



**Homeland
Security**

**G&T Information Bulletin
No. 202 February 8, 2006**

TO: All State Administrative Agency Heads
All State Administrative Agency Points of Contact
All State Homeland Security Directors

FROM: Tracy A. Henke
Executive Director, Office of Grants and Training

SUBJECT: Application Review and Scoring Approach for Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program

The FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Application Kit was released on December 2, 2005, which outlines the application process that States and Urban Areas must use to request FY 2006 HSGP funding by utilizing an Investment Justification. The Investment Justification Template and the Investment Justification User's Manual were both released on December 9, 2005. This Information Bulletin provides more detail on the application review process and scoring approach, as well as information on making final investment decisions.

A. Review Process

All Investment Justifications will be reviewed and scored by peer review panels, representative of States, Territories, Urban Areas, and Federal Agencies. Each peer review panel will include a balance of representation from each region (Eastern, Central, and Western) and from both large and small States. The peer review panels will review and score each individual Investment included in the Investment Justification, as well as the Investment Justification submission in its entirety. In addition, the peer review panels will review the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan to ensure alignment among Initiatives from the Enhancement Plan with proposed Investments.

After reviewing Investments independently, the peer review panels will convene during the week of April 3, 2006, in the greater Washington, DC metropolitan area to discuss the findings of their review, and to develop final scores and comments for each Investment Justification.

B. Scoring Approach

Each Investment will be reviewed and scored using discrete criteria to determine how effective the proposed solution addresses the identified need. Evaluation criteria have been developed

based strictly on the guidance provided in the Investment Justification User's Manual. The specific criteria that will be the basis for scoring are included as Appendix A to this Information Bulletin. Individual Investments will be reviewed against the evaluation criteria to determine a score. Then, the individual Investment scores will be averaged to determine the *total Investment* score. **Since individual Investment scores will be averaged, States and Urban Areas should only submit well planned and sound Investments.** Submitting the maximum number of Investments may actually decrease the overall State/Urban Area score if all Investments are not sound.

Additionally, the Investment Justification submission will be given an *overall Investment Justification* score based on the completeness, reasonableness, vision, and innovativeness of the proposed Investments. The *overall Investment Justification* score will be determined by:

- Relevance to implementation of the National Preparedness Goal;
- Connection to both the spirit and scope of the Enhancement Plan;
- Extent to which the Investments portray a complete picture of plans for the homeland security program (for example, by demonstrating intra- or inter-state collaboration; appropriate management, governance, and stakeholder communication);
- Innovativeness of the proposed solutions to address needs; and
- Overall feasibility and reasonableness of the proposed solutions.

Finally, each State and Urban Area will receive a *risk* score. The FY 2006 DHS risk methodology represents a major step forward in the analysis of the risk of terrorism, with tremendous gains made in both the quality and specificity of information and analysis incorporated within the model. Risk is treated as a function of three variables:

- Threat, or the likelihood of a type of attack that might be attempted
- Vulnerability, or the likelihood that an attacker would succeed
- Consequence, or the impact of an attack occurring

Fundamentally, the FY 2006 methodology addresses two separate, but complementary, types of risk: asset-based risk and geographically-based risk. Considered together, these two calculations provide an estimate of total terrorism risk, evaluating both risks to assets as well as risk to populations and geographic areas.

This formula-driven *risk* score will be used along with the peer reviewer-given *total Investment* score and *overall Investment Justification* score to determine final funding allocations.

C. Final Allocations

Upon conclusion of the review process, the Office of Grants and Training (G&T) will announce final allocation totals for each State and Urban Area by May 31, 2006. Separate amounts will be awarded for each grant program within the FY 2006 HSGP. States and Urban Areas will receive comments from the peer review panels for review and consideration along with their grant announcements.

The State Administrative Agency (SAA) will have 60 days after receipt of the awards in which to submit a prioritization of Investments they intend to fund using their FY 2006 HSGP

allocations. The SAA must also submit a certification that funds have been passed through to local units of government (to include the identification of sub-grantees and sub-award amounts). The final list of prioritized Investments must be chosen from the Investments included in the State's or Urban Area's Investment Justification submission; **no new Investments may be proposed for funding.**

Peer reviewers will place a special condition(s) on Investments that fall below a certain score threshold at the time of the panel convention. If a State or Urban Area still intends to utilize FY 2006 HSGP funds for a low-scoring Investment, the special condition(s) must be met before funding can be obligated towards that Investment. Further information for meeting the special condition(s) will be provided by the peer reviewers and the Preparedness Officer at the time of grant award.

The signed award document with special conditions must be returned to G&T's Office of Grant Operations (OGO). Each State's obligation period must be met within **60 days** of the award date. For more information on award and reporting requirements, refer to section V of the FY 2006 HSGP Grant Guidance and Application Kit.

A list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) is included as Appendix B to this information Bulletin, and will be updated as necessary. Additional questions may be directed to your Preparedness Officer or the Centralized Scheduling and Information Desk at askcsid@dhs.gov, 1-800-368-6498.

Appendix A: Investment Justification Review and Scoring Criteria for Solution Effectiveness

I. Background

Question	Criteria
I.A. Provide a summary description of this Investment and its purpose.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows clear purpose • Articulates clear end-result of using FY 2006 HSGP funds • Describes expected outcomes • Explains how outcomes relate to the purpose • Explains how outcomes will be achieved
I.B. Explain how the Investment will support the implementation of an Initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relates to at least one Enhancement Plan Initiative • Clearly describes how the Investment relates to the Initiative(s) identified • Discusses the specific areas of the Initiative that are/will be addressed by the Investment • Draws specific linkages to at least one of the Homeland Security Strategy goals and objectives • Explains how the Investment supports achievement of identified goals and objectives
I.C. List up to four National Priority(ies) this Investment <u>primarily</u> supports.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selects appropriate National Priority(s) • The Investment directly supports the selected Priorities
I.D. List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this Investment <u>primarily</u> supports.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selects at least one Target Capability • The Investment directly supports the selected Target Capabilities

II. Regionalization

Question	Criteria
II.A. Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this Investment covers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly defines Geographic areas that are unambiguous • Clearly defines Demographic areas that are unambiguous • Describes how the areas were determined • Discusses whether or not the Investment has the potential to affect areas outside the identified geographic and demographic area

Question	Criteria
II.B. Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this Investment over the identified geographic area(s).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discusses regional partnerships • Identifies specific multi-jurisdictional/disciplinary stakeholders • Describes the strategies that stakeholder groups have, or will employ, to effectively communicate and work together • Discusses mitigating duplication of effort • Leverages common solutions across multiple jurisdictions and disciplines to take advantage of all available strengths
II.C. Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (inter- and intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this Investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this Investment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies collaboration processes and communication strategies with other regions • Explains why specific individuals/groups were selected to collaborate with • Explains how those outside individuals/groups will benefit • Puts forth a general collaboration strategy with a basic timeline • Explains operational activities or exercises that are being planned/developed with outside areas

III. Impact

Question	Criteria
III.A. Discuss anticipated impacts of this Investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this Investment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlines high-level impacts of this Investment • Explains how HSGP funding will promulgate positive impacts of the Investment • Clearly links impacts and specific geographic/demographic areas outlined in II.A. • Identifies other jurisdictions/disciplines that may benefit, or makes clear that no other entities will benefit
III.B. Discuss how the implementation of this Investment will decrease or mitigate risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets specific consequences, vulnerabilities, and threats • Provides a rationale of choices • Discusses how the Investment will mitigate each identified consequence, vulnerability, and threat • Discusses specific benefits of mitigating the consequence, vulnerability, or threat

Question	Criteria
III.C. Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this Investment are.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains the result of not implementing the Investment (considers the impact on current vulnerabilities or threats and if there will be any new risks) • Articulates that each vulnerability or threat will either increase, decrease, or stay the same without this Investment • Identifies specific vulnerabilities or consequences that will not be mitigated

IV. Funding and Implementation Plan

Question	Criteria
IV.A. Investment Funding Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests funding for this Investment only • Reasonably links grant sources and activities outlined in this Investment • Reasonably links allowable cost categories and activities outlined in this Investment • If applicable, identifies non-HSGP sources • Requests reasonable HSGP amount given the scope of the Investment
IV.B. Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this Investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes the necessary steps required for successful implementation • Describes potential implementation challenges • Explains why the identified implementation challenges are challenges to this Investment
IV.C. Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discusses each challenge with specific solutions/approaches • Discusses proactive measures • Discusses measures to mitigate challenges as they arise
IV.D. Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this Investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this Investment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links specific skill-sets to implementation and oversight of this Investment • Describes how the management roles and responsibilities will be assigned to the management team • Discusses organization and teamwork strategies to manage this Investment

Question	Criteria
<p>IV.E. Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustainment of this Investment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies non-HSGP funding sources that will support the Investment • Discusses for what those other sources will be used • If no other funding sources are identified, explains why
<p>IV.F. Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this Investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies only milestones that are critical to this Investment • Identifies milestones that are relevant only to this Investment, only to FY 2006 HSGP funds, and only to the 24-month award period • Keeps milestones to high-level • Includes major tasks and dates for all milestones. • Related Activities are relevant to this particular milestone
<p>IV.G. Describe the planned duration for this overall Investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the Investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives an estimated total lifespan • If applicable, explains how this Investment will be funded after FY 2006 HSGP funds are expended • Addresses resources needs • Addresses critical governance needs • Lists critical milestones that occur after the FY 2006 HSGP award period

Office of Grants and Training FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Application Review and Scoring Frequently Asked Questions

I. Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Application

Q. I.1: What should States include with their HSGP grant application?

- A. States will submit applications for FY 2006 HSGP funding through the online Grants Management System (GMS) at <https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov/>. A complete HSGP application will include the State's Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, a State Investment Justification, and one Investment Justification for each eligible Urban Area within the State. Each Investment Justification may contain up to 15 individual Investments. For information on eligible Urban Areas, see Office of Grants and Training (G&T) Bulletin No. 200, dated January 3, 2006. Applications should also include the SF-424, DUNS number, and applicable Urban Area information. For further information on completing your grant application, please review the FY 2006 HSGP Grant Guidance and Application Kit.

Q. I.2: What is the deadline for submitting FY 2006 HSGP applications?

- A. The deadline for submissions is March 2, 2006. No exceptions to the submission deadline will be made.

Q. I.3: Can agencies other than the State Administrative Agency (SAA) apply for funding under the HSGP?

- A. The Governor of each State has designated one SAA, which has sole authority within the State to apply for and administer HSGP funds. The FY 2006 HSGP integrates the State Homeland Security Program (SHSP), Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI), Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP), Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS), and Citizen Corps Program (CCP) into a single grant program.

While only SAAs are eligible to apply for HSGP funds, SAAs should collaborate with the appropriate State and local stakeholders (as identified in both the FY 2006 HSGP guidance and the Program and Capability Review Guidebook) to develop their Enhancement Plan and Investment Justifications. In addition, SAAs will be responsible for submitting Investment Justifications on behalf of eligible Urban Areas for UASI funding.

II. Program and Capability Review Enhancement Plan

Q. II.1: How does the Enhancement Plan relate to and support the FY 2006 HSGP application process?

- A. The Enhancement Plan will help States identify strengths and weaknesses within their homeland security programs and capabilities, prioritize focus areas, and develop high-level Initiatives to address the most critical needs. The Enhancement Plan is an

enterprise-wide program management plan that describes how the State intends to address critical needs both within and across regions. In addition, the Enhancement Plan is the foundation for building an Investment Justification to request funding through the FY 2006 HSGP. States will determine what areas from the Enhancement Plan they wish to use FY 2006 HSGP funding to address, and then create an Investment Justification for that request. States are required to submit their Enhancement Plan as part of their FY 2006 HSGP application.

Q. II.2: What is the difference between an Investment (Investment Justification) and an Initiative (Enhancement Plan)?

- A.** Initiatives are defined as the Statewide, cross-jurisdictional aggregation of related projects geared towards achieving a common State homeland security goal/objective, National Priority, and/or Target Capability. Initiatives will be developed as part of the Program and Capability Review process and will identify the means by which States (and regions/jurisdictions within that State) will address or maintain strengths or weaknesses. Initiatives will comprise the Enhancement Plan, which is intended to be a multi-year, multi-jurisdictional, multi-disciplinary, long term management plan that will leverage a variety of funding sources and resources.

An Investment is the application of FY 2006 HSGP funding towards the achievement of one or more Initiatives identified in a State Program and Capability Enhancement Plan. Investments can support all or part of an Initiative, but must specifically describe how FY 2006 HSGP funds will be utilized in the 24-month grant cycle.

Q. II.3: How is the Enhancement Plan related to the Investment Justification review and scoring process? Will the Enhancement Plan be scored?

- A.** The Investments proposed by States and Urban Areas in their Investment Justifications must relate back to an Initiative from the State's Enhancement Plan. The Enhancement Plan is a required component of the FY 2006 HSGP application. While the Enhancement Plans submitted by the States will **not** be scored, they will be used by the peer reviewers to serve as a contextual reference for the Investments proposed in the Investment Justification. Peer reviewers will reference the Enhancement Plan during their review of the Investment Justifications to ensure that the proposed Investments align with the spirit and scope of the Initiatives outlined in the Enhancement Plan.

Q. II.4: If a State or Urban Area references a multi-jurisdictional or multi-agency agreement (e.g., a Memorandum of Understanding/Agreement) in their Enhancement Plan or Investment Justification, should they include a copy with their grant application?

- A.** States and Urban Areas should not include copies of agreements referenced in the Enhancement Plan or Investment Justification with their grant application, but should retain a copy of the document(s) on file for review by G&T Preparedness Officers upon request.

Q. II.5: Do States have to use the template format provided for the Enhancement Plan and Initiatives, or can they develop their Enhancement Plan in their own format?

- A. States are strongly encouraged to utilize the template provided in order to complete their Enhancement Plan. However, they are not required to use the template since the Enhancement Plan is meant as a program management tool for the State.

If a State develops its own format for the Enhancement Plan, it still **must address the five questions in the Initiative Plan Template**, but can add additional information as necessary. The State must also still complete and submit the Enhancement Plan Analysis Summary Sheet, and the Enhancement Plan Cover Sheet as part of the FY 2006 HSGP application.

Q. II.6: Should Urban Areas develop and submit their own Enhancement Plans?

- A. Urban Areas should not complete separate Enhancement Plans; their needs should be addressed in the State's Enhancement Plan. The Investment Justification is the only document Urban Areas should be submitting separate from the State, and their Investments must be tied back to the State's Enhancement Plan.

Q. II.7: As part of the Program and Capability Review and Enhancement Plan development, can a State exceed the recommended three to five additional priority capabilities identified in their homeland security strategies to include capabilities that are a priority for Urban Areas?

- A. The State may elect to address more than the recommended 3-5 additional priority capabilities. This supplemental analysis should be integrated into the overall program plan and approach included in the Enhancement Plan.

III. Investment Justification

Q. III.1: What is the Investment Justification and how does it support the FY 2006 grant application process?

- A. The Investment Justification will be the method by which States and Urban Areas formally request FY 2006 HSGP funding across three HSGP programs: SHSP, LETPP, and UASI. Additionally, States must use the Investment Justification to demonstrate their planned use of funds for MMRS and CCP.

Through the Investment Justification, States and Urban Areas will describe specific funding and implementation approaches that will help achieve Initiatives outlined in the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, which results from the Program and Capability Review. The targeted application of FY 2006 HSGP funding towards the achievement of an Initiative from the Enhancement Plan is called an *Investment*. States and Urban Areas will use the Investment Justification to request funding they wish to allocate to those areas from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan they have identified as priorities in the near-term.

Investments will be evaluated based on the effectiveness of a State's plan to address priorities it has outlined in the Enhancement Plan, thereby reducing overall risk. This approach creates incentives for States and Urban Areas to develop innovative solutions

and effectively leverage HSGP funds in the management and implementation of their overall homeland security program.

Q. III.2: Will any additional assistance be provided to States and Urban Areas in completing the FY 2006 HSGP application and Investment Justifications?

- A. DHS will not be offering technical assistance on completing the HSGP application, since the grants are competitive. Additionally, as described in Information Bulletin #199, G&T Preparedness Officers are not permitted to aid States with developing their Investment Justifications.

Q. III.3: How should multi-State efforts be accounted for in the Investment Justification?

- A. If two or more States plan to request funding for a multi-State effort, each State will be responsible for documenting this effort in their Investment Justification, as well as the amount of requested funding that will be allocated to their State in this effort.

If one State is requesting total funding for an Investment on behalf of other States, each State is still required to document this effort in their Investment Justification; however, only one State is responsible for requesting funding. States requesting the funding should clearly indicate how funds will be distributed amongst all States involved in the multi-State effort. Participating States that are not requesting funds should not fund the Investment Funding Plan, but should explain the relationship with the other State that is requesting the funds related to the multi-State effort in their Investment Justification.

Q. III.4: Is there a limit to the amount of HSGP funding States can request in their Investment Justifications?

- A. States and Urban Areas are not limited in the amount of funding they can request; however, each individual Investment, as well as the overall Investment Justification, will be reviewed and evaluated to ensure that funding requests are reasonable and justified. To that end, States and Urban Areas must ensure that the amount of funding requested directly links to the key activities and needs outlined in their Investment, and that estimated costs for these activities are realistic. In addition, States and Urban Areas should clearly indicate how other resources will be leveraged to support the proposed Investment. Furthermore, States will know the actual allocation amounts for MMRS and CCP before the application deadline. These exact figures should be reflected in the State's Investment Justification.

Q. III.5: Should Urban Areas submit a separate Investment Justification?

- A. Eligible Urban Areas are responsible for completing an Investment Justification that requests only UASI funds. The appropriate State SAA will submit the Urban Area's Investment Justification as an attachment to the State's HSGP grant application in GMS. States should not request UASI funds in their Investment Justifications on behalf of Urban Areas. If the State will retain and manage a portion of UASI funds, Urban Areas should indicate this in their Investment Justification.

Q. III.6: Are the Urban Areas that are eligible for sustainment funding in FY 2006 required to complete an Investment Justification?

- A. All 46 eligible Urban Areas (including those identified as “sustainment only” Urban Areas) must complete an Investment Justification to receive consideration for FY 2006 UASI funding.

Q. III.7: In the Investment Justification, how should the State account for the amount awarded for MMRS and CCP? Should a single Investment be completed for MMRS and CCP, or can those funds be accounted for within other Investments?

- A. States should account for the exact amount of MMRS and CCP funding awarded in their Investment Justifications, and use the Investment Justification to explain their plans for their awarded amounts under these two programs. States can account for their MMRS and CCP funding in a single Investment to represent the total of the MMRS and CCP funds; they may also spread them across several Investments. In all cases, the total MMRS and CCP funding for the entire Investment Justification must equal the allocation amounts communicated by G&T.

IV. Application Scoring and Review

Q. IV.1: How will the FY 2006 HSGP applications be reviewed and scored?

- A. Each Investment Justification will be reviewed and scored by a peer review panel, made up of State, Urban Area, and Federal representatives. The review and scoring will focus on how well the proposed solution in each Investment meets the identified need (outlined in the Enhancement Plan), and the completeness and comprehensiveness of the Investment Justification submission as a whole; these two together will constitute the need score. Additionally, each State and Urban Area will receive a risk score, derived from a comprehensive formula. Together, risk and need will determine how SHSP, LETPP and UASI grant funding is allocated. For SHSP and LETPP, each State and Territory will receive a base amount of funds with additional funds allocated based on the risk and need scores. There is no such base for UASI funding.

Q. IV.2: How will peer reviewers be selected? How will peer reviewers be placed on panels?

- A. To ensure a fair and equitable peer review process, each State, Territory, and Urban Area has been asked to identify representatives who are able and eligible to participate in the peer review process. Representatives from Federal agencies will also participate in the panel review. Peer review panelists will be selected to create panels that are comprised of individuals from a variety of disciplines, levels of government, and regions. In addition, panelists will be selected based on their level of experience, familiarity with a broad range of homeland security issues, and familiarity with the HSGP. Careful consideration will be made in selecting and placing peer reviewers to avoid potential conflicts of interest.

Q. IV.3: To what extent will the State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies be used during the review and scoring process?

- A. The Investment Justification asks States and Urban Areas to explain how each individual Investment relates to the high-level goals and objectives outlined in their State/Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies. While the linkages drawn between the Investment and the goals and objectives will be verified, the strategies themselves will not factor into the review and scoring process.

V. Information Security

Q. V.1: How will information security be addressed during the peer review process?

- A. All information received from the States and Urban Areas in the Investment Justifications will be treated as sensitive and For Official Use Only (FOUO). DHS staff, and all peer reviewers, must meet the requirements for handling sensitive and FOUO information and comply with the handling and use of this information as outlined in DHS Management Directive 11042.1: Safeguarding Sensitive but Unclassified (For Official Use Only) Information. Also, all peer reviewers will be required to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement prior to viewing any information in the Investment Justifications.

Q. V.2: Will Statewide Enhancement Plans and Investment Justifications be available to the public in whole or in part under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)?

- A. In most instances, documentation submitted as part of an application or request for Federal funding must be made available to the public under FOIA guidelines. While the designation of information as For Official Use Only (FOUO) does not imply that the information is already exempt from disclosure under FOIA, requests under FOIA for FOUO information will be reviewed and processed in the same manner as any other FOIA request. However, there are exemptions to FOIA in cases where information released to the public may compromise the health or safety of individual citizens, or national security as a whole. To that end, much of the information contained within the Statewide Enhancement Plan, and most of the information contained within the State or Urban Area Investment Justification will have to be redacted, or eliminated, from any documentation provided to the public under FOIA.

VI. Funding Allocation

Q. VI.1: Which FY 2006 grant program allocations are based, in part, on risk and need?

- A. The grant programs that will be allocated based, at least in part, on risk and need are: SHSP, UASI, and LETPP. Each State and Territory will still receive a base allocation under SHSP and LETPP according to the USA PATRIOT Act formula, with the remainder of funds allocated based on risk and need. All UASI funding will be allocated based on risk and need. MMRS funding will continue to be distributed evenly among all MMRS jurisdictions; CCP will continue to be a formula-based program.

Q. VI.2: How will funding for SHSP, UASI, and LETPP grants be allocated to States based on risk and need?

- A. Based on direction from Congress, each State and Territory will receive a base allocation under SHSP and LETPP according to the USA PATRIOT Act formula. The remainder of funds will be allocated based on: 1) an analysis of risk at the State and Urban Area level, and 2) the effectiveness of State and Urban Area grant proposals in addressing their identified homeland security needs. All UASI funding will be allocated based on risk and need. States and Urban Areas will address their homeland security needs in their Investment Justifications.

VII. Post Award Procedures

Q. VII.1: When will FY 2006 HSGP awards be made? How will States be notified of their allocated funds?

DHS will evaluate the grant applications from March through May of 2006. G&T will announce final allocation totals for each State and Urban Area by May 31, 2006. The grant will be awarded to the respective SAA. The total FY 2006 HSGP award will be comprised of 5 separate allocations for each grant program within the FY 2006 HSGP. In addition to standard grant award materials, States and Urban Areas will receive comments from the peer review panels for review and consideration along with their grant awards.

Q. VII.2: If an Investment is rated poorly, is a State or Urban Area precluded from applying HSGP funding to that Investment?

- A. When FY 2006 HSGP grants are awarded, States will receive one amount for each of the HSGP programs (SHSP, UASI, LETPP, MMRS, and CCP). States will then have 60 days after the award date to advise G&T on how they intend to use the award. While States and Urban Areas will not be prohibited from using FY 2006 HSGP funds on poorly-rated Investments, a special condition will be placed on the grant award. States may not fund poorly-rated Investments without addressing these specific concerns identified through the peer review process, as well as sufficiently considering highly-rated Investments before considering poorly-rated Investments. States must work with their Preparedness Officer to address these concerns effectively in order to lift the special condition and apply funding to the Investment.

Based on the award allocation, States and Urban Areas may fund all or part of their proposed Investments. However, States and Urban Areas can only fund activities and projects identified in their Investment Justification, and may not fund other activities not accounted for in their initial Investment Justification submission to G&T.

Q. VII.3: What if a State or Urban Area, due to a disruptive event or significant change in circumstance, is compelled to discontinue funding to a particular Investment and/or reallocate funding to a new or different Investment at some point during the FY 2006 HSGP grant cycle?

- A. In the event that a State or Urban Area is compelled to re-prioritize their funding allocation, the State or Urban Area should immediately contact its Preparedness Officer for further instructions.

VIII. Resources

Q. VIII.1: Where can I find related Information Bulletins, such as those identifying the Urban Areas eligible to receive FY 2006 UASI funding?

- A. All Information Bulletins published by G&T are available at:
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/docs/bulletins.htm>

Q. VIII.2: Who should States contact with additional HSGP-related questions?

- A. Further questions may be directed to your State's Preparedness Officer or to the Centralized Scheduling and Information Desk (CSID) at askcsid@dhs.gov or 800-368-6498.