recently applied for registration, or is exempt from registering with the Charities Bureau of the NYS Attorney General’s Office?
5. Is the proposed project site or facility located within the approved Urban Area of the New York City Metropolitan Area?
6. Is the applicant a responsible vendor as evidenced by the **completed and signed grantee responsibility questionnaire**? (Consistent with provisions of the State Comptrollers’ Bulletin G-221.)
7. Obtained and provided Dun and Brad Street Number?

### B. State Administrative Agency and Urban Area Workgroup Review:

A review will be conducted by the NYC Urban Area Working Group (UAWG) in coordination with DHSES as the State Administrative Agency (SAA). This portion of the review will focus on:

- Need – The relative need for the nonprofit organization compared to the other applicants
- Impact – The potential impact of the nonprofit organization in achieving maximum prevention and/or protection results at minimal cost

This review will produce a score of up to 41\* points total (see Attachment C for more detailed information) (\***NOTE: Due to the competitive nature of**

**this program, preference will be given to nonprofit organizations that have not received prior years funding. Applicants that have not received NSGP funding in the past will receive one bonus point on their total State application score).**

## **X. Timeline**

The NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services must receive completed grant applications, via the electronic grants management system (E-Grants) by 11:59 p.m. on April 16, 2012. Supporting documentation must be received as an attachment to the application. Applications and supporting documentation received after the due date and time will not be considered. Applications will be forwarded to DHS for review and award.

## **XI. Award of Funds**

Final award determinations will be made by DHS and funds awarded to DHSES for administration to the award recipients. DHSES will issue award letters to successful applicants and will enter into reimbursement grant contracts with awardees. Funds will be awarded for a 24 month period and will be determined based on the federal award period.

**Successful applicants** must comply with Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) requirements as follows:

**Environmental and Historic Preservation Compliance:** Much of the equipment purchased with NSGP funds require Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) review. FEMA is legally required to consider the potential impacts of all NSGP projects on environmental resources and historic properties. Grantees must comply with all applicable environmental planning and historic preservation laws, regulations, and Executive Orders (Eos) in order to draw down their FY 2012 NSGP grant funds. To avoid unnecessary delays in starting a project, grantees are encouraged to pay close attention to the reporting requirements for an EHP review. .

## **XII. Administration of Grant Contracts**

### **A. Issuing Agency**

This RFA is issued by DHSES. DHSES is responsible for the requirements specified herein and for the evaluation of all applications.

### **B. Filing an application**

Grant applications must be submitted via the automated DHSES E-Grants System. The system allows an agency to complete an application electronically and submit it over the Internet using a secure portal. If, upon reading this RFA, you are interested in completing a grant application and

you have not previously been registered to use the DHSES E-Grants system, your agency will need to register and be assigned a user name and password. The Registration Request Form can be found at the following Internet address: <http://www.dhSES.ny.gov/grants>

A detailed tutorial on how to use the E-Grants system can also be found at the internet address above. It will guide you in a step-by-step process through the E-Grants application submission.

### **C. Reservation of Rights**

DHSES Reserves the Right To:

- 1) Reject any or all applications received in response to this RFA;
- 2) Award more than one contract resulting from this RFA;
- 3) Waive or modify minor irregularities in applications received after prior notification to the applicant;
- 4) Adjust or correct cost figures with the concurrence of the applicant if errors exist and cannot be documented to the satisfaction of DHSES and the State Comptroller;
- 5) Negotiate with applicants responding to this RFA within the requirements to serve the best interests of the State;
- 6) If DHSES is unsuccessful in negotiating a contract with the selected applicant within an acceptable time frame, DHSES may begin contract negotiations with the next qualified applicant(s) in order to serve and realize the best interests of the State; and
- 7) Award grants based on the best interests of the State.

### **D. Term of the Contract**

1. Any resulting contract or agreement resulting from this RFA will be effective only upon approval by the New York State Office of the Comptroller and the Office of the Attorney General.
2. Grantees must review and agree to the standard terms and conditions included in DHSES grant contracts, including but not limited to Appendices A and A-1, which are available for review on the DHSES website at <http://www.dhSES.ny.gov/> .
3. Contract Period – Grant contracts supported with FFY2012 funding are generally executed for a period of two years and are subject to the continued availability of the grant funding.
4. Contract Activities - All activities must have prior approval from DHSES and meet guidelines established by the State of New York and the Federal government.
5. Contract Changes - Contracts with grantees may be executed, terminated, renewed, increased, reduced, extended, amended, or renegotiated at the

discretion of the Commissioner of DHSES, in light of a grantee's performance, changes in project conditions, or otherwise.

6. Records - Grantees must keep books, ledgers, receipts, work records, consultant agreements and inventory records pertinent to the project; and in a manner consistent with DHSES contractual provisions and mandated guidelines.
7. Liability - Nothing in the contract between DHSES and the grantee shall impose liability on the State of New York or DHSES for injury incurred during the performance of approved activities or caused by use of equipment purchased with grant funds.
8. Payments - Payments to reimburse project expenses will be made pursuant to a schedule specified in a contract entered into between the State of New York and the grant award recipient.
9. Reports - A provider agency shall submit to the DHSES reports in a format and time schedule specified in the grant contract, which shall include a description of the program efforts undertaken during the report period and the current status of the project.
10. Review - The grantee's performance in all areas mentioned above, in addition to the services contracted for, will be monitored by DHSES. Monitoring activities may take the form of site visits, record inspections, written and telephone communication, or other methods deemed necessary by DHSES.
11. Revocation of Funds - Funds awarded to an applicant who does not implement an approved project within one year of the award date may be revoked and reallocated to another applicant at the discretion of the Commissioner of DHSES.
12. Tax Law Section 5-a Certification – In accordance with section 5 – a of the Tax Law, grantees will be required, prior to the approval of any contract awarded as a result of this RFA, to certify that it and its affiliates, subcontractors, and subcontractors' affiliates have registered with the New York State Tax Department for the purpose of collection and remittance of sales and use taxes. In order to trigger this certification requirement, a grantee or its affiliates, subcontractor, or subcontractors' affiliates must have made more than \$300,000 in sales of tangible personal property or taxable services to location within New York State and the contract must be valued in excess of \$15,000. Certification will take the form of a completed Tax Form ST-220 (1/05).
13. Purchasing Procedures –
  - i. If the Grantee is eligible to purchase an item or service from a government contract or is able to purchase such item or service

elsewhere at a lower than or equal price, then such purchase may be made immediately.

- ii. A Grantee purchasing any single piece of equipment, single service or multiples of each that cost up to \$15,000 may do so by proving reasonableness of price. One method of proving reasonableness of price is to obtain three quotations from responsible vendors, on the vendor's letterhead. A description of the selection process must be maintained, as well as a record of the quotations.
  - iii. Goods or services or multiples of each that have an aggregate cost between \$15,000 up to \$50,000 may be obtained by advertising the opportunity in a reasonable manner and in an appropriate venue for a reasonable period of time. Reasonableness of price must be proven; obtaining three quotations as in (ii) above may be used. A record must be maintained of the advertisement, the quotations, and the selection process.
  - iv. A Grantee expending over \$50,000 must use a formal competitive bidding process. Guidance may be obtained from DHSES. At a minimum, the competitive bidding process must incorporate the following: open, fair advertisement of the opportunity to provide the goods or services; equal provision of the information to all interested parties; reasonable deadlines; establishment of the methodology for evaluating bids before the bids are opened; sealed bids opened at one time before a committee who will certify the process; and maintenance of a record of the competitive procurement process.
  - v. A Grantee who proposes to purchase from a particular vendor without competitive bidding must obtain the prior written approval of DHSES. The request for approval must be in writing and set forth, at a minimum, a detailed justification for selection and the basis upon which the price was determined to be reasonable. Further, such procurement must be in accordance with the guidelines, bulletins and regulations of the NYS Office of the State Comptroller, State Procurement Council, and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. A copy of DHSES' approval must also be submitted with the voucher for payment.
14. Charities Registration Exemption – A nonprofit organization that reports it is exempt from registering with the NYS Charities Bureau, will be required to sign a Certification to that effect before a grant award contract is finalized.
15. Standard Contract Provisions - Grant contracts executed as a result of this RFA process will be subject to the terms and conditions of Appendix A and Appendix A-1, as referenced above.
16. Compliance with Procurement Requirements - The applicant shall certify to DHSES, to the extent applicable, that procedures under

General Municipal Law §103 were **followed and complied with for all purchase contracts.**

Satisfactory Progress - Satisfactory progress toward implementation includes, but is not limited to; executing contracts and submitting payment requests in a timely fashion, retaining consultants, completing plans, designs, reports, or other tasks identified in the work program within the time allocated for their completion. DHSES may recapture awarded funds if satisfactory progress is not being made on the implementation of a grant project.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **E-Grants Instructions**

Grant applications must be submitted to the NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services via the automated DHSES E-Grants System operated by the State of New York Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services (DHSES). The system allows an agency to complete an application electronically and submit it over the Internet. If upon reading this RFA you are interested in completing a grant application, and you have not previously been registered to use the DHSES E-Grants system, your agency will need to register and be assigned a username and password. The Registration Request Form can be found at the following Internet address: <http://www.dhses.ny.gov/grants/> . Instructions for use of the E-Grants system by a nonprofit organization can be found at the Internet address above in the form of a tutorial.

Should you have difficulty in accessing or using the E-Grants system, please call 1-866-837-9133 for assistance.

# ATTACHMENT B

## 2012 NSGP Investment Justification and Selection Criteria

Question	Scoring Criteria
<b>I. APPLICANT INFORMATION</b>	
<p><b>Identify the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal Name of the Organization</li> <li>• Physical Address of the Facility to include the City and/or County Name</li> <li>• Year the Original Facility was Constructed</li> <li>• Organization Type (Short description of organization's ideology, beliefs and mission)</li> <li>• 501(c)(3) Number (If Applicable)</li> <li>• Dun and Bradstreet Number<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• FY 2012 Urban Area<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• FY 2012 Federal Funding Request</li> <li>• FY 2012 NSGP Total Project Cost</li> <li>• Any Current Contract with DHS<sup>3</sup> (Yes/No – if yes, please describe)</li> <li>• Investment Phase - New or Ongoing</li> </ul> <p><b>(1,500 character limit not including spaces)</b></p>	<p>This information will not be scored</p>
<b>II. BACKGROUND</b>	
<p><b>Background:</b> Describe the nonprofit organization including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership and community served</li> <li>• Symbolic value of the site(s) as a highly recognized national or historical institution that renders the site as a possible target of terrorism</li> <li>• Any role in responding to or recovering from terrorist attacks</li> </ul> <p><b>(1,800 Character limit not including spaces)</b></p>	<p>The information provided will be scored in terms of its contribution to setting context and its relationship to other questions. Out of 40 points, this section is worth 2 possible points.</p>

<sup>1</sup> Applications can only be submitted with a **current** and **valid** DUNS Number; pending DUNS numbers will **not** be accepted.

<sup>2</sup> The applicant **must** be located within one of the specific UASI-eligible Urban Areas listed in the FY 2012 NSGP FOA. Please refer to Appendix A – FY2012 UASI-Eligible Urban Areas to determine the organization's Urban Area designation.

<sup>3</sup> This does not include any DHS or NSGP grant funds previously awarded to the nonprofit organization.

Question	Scoring Criteria
<b>III. RISK</b>	
<p><b>Risk:</b> DHS defines risk as the product of three principal variables: <i>Threat</i>, <i>Vulnerability</i>, and <i>Consequences</i>. In the space below, describe findings from previously conducted risk assessments, including A) Threats, B) Vulnerabilities, and C) Potential Consequences of an attack.  <b>(2,200 character limit not including spaces)</b></p>	<p>The information provided will be scored based on the indication of an understanding of the organization’s risk, including threat and vulnerabilities, as well as potential consequences of an attack. Out of 40 points, this section is worth 12 possible points.</p>
<p><b>III. A. Threat:</b> In considering threat, the applicant should discuss the identification and substantiation of prior threats or attacks against the nonprofit organization or closely related organization by a terrorist organization, network, or cell. The applicant should also discuss findings from risk assessment, police findings, and/or insurance claims.</p>	
<p><b>III. B. Vulnerabilities:</b> In considering vulnerabilities, the applicant should discuss the organization’s susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack.</p>	
<p><b>III.C. Potential Consequences:</b> In considering potential consequences, the applicant should discuss potential negative effects on the organization’s asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack.</p>	
<b>IV. TARGET HARDENING</b>	
<p><b>Target Hardening:</b> In this section, describe the proposed target hardening activity, including the total Federal funds requested, that addresses the identified threat or vulnerability. Allowable costs are focused on target hardening activities as well as security-related training courses and programs limited to the protection of critical infrastructure key resources, including physical and cyber security, target hardening, and terrorism awareness/employee preparedness. Funding can also be used for the acquisition and installation of security equipment on real property (including buildings and improvements) owned or leased by the nonprofit organization, specifically in prevention of and/or in protection against the risk of a terrorist attack. This equipment is <b>limited to two</b> categories of items on the Authorized Equipment List (AEL).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical Security Enhancement Equipment (AEL Category 14)</li> <li>• Inspection and Screening Systems (AEL Category 15)</li> </ul> <p>The equipment categories are listed on the web based AEL on the Responder Knowledge Base (RKB), which is sponsored by DHS and located at <a href="http://www.rkb.us/">http://www.rkb.us/</a>. The description must identify the respective AEL category for <b>all</b> requested equipment.  <b>(2,200 Character limit not including spaces)</b></p>	<p>Target hardening activity and impact address prevention of, protection against, and/or mitigation of the identified risk(s). Out of 40 points, this section is worth 8 possible points.</p>

Question	Scoring Criteria
<b>V. MILESTONES</b>	
<p><b>Milestones:</b> Provide description and associated key activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance. Start dates should reflect the start of the associated key activities and end dates should reflect when the <b>milestone event will occur</b>.</p> <p><b>(1,000 character limit not including spaces)</b></p>	<p>Milestones collectively present a clear sequence of events that will allow the Investment to reach its objectives for this period of performance. Out of 40 possible points, this section is worth 9 possible points.</p>
<b>VI. PROJECT MANAGEMENT</b>	
<p><b>Describe the project management, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who will manage the project</li> <li>• Description of any challenges to the effective implementation of this project</li> <li>• Coordination of the project with State and local homeland security partners</li> </ul> <p><b>(2,000 character limit not including spaces)</b></p>	<p>Response describes, at a high-level, the roles and responsibilities of the management team, governance structures, and subject matter expertise required to manage the Investment. Out of 40 points, this section is worth 5 possible points.</p>
<b>VII. IMPACT</b>	
<p><b>Impact:</b> What measurable outputs and outcomes will indicate that this Investment is successful at the end of the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance? What specific NPG core capabilities does this investment work to achieve? Explain how this Investment supports the building or sustaining of these NPG core capabilities.</p> <p><b>(2,200 character limit not including spaces)</b></p>	<p>Response describes how the outcomes will mitigate risks outlined in the Background and Risk sections, as well as how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified NPG core capabilities. (See <a href="http://www.fema.gov/prepared/ppd8.shtm#3">http://www.fema.gov/prepared/ppd8.shtm#3</a>)</p> <p>Out of 40 points, this section is worth 4 possible points.</p>
<b>BONUS</b>	
<b>FUNDING HISTORY</b>	
<p><b>Funding History – Previous Request Name and Funding:</b> If the nonprofit organization has received NSGP funding in the past, provide the funding source, funding amount, funding year, and the investment type</p> <p><b>(700 character limit not including spaces)</b></p>	<p>Due to the competitive nature of this program, preference will be given to nonprofit organizations that have not received prior years funding. Applicants that have not received NSGP funding in the past will receive an additional one bonus point to their total State application score at the time of submission to FEMA.</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

## **Application Selection Process**

Applications will be reviewed in two phases to leverage local knowledge and understanding of the applicant's risk of a terrorist attack, while also ensuring coordination and alignment with Federal, State, and local preparedness efforts.

**State Review:** Applications should be submitted by the nonprofit organization to the SAA/UAWG, **no later than 11:59 p.m.** on April 16, 2012 to ensure adequate time for a State review of nonprofit applications.

The SAA, in coordination with the UAWG, is encouraged to conduct an initial review of all submitted application from nonprofit organizations to first determine eligibility based on the established criteria. Once eligibility has been determined, the SAA with review and score compliant IJs using the FY2012 NSGP Scoring Worksheet. The SAA should provide the scores from the State review along with a prioritized list of NSGP projects. Each application should receive a unique rank. Rankings should be developed based on these two factors:

- Need – The relative need for the nonprofit organization compared to the other applications
- Impact – The potential impact of the nonprofit organization in achieving maximum prevention and/or protection results at minimal cost

The SAA should ensure that information noted in the Prioritization on Investment Justifications accurately reflects the data noted in each organization's IJ. While completing the Prioritization of Investment Justifications, the SAA should verify the Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number and legal organization name. Tracker information submitted by the SAA pertaining to a nonprofit (s) "Organization Type" and "Total Project Cost" will be considered during FEMA's review and scoring process.

## **Federal Review:**

**The highest-scoring IJ's from each submitting Urban Area** will be reviewed by a panel of Federal evaluators. In order to determine the number of applications that will advance to the Federal Review, FEMA will multiply the available FY2012 USGP funding by 1.5 (150%). Applicants will then be selected from each submitting Urban Area, based on their State scores, using a top-down approach until the cumulative funding amount requested has reached 150 percent (150%).

## **Final Score**

To calculate the final score, the sum of each applicant's Federal and State scores will be multiplied by a factor of three (3) for nonprofit groups that are at a high risk of terrorist attacks due to their ideology, beliefs and mission, by a factor of two (2) for medical and educational institutions, and by a factor of one (1) for all others. All final application scores will then be sorted in descending order and awardess will be selected for funding from highest to lowest until the available FY 2012 NSGP funding has been exhausted. In the event of a tie during the funding

determination process, priority will be given to nonprofit organizations that have not received prior year funding and those ranked highest by their SAA. FEMA will use the final results to make funding recommendations to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

**NOTE: Upon award, recipients may only fund Investments that were included within the FY 2012 IJs that were submitted to FEMA and evaluated through the Federal review process.**

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2012 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)  
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

State

Urban Area

Name of the Nonprofit Organization

FY 2012 NSGP Federal Funding Request

Scoring Legend

Did Not	The applicant provided <b>no</b> response
Poor	The applicant's response is <b>incomplete</b> and <b>does not</b> address all of the required information
Partial	The applicant's response is <b>complete</b> but <b>minimally</b> addresses all of the required information
Adequate	The applicant's response is <b>complete</b> and <b>moderately</b> addresses all of the required information
Thorough	The applicant's response is <b>complete</b> and <b>fully</b> addresses all of the required information

I. Applicant Information (Unscored)

1. **Did the applicant provide all of the required information?**
- No** The applicant **did not** provide all the required information
- Yes** The applicant **did** provide all of the required information

II. Background (Total of 2 possible points)

2. **Did the applicant provide a description of their nonprofit organization to include:**
- \* Membership and community served
  - \* Symbolic value of the site(s) as a highly recognized national or historic institution that renders the site as a possible target of terrorism
  - \* Any role in responding to or recovering from terrorist attacks
- 0 = The applicant **did not** provide any of the required information regarding their nonprofit organization
- 1 = The applicant provided **some** of the required information regarding their nonprofit organization
- 2 = The applicant provided **all** of the required information regarding their nonprofit organization
- Score
- 

III. Risk (Total of 12 possible points)

3. **In considering threat, how well did the applicant address findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims?**
- 0 = The applicant **did not** address findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims
- 1 = The applicant **poorly** addressed findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims
- 2 = The applicant **partially** addressed findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims
- 3 = The applicant **adequately** addressed findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims
- 4 = The applicant **thoroughly** addressed findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims
- Score
- 
4. **In considering vulnerabilities, how well did the applicant address the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack?**
- 0 = The applicant **did not** address the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack
- 1 = The applicant **poorly** addressed the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack
- 2 = The applicant **partially** addressed the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack
- 3 = The applicant **adequately** addressed the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack
- 4 = The applicant **thoroughly** addressed the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack
- Score
-

5. **In considering potential consequences, how well did the applicant address potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack?**
- 0 = The applicant **did not** address potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack
  - 1 = The applicant **poorly** addressed potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack
  - 2 = The applicant **partially** addressed potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack
  - 3 = The applicant **adequately** addressed potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack
  - 4 = The applicant **thoroughly** addressed potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack

Score

IV. Target Hardening (Total of 8 possible points)

6. **Did the applicant describe how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)?**
- 0 = The applicant **did not** provide a description of how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)
  - 1 = The applicant provided a **poor** description of how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)
  - 2 = The applicant provided a **partial** description of how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)
  - 3 = The applicant provided an **adequate** description of how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)
  - 4 = The applicant provided a **thorough** description of how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)

Score

7. **Did the applicant's proposed target hardening activity focus on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack?**
- 0 = The applicant's target hardening activity **did not** focus on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack
  - 1 = The applicant's target hardening activity **poorly** focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack
  - 2 = The applicant's target hardening activity **partially** focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack
  - 3 = The applicant's target hardening activity **adequately** focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack
  - 4 = The applicant's target hardening activity **thoroughly** focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack

Score

V. Milestones (Total of 9 possible points)

8. **Did the applicant provide specific milestones that present a clear sequence of events that will allow the investment to reach its objectives during the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance?**
- 0 = **No**, the applicant **did not** provide specific milestones that present a clear sequence of events that will allow the investment to reach its objectives during the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance
  - 1 = **Yes**, the applicant **did** provide specific milestones that present a clear sequence of events that will allow the investment to reach its objectives during the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance

Score

9. **How well do the milestones collectively present a clear sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicants to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance?**

- 0 = The milestones identified **do not** present a clear sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicant to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance
- 1 = The milestones present a **poorly** defined sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicant to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance
- 2 = The milestones present a **partially** defined sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicant to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance
- 3 = The milestones present an **adequately** defined sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicant to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance
- 4 = The milestones present a **thoroughly** defined sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicant to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance

Score

10. **How well did the applicant describe the milestones as well as associated key activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance?**

- 0 = The applicant **did not** provide a description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance
- 1 = The applicant provided a **poor** description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance
- 2 = The applicant provided a **partial** description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance
- 3 = The applicant provided an **adequate** description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance
- 4 = The applicant provided a **thorough** description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2012 NSGP period of performance

Score

#### VI. Project Management (Total of 5 possible points)

11. **Has the applicant described, at high level, the roles and responsibilities of the management team, governance structures, and subject matter expertise required in managing the Investment?**

- 0 = **No**, the applicant **did not** describe the management team's roles and responsibilities, governance structure, or subject matter expertise required to manage the Investment
- 1 = **Yes**, the applicant **did** describe the management team's roles and responsibilities, governance structure, and subject matter expertise required to manage the Investment

Score

12. **How well did the applicant justify the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment?**

- 0 = The applicant **did not** justify the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment
- 1 = The applicant **poorly** justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment
- 2 = The applicant **partially** justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment
- 3 = The applicant **adequately** justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment
- 4 = The applicant **thoroughly** justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment

Score

VII. Impact (Total of 4 possible points)

13. Did the applicant provide a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risks outlined in the Background and Risk sections, as well as how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified NPG Core Capabilities?

0 = The applicant **did not** provide a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risks outlined in the Background and Risk sections, as well as how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified NPG Core Capabilities

1 = The applicant **poorly** provided a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risks outlined in the Background and Risk sections, as well as how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified NPG Core Capabilities

2 = The applicant **partially** provided a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risks outlined in the Background and Risk sections, as well as how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified NPG Core Capabilities

3 = The applicant **adequately** provided a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risks outlined in the Background and Risk sections, as well as how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified NPG Core Capabilities

4 = The applicant **thoroughly** provided a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risks outlined in the Background and Risk sections, as well as how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified NPG Core Capabilities

Score

Total Score

**Total Investment Justification Score:**

Based on a possible score of 40, this Investment Justification scored a

## Appendix D - FY 2012 NSGP Priorities

### Presidential Policy Directive 8: National Preparedness

Presidential Policy Directive 8: National Preparedness (PPD-8), signed on March 30, 2011, describes the Nation's approach to preparing for the threats and hazards that pose the greatest risk to the security of the United States. National preparedness is the shared responsibility of our whole community. Every member contributes, including individuals, communities, the private and nonprofit sectors, faith-based organizations, and Federal, State and local governments. We describe our security and resilience posture through the core capabilities that are necessary to address risks, and we will use an integrated, layered, and all-of-Nation approach as our foundation. We define success as a secure and resilient Nation with the capabilities required across the whole community to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from the threats and hazards that pose the greatest risk.

National preparedness is the shared responsibility of all levels of government, the private and nonprofit sectors, and individual citizens. The objective of PPD-8 is to facilitate an integrated, all-of-Nation, risk informed, capabilities-based approach to preparedness.

Using the core capabilities, we achieve the NPG by:

- Preventing, avoiding, or stopping a threatened or an actual act of terrorism.
- Protecting our citizens, residents, visitors, and assets against the greatest threats and hazards in a manner that allows our interests, aspirations, and way of life to thrive.
- Mitigating the loss of life and property by lessening the impact of future disasters.
- Responding quickly to save lives, protect property and the environment, and meet basic human needs in the aftermath of a catastrophic incident.
- Recovering through a focus on the timely restoration, strengthening, and revitalization of infrastructure, housing and a sustainable economy, as well as the health, social, cultural, historic, and environmental fabric of communities affect by a catastrophic incident.

The core capabilities contained in the NPG are the distinct critical elements necessary for our success. They are highly interdependent and will require us to use existing preparedness networks and activities, improve training and exercise programs, promote innovation, and ensure that the administrative, finance, and logistics systems are in place to support these capabilities. The core capabilities represent an evolution from the Target Capabilities List (TCL). The transition from TCLs to core capabilities expands the focus to include mitigation and allows greater focus on prevention and protection activities.

To support building, sustaining, and delivering these core capabilities grantees will use elements of the National Preparedness system (NPS). The NPS is to be an integrated set of guidance, programs, and processes that can be implemented and measured at all levels of government, thereby enabling the Nation to achieve the Goal.

### **Building and Sustaining Core Capabilities**

Capabilities are the means to accomplish a mission, function, or objective based on the performance of related tasks, under specified conditions, to target levels of performance. The most essential of these capabilities are core capabilities identified in the NPG. Complex and far reaching threats and hazards require the whole community to integrate preparedness efforts in order to build, sustain, and deliver the core capabilities and achieve the desired outcomes identified in the NPG.

Working together, subject matter experts, government officials, and elected leaders can develop strategies to allocate resources effectively, as well as leverage available assistance to reduce risk. These strategies consider both how to sustain current levels of capability and address gaps in order to achieve the NPG. Achieving the NPG will require participation and resource support from all levels of government. Not all capabilities can be addressed in a given funding cycle, nor can funding be expected to flow from any one source. Officials must prioritize the achievement of capabilities to most effectively ensure security and resilience while understanding the effects of not addressing identified gaps. Building and sustaining capabilities will include a combination of organizational resources, equipment, training, and education. Grants and technical assistance may also be available to support building and sustaining capabilities. Consideration must also be given to finding, connecting to, and strengthening community resources by leveraging the expertise and capacity of individuals, communities, private and nonprofit sectors, faith-based organizations, and a levels of government. Jurisdictions may also choose to use mutual aid agreements to fill gaps or work with partners to develop regional capabilities. Ultimately, a jurisdiction may need to rely on other levels of government to address a gap in capability. This expectation should be communicated well before the time arises when the capabilities are more urgently needed.

As these issues are considered in light of the eligible activities under NSGP, an effective risk assessment must guide jurisdictions' efforts. This risk picture will cover the range of threats and hazards, from those a community faces daily to those infrequent events that would stress the core capabilities of a jurisdiction. Coupled with the desired outcomes established by a community, this combined perspective is crucial to enabling all levels of government to effectively estimate the level of capabilities required to address its risks.

Files and information on PPD-8 can be found at <http://www.fema.gov/prepared/ppd8.shtm#3> . Download the pdf document entitled *National Preparedness Goal*.

The President's FY 2012 budget has proposed substantial changes to DHS grant programs. FY 2012 grant programs will prepare grantees for the transition to new requirements in FY 2013 in the following ways:

- Begin the process of transitioning from separate preparedness grant programs in FY 2011 to a more streamlined model within the construct of the FY 2012 appropriations
- Continue the transition to address the core capabilities outlined in the NPG
- Implement a two year period of performance with very limited extensions

Grantees are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the grant proposals in the Presidents FY 2013 budget.

### **FY 2012 NSGP and Alignment to PPD-8**

The FY 2012 NSGP plays an important role in the implementation of PPD-8 by supporting the development and sustainment of core capabilities. Core capabilities are essential for the execution of each of the five mission areas outlined in the NPG. The development and sustainment of these core capabilities are not exclusive to any single level of government or organization, but rather require the combined effort of the whole community. The FY 2012 NSGP supports all core capabilities in the Prevention, Protection, Mitigation, Response, and Recovery mission areas based on allowable costs.