



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

FISCAL YEAR 2011

PORT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM

**GUIDANCE AND APPLICATION KIT
SECTION I – APPLICATION AND REVIEW
INFORMATION**

MAY 2011



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Title of Opportunity: Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Port Security Grant Program (PSGP)

Funding Opportunity Number: DHS-11-GPD-056-000-01

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 97.056

Federal Agency Name: U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

Announcement Type: Initial

Dates: Completed applications must be submitted **no later than 11:59 p.m. EDT, June 20, 2011.**

Additional Overview Information:

- **Reformatted PSGP Guidance Kit.** Due to continued stakeholder feedback and recommendations, GPD has reformatted its FY 2011 PSGP Guidance and Application Kit. The Kit is now structured into two separate documents, referred to as *Section I* and *Section II*. While both are important documents for grantees to study and thoroughly familiarize themselves with, *Section I* is intended to help grantees during the application phase of the PSGP, whereas, *Section II* is intended to help grantees in understanding the rules and regulations associated with administering federally-funded grant awards.
- **Enhanced Data Collection.** As part of the DHS Performance Management Initiatives, including the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR) Report, FEMA will enhance data collection processes and tools to assess the use and impact of FY 2011 PSGP grant funds. Grantees will not be asked to provide additional data, but may be required to modify existing data reporting processes to collect more useful performance information.
- **Investment Justifications (IJs).** Subject to available funding, for the FY 2011 and future PSGP cycles, DHS requires Group I, Group II, Group III, and All Other Port (AOPs) port areas to submit IJs with Detailed Budgets and other required documentation at the time of application, and before or on the application deadline date and time.
- **Sensitive Security Information (SSI) Requirements.** For the purposes of the Port Security Grant Program, all IJs shall be considered SSI and treated as such. This means labeling as SSI and password protecting appropriate documents prior to submission. The passwords for protected documents must be sent (separate of the documents) to the following e-mail address AskCSID@dhs.gov.

The subject line of the email should identify:

- Applicant name

- Application number

The body of the e-mail should clearly identify:

- Applicant name
- IJ number and/or summary description
- Captain of the Port (COTP) area
- Point of Contact (POC) information

NOTE: A single password should be provided for all SSI documents within the same application.

Further information regarding these requirements can be found on page 36.

CONTENTS

Contents.....	3
Part I. FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION.....	4
Part II. AWARD INFORMATION	9
A. Funding Guidelines.....	9
Part III. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION	23
A. Eligible Applicants	23
B. Governance	29
C. Other	30
Part IV. APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION.....	32
A. Address to Request Application Package	32
B. Content and Form of Application	32
C. Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation (EHP) Compliance ..	36
D. Submission Dates and Times	37
Part V. APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION	38
A. Review Criteria	38
B. Review and Selection Process.....	38
C. Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates.....	40
D. Intergovernmental Review.....	40
Part VI. OTHER INFORMATION	41
A. Investment Justification Template	41
B. Sample Budget Detail Worksheet	43
C. Sample MOU/MOA Template	47
D. Other	48

PART I.

FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

The Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) is one of five grant programs that constitute the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 focus on transportation infrastructure security activities. The PSGP is one tool in the comprehensive set of measures authorized by Congress and implemented by the Administration to strengthen the Nation's critical infrastructure against risks associated with potential terrorist attacks. Section 102 of the *Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002*, as amended (Public Law 107-295), established the PSGP at 46 U.S.C. §70107 to implement Area Maritime Transportation Security Plans and facility security plans among port authorities, facility operators, and State and local government agencies required to provide port security services. Funds for the FY 2011 PSGP are appropriated under the *Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112-10)*.

The vast majority of U.S. critical infrastructure is owned and/or operated by State, local, and private sector partners. The PSGP funds available to these entities are intended to support increased port-wide risk management; enhanced domain awareness; training and exercises; expansion of port recovery and resiliency capabilities; and further capabilities to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from attacks involving improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and other non-conventional weapons.

Federal Investment Strategy

The PSGP is an important part of the Administration's larger, coordinated effort to strengthen homeland security preparedness, including the security of the country's critical infrastructure. The PSGP implements objectives addressed in a series of post-9/11 laws, strategy documents, plans, Executive Orders (EOs) and Homeland Security Presidential Directives (HSPDs). Of particular significance are the National Preparedness Guidelines and its associated work products, including the National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP) and its sector-specific plans. The National Preparedness Guidelines provide an all-hazards vision regarding the Nation's four core preparedness objectives: prevent, protect, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks and catastrophic natural disasters. In addition, Presidential Policy Directive/PPD-8 is aimed at strengthening the security and resilience of the United States through systematic preparation for the threats that pose the greatest risk to the security of the Nation, including acts of terrorism, cyber attacks, pandemics, and catastrophic natural disasters. At the regional port level, Area Maritime Security Plans (AMSPs), Port-Wide Risk Mitigation Plans (PRMPs), Facility Security Plans (FSPs), and analytical products such as the Maritime Security Risk Analysis Model (MSRAM) are used in support of the NIPP by identifying critical security needs specific to a port area. Area Maritime Security Committees, which are comprised of port stakeholders representing all levels

of government and the port industry, use these various plans and tools to prioritize funding needs and rank port security project proposals.

Overarching Funding Priorities

The funding priorities for the FY 2011 PSGP reflect the Department's overall investment strategy, in which two priorities have been paramount: risk-informed funding and regional security cooperation.

First, DHS will focus the bulk of its available port security grant dollars on the highest-risk port systems. This determination is based on ongoing intelligence analysis, extensive security reviews, and consultations with port industry partners.

At the recommendation of the United States Coast Guard (USCG), some ports are being considered as a single cluster due to geographic proximity, shared risk, and a common waterway. As with other DHS grant programs, applications from these port clusters must be locally coordinated and include integrated security proposals to use PSGP grant dollars to mitigate port security risks.

Eligible port areas were identified using a comprehensive, empirically-grounded risk analysis model. Risk methodology for PSGP programs is consistent across transportation modes and is linked to the risk methodology used to determine eligibility for the core DHS State and local grant programs.

Within the PSGP, eligibility for all grant awards is first predicated on a systematic risk analysis that reviews and rates eligible ports in a given area for comparative risk. All port areas will be comparably rated. Risk will be evaluated using an analytical model developed by DHS in conjunction with other Federal entities. Risk is defined as the product of three principal variables:

- Threat – the likelihood of an attack occurring
- Vulnerability – the relative exposure to an attack
- Consequence – the expected impact of an attack

Risk data for eligible port areas is gathered individually and then aggregated by region. The DHS risk formula incorporates multiple normalized variables, meaning that for a given variable, all eligible port areas are empirically ranked on a relative scale from lowest to highest.

DHS' risk assessment methodology for PSGP considers critical infrastructure system assets and characteristics from four areas that might contribute to their risk: intelligence community assessments of threat; economic consequences of attack; port assets; and area vulnerabilities and consequences (to people and physical infrastructure immediately surrounding the port). The relative weighting of variables reflects DHS' overall risk assessment, as well as the FY 2011 program priorities. Specific variables include multiple data sets regarding international and domestic measure of cargo throughput (container, break bulk, petro-chemical, etc); foreign vessel calls; the

adjacent critical assets that may be associated with the port area; the adjacent military missions' variables; the population density; and MSRAM data.

Second, DHS places a very high priority on ensuring that all PSGP applications reflect robust regional coordination and an investment strategy that institutionalizes and integrates a regional maritime security risk strategy. This priority is a core component in the Department's statewide grant programs and complements the goals of the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grant program.

In FY 2011, the PSGP will continue to fund those eligible projects identified in the PRMP that close or mitigate maritime security risk vulnerabilities gaps, and ensure a rapid transition to the optional Business Continuity/Resumption of Trade Plans (BCRTP). Adoption of a deliberate risk management planning process, consistent with that employed in the UASI and State programs, is also a key focus of the *Security and Accountability For Every (SAFE) Port Act* (Public Law 109-347) amendments to the PSGP.

PSGP Priorities

In addition to these two overarching priorities, the Department has identified the following five priorities as its selection criteria for all FY 2011 PSGP applicants:

1. Enhancing Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA)

MDA is the critical enabler that allows leaders at all levels to make effective decisions and act early against threats to the security of the Nation's seaports. In support of the National Strategy for Maritime Security, port areas should seek to enhance their MDA through projects that address knowledge capabilities within the maritime domain. This could include access control/standardized credentialing, command and control, communications, and enhanced intelligence sharing and analysis. This may also include construction or infrastructure improvement projects that are identified in the PRMP and/or FSPs and/or Vessel Security Plans (VSPs). Construction and enhancement of Interagency Operations Centers for port security should be considered a priority for promoting MDA and unity of effort.

MDA requires a coordinated unity of effort within and among public and private sector organizations and international partners. The need for security is a mutual interest requiring the greatest cooperation between industry and government. MDA depends upon unparalleled information sharing. MDA must have protocols to protect private sector proprietary information. Bi-lateral or multi-lateral information sharing agreements and international conventions and treaties will greatly assist enabling MDA.

2. Enhancing Improvised Explosive Device (IED) and Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, Explosive (CBRNE) prevention, protection, response and supporting recovery capabilities

Port areas should continue to enhance their capabilities to prevent, detect, respond to and recover from terrorist attacks employing IEDs, CBRNE devices and other

non-conventional weapons. Of particular concern in the port environment are attacks that employ IEDs delivered via small craft (similar to the attack on the USS Cole), by underwater swimmers (such as underwater mines), or on ferries (both passenger and vehicle). Please refer to the DHS Small Vessel Security Strategy April 2008 document, which can be found at http://www.dhs.gov/files/publications/gc_1209408805402.shtm. In addition, refer to the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) *Section I, Part VI.D* for detailed information on nuclear detection capabilities.

3. Port Resilience and Recovery Capabilities

The Nation's ability to withstand threats and hazards requires an understanding of risks and robust efforts to reduce vulnerabilities. Mitigating vulnerabilities reduces both the direct consequences and the response and recovery requirements of disasters. One of the core missions of DHS, as outlined in the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR) Report, is "ensuring resilience to disasters". A major goal in support of this mission is to "improve the Nation's ability to adapt and rapidly recover". A main objective of this goal is to sustain critical capabilities and restore essential services in a timely manner.

Those responsible for the security and resilience of our Nation's ports must take appropriate action to reduce risk related vulnerabilities. Resilience spans the full spectrum of activities by exploring options and identifying processes that reduce the magnitude and duration of disruptions. PSGP funds are intended to assist "risk owners" in addressing port security vulnerabilities. Port resilience and recovery should be viewed as a critical component of this overarching effort.

During the FY 2007 Supplemental round of port security grants, port stakeholders, through their Area Maritime Security Committees, were encouraged to develop BC RTP. Those ports that already have completed plans should pursue PSGP funds to address their identified risks and vulnerabilities, including any worthwhile projects that would help enable continuity of port operations and/or rapid recovery of the port following a major incident. Ports that have not completed plans are highly encouraged to complete them and may apply for PSGP funding to facilitate that effort.

4. Training and Exercises

Port areas should assess their training and qualification requirements, coordinate training and qualification of incident response personnel, and regularly test these capabilities through emergency exercises and drills. Exercises must follow the Area Maritime Security Training Exercise Program (AMSTEP) or the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) Intermodal Security Training Exercise Program (I-STEP) guidelines that test operational protocols that would be implemented in the event of a terrorist attack. The efforts include live situational exercises involving various threat and disaster scenarios, table-top exercises, and methods for implementing lessons learned.

5. Efforts supporting implementation of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC)

TWIC is a congressionally mandated security program through which DHS will conduct appropriate background investigations and issue biometrically enabled and secure identification cards for individuals requiring unescorted access to U.S. port facilities. Regulations outlining the initial phase of this program (card issuance) were issued by TSA in cooperation with the Coast Guard in 72 Federal Register 3492 (January 25, 2007). See FEMA Grant Programs Directorate (GPD) Information Bulletin (IB) 343, dated June 21, 2010 for further information on the TWIC program and guidance for executing PSGP-funded TWIC projects.

PSGP Program Management: Roles and Responsibilities at DHS

Effective management of the PSGP entails a collaborative effort and partnership within DHS, the dynamics of which require continuing outreach, coordination, and interface. For the FY 2011 PSGP, FEMA is responsible for designing and operating the administrative mechanisms needed to implement and manage the grant program. The USCG provides programmatic subject matter expertise for the maritime industry. Together, these two agencies, with additional assistance and cooperation from TSA, the Department of Transportation's Maritime Administration (MARAD), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), determine the primary security architecture of the PSGP.

PART II. AWARD INFORMATION

Authorizing Statutes

The *Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011* (Public Law 112-10) and the *Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002*, as amended (46 U.S.C. §70107) authorized the FY 2011 PSGP.

Period of Performance

The period of performance of this grant is 36 months. Extensions to the period of performance will be considered only through formal requests to FEMA with specific and compelling justifications as to why an extension is required. For more information on grant extensions, see *Section II, Part I.A.*

Available Funding

In FY 2011, the total amount of funds distributed under this grant program will be \$235,029,000. The FY 2011 PSGP funds will be allocated based on the following table.

Table 1: FY 2011 PSGP Available Funding

Group	FY 2011 PSGP Funding
Group I	\$141,017,400
Group II	\$70,508,700
Group III	\$11,751,450
All Other Port Areas	\$11,751,450
TOTAL	\$235,029,000

Cost Match

The cost match for the FY 2011 PSGP is assumed waived per the *Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011* (Public Law 112-10). The statutory waiver provision carries over from the *Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010* (Public Law 111-83), where it was explicitly included.

A. Funding Guidelines

DHS grant funds may only be used for the purpose set forth in the grant, and must be consistent with the statutory authority for the award. Grant funds may not be used for matching funds for other Federal grants/cooperative agreements, lobbying, or intervention in Federal regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. In addition, Federal funds may not be used to sue the Federal government or any other government entity.

Pre-award costs are allowable only with the written consent of DHS and if they are included in the award agreement.

Federal employees are prohibited from serving in any capacity (paid or unpaid) on any proposal submitted under this program. Federal employees may not receive funds under this award.

The following pages outline general allowable and unallowable PSGP Program costs guidance.

- 1. Management and Administration (M&A).** A maximum of five percent (5%) of the total award may be retained by the applicant. Any funds retained are to be used solely for management and administrative purposes associated with the PSGP award. Sub-recipients receiving pass-through funds from the Fiduciary Agent (FA) may use up to five percent (5%) of their sub-award for M&A purposes. FY 2011 PSGP M&A funds may be used for the following M&A costs:
 - Hiring of full-time or part-time staff, contractors or consultants, and M&A expenses related to compliance with grant reporting or data collection requirements, including data calls
 - Development of operating plans for information collection and processing necessary to respond to DHS data calls
 - Travel expenses
- 2. Allowable Costs.** This section provides guidance on allowable costs for the FY 2011 PSGP.

Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA)

Funds may be used for the following types of MDA projects:

- Deployment of access control methods and projects
- Deployment of detection and security surveillance equipment
- Development/enhancement of information sharing systems for risk mitigation purposes, including equipment (and software) required to receive, transmit, handle, and store classified information
- Enhancements of command and control facilities
- Enhancement of interoperable communications/asset tracking for sharing terrorism threat information (including ensuring that mechanisms are interoperable with Federal, State, and local agencies) and to facilitate incident management

Applicants are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the National Strategy for Maritime Security, National Plan to Achieve Maritime Domain Awareness that can be found at http://www.dhs.gov/files/programs/editorial_0753.shtm.

IED and CBRNE Prevention, Protection, Response, Recovery Capabilities

Eligible port facilities and vessels may receive funding for the following types of IED and CBRNE capabilities:

Port Facilities regulated under 33 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 105

- CBRNE detection, response, and decontamination equipment
- Explosives Detection Canine Teams
- Intrusion detection systems for Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) regulated facilities, vessels captured within the AMSP, or port areas that are in direct support of these MTSA regulated entities
- Small boats that are specifically designed and equipped as CBRNE platforms for eligible Port Police and Local Law Enforcement port security patrol and response
- Video surveillance systems that specifically address and enhance maritime security
- TWIC standardized credentialing access control
- Improved lighting
- Hardened security gates and vehicle barriers
- Floating protective barriers
- Underwater intrusion detection systems
- Communications equipment for risk mitigation (including interoperable communications)
- Reconfiguring of docks to prevent small boat access

Vessels regulated under 33 CFR Part 104 and police/fire rescue vessels having jurisdiction within a port area.

- CBRNE agent detection, response, and decontamination equipment
- Restricted area protection (cipher locks, hardened doors, closed-circuit television (CCTV) for bridges and engineering spaces)
- Interoperable communications equipment
- Canines for explosives detection
- Access control and TWIC standardized credentialing
- Floating protective barriers

Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC)

The TWIC is designed to be an open architecture, standards-based system. Port projects that involve new installations or upgrades to access control and credentialing systems, should exhibit compliance with TWIC standards and program specifications. Recipients of grant funding for the implementation of TWIC systems may be requested by the Federal government to apply these systems in a field test of TWIC readers in accordance with the SAFE Port Act. Systems implemented with grant funding may be used by recipients to comply with the TWIC rulemaking requirements. However, *the fees associated with the application for and issuance of the TWIC cards themselves are ineligible for award consideration.*

Allowable costs under this section include those projects that will ensure the safe and secure transit of foreign seafarers and shore staff/support [who are not eligible for TWIC] to and from the vessel while at MTSA regulated facilities. For additional information, see GPD IB 346: Port Security Grant Program Allowable Costs for Seafarers and Shore Staff/Support.

PSGP TWIC funding recipients may be required to provide data and lessons learned from the application of card readers and associated systems. Systems implemented with grant funding may be used by recipients to comply with all TWIC rulemaking requirements once established. See FEMA GPD IB 343 for additional guidance on funding for TWIC projects.

Training and Exercises

Funds for training will generally be limited to those courses that have been approved through the FEMA National Training and Education Division (NTED) review and approval process. Approved courses are listed in the following catalogs maintained by the NTED: *NTED Course Catalog*; *Federal Sponsored Course Catalog*; and the *State-Sponsored Course Catalog*. The catalogs may be viewed at the <http://www.firstrespondertraining.gov> website. In support of the continuing efforts to build common catalogs of approved training, grantees will be allowed three deliveries of the same course before the course is required to go through the FEMA NTED review and approval process. The NTED Course Review and Approval Process (State- and Federal-sponsored courses) may be viewed at https://www.firstrespondertraining.gov/odp_webforms/. Additional course deliveries will be authorized during the award period. However, if the course is disapproved as part of the process, no additional FEMA funds can be dedicated to attending the course.

Funding used for exercises will only be permitted for those exercises that are in direct support of a facility or port area's MTSA required exercises (see 33 CFR 105.220 for a facility and 33 CFR 103.515 for the AMSP). These exercises must be coordinated with the Captain of the Port (COTP) and AMSC and adhere to the guidelines outlined in DHS Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP). More information on HSEEP may be found at <https://hseep.dhs.gov>.

PSGP funds may be used for the following training and/or exercise activities:

- **Hiring of Full or Part-Time Staff or Contractors/Consultants** to support training and/or maritime security exercise-related activities. Payment of salaries and fringe benefits must be in accordance with the policies of the State or unit(s) of local government and have the approval of the State or awarding agency, whichever is applicable. Such costs must be included within the funding allowed for program management personnel expenses, which must not exceed 15 percent (15%) of the total allocation. In no case is dual compensation allowable (see above).

- **Overtime and Backfill.** The entire amount of overtime costs, including payments related to backfilling personnel, which are the direct result of attendance at FEMA and/or approved training courses and programs and/or maritime security exercise-related activities are allowable. These costs are allowed only to the extent the payment for such services is in accordance with the policies of the State or unit(s) of local government and has the approval of the State or the awarding agency, whichever is applicable. In no case is dual compensation allowable. That is, an employee of a unit of government may not receive compensation from their unit or agency of government AND from an award for a single period of time (e.g., 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.), even though such work may benefit both activities.
- **Travel.** Travel costs (e.g., airfare, mileage, per diem, hotel) are allowable as expenses by employees who are on travel status for official business related to approved training and exercises
- **Training workshops and conferences.** Grant funds may be used to plan and conduct training workshops or conferences to include costs related to planning, meeting space and other meeting costs, facilitation costs, materials and supplies, travel, and training plan development
- **Funds used to develop, deliver, and evaluate training,** including costs related to administering the training, planning, scheduling, facilities, materials and supplies, reproduction of materials, and equipment
- **Funds used to design, develop, conduct, and evaluate a maritime security exercise.** Includes costs related to planning, meeting space and other meeting costs, facilitation costs, materials and supplies, travel, and documentation
- **Certification/Recertification of Instructors** is an allowable cost. States are encouraged to follow the FEMA Instructor Quality Assurance Program to ensure a minimum level of competency and corresponding levels of evaluation of student learning. This is particularly important for those courses that involve training of trainers. This information is contained in an IB 193, issued October 20, 2005.
- **Supplies.** Supplies are items that are expended or consumed during the course of the planning and conduct of the training project(s) (e.g., copying paper, gloves, tape, and non-sterile masks). These costs will contribute to the five percent (5%) M&A cap.
- **Other items.** These costs may include the rental of space/locations for exercise planning and conducting approved training courses, rental of equipment, etc. For PSGP funded courses, the cost of fuel may be allowed in cases where the participating entity must provide its own equipment (such as boats, response vehicles, etc.). For maritime security exercises, the cost of fuel, exercise signs, badges, etc. may be allowed.

Examples of security exercise programs include:

- *Area Maritime Security Training and Exercise Program (AMSTEP):* AMSTEP is the USCG developed mechanism by which AMSCs and Federal Maritime

Security Coordinators will continuously improve security preparedness in the port community. It is an integral part and a strategic implementation of the DHS HSEEP for the maritime sector. Rooted in long-standing USCG exercise policy and procedures, AMSTEP aligns to support the National Preparedness Guidelines and the National Strategy for Maritime Security. Through a structured approach, AMSTEP focuses all exercise efforts, both public and private, on improving the AMSPs and individual vessel and facility security plans of the nation's seaports.

- *Intermodal Security Training Exercise Program: I-STEP* was established by TSA to enhance the preparedness of our nation's surface-transportation sector network with meaningful evaluations of prevention, preparedness, and ability to respond to terrorist-related incidents. I-STEP improves the intermodal transportation industry's ability to prepare for and respond to a transportation security incident (TSI) by increasing awareness, improving processes, creating partnerships, and delivering transportation-sector network security training exercises. I-STEP provides security-exercise tools and services to modal operators through TSA general managers. The tools include software for exercise design, evaluation and tracking for a mix of tabletop, advanced tabletop and functional exercises. More information on I-STEP is available at http://www.tsa.gov/what_we_do/layers/istep/index.shtm.
- *National Preparedness for Response Exercise Program (NPREP):* The USCG NPREP focuses on exercise and evaluation of government area contingency plans and industry spill response plans (oil and hazardous substance). NPREP is a coordinated effort of the four Federal agencies with responsibility for oversight of private-sector oil and hazardous substance pollution response preparedness: USCG, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Department of Transportation's Research and Special Programs Administration, and the U.S. Department of the Interior's Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement. These agencies worked with Federal, State, and local governments, the oil and marine transportation industry, cleanup contractors, and the general public to develop the program. NPREP meets the OPA mandate for exercises and represents minimum guidelines for ensuring overall preparedness within the response community. The guidelines, which are reviewed periodically through a public workshop process, outline an exercise program that satisfies the exercise requirements of the four Federal regulatory agencies. More information on NPREP is available at <http://www.boemre.gov/offshore/OilSpillProgram/Assets/PDFs/PREPGuidelines.pdf>.

Unauthorized exercise-related costs include:

- Reimbursement for the maintenance and/or wear and tear costs of general use vehicles (e.g., construction vehicles) and emergency response apparatus (e.g., fire trucks, ambulances, repair or cleaning of PPE, etc).

- Equipment that is purchased for permanent installation and/or use, beyond the scope of exercise conduct (e.g., electronic messaging signs).

Planning

FY 2011 PSGP funds may be used for the following types of planning activities:

- Public education and outreach (such as the America's Waterways Watch or Transit Watch), and where possible, such activities should be coordinated with local Citizen Corps Council(s), and local Coast Guard Reserves and/or Auxiliary
- Public Alert and warning systems and security education efforts in conjunction with America's Waterways Watch Program or similar public education/outreach programs addressing port security
- Development and implementation of homeland security support programs and adoption of ongoing DHS national initiatives (including building or enhancing preventive radiological and nuclear detection programs) within the maritime transportation system realm (see *Section I, Part VI.D*)
- Development and enhancement of security plans and protocols within the AMSP, PRMP, and/or the BC RTP in support of maritime security planning and risk mitigation
- Hiring of part-time staff and contractors or consultants to assist with planning activities (not for the purpose of hiring public safety personnel)
- Materials required to conduct the aforementioned planning activities
- Travel and per diem related to the professional planning activities noted in this section
- Other project planning activities with prior approval from DHS

Equipment Acquisition

FY 2011 PSGP funds may be used for the following types of equipment provided it will be used in direct support of maritime security risk mitigation:

- Personal protection equipment
- Explosive device response and remediation equipment
- CBRNE detection equipped patrol watercraft/small boat used to directly support maritime security for a facility or within a port area on a routine basis
- Information sharing technology; components or equipment designed to share maritime security risk information and maritime all hazards risk information with other agencies
- Cyber security enhancement equipment
- Interoperable communications equipment
- Decontamination equipment
- Systems and equipment required for continuity of critical port operations
- Terrorism incident prevention and response equipment
- Physical security enhancement equipment

- Equipment such as portable fencing, CCTVs, passenger vans, mini-buses, etc. to support secure passage of vessel crewmembers through an MTSA regulated facility
- CBRNE detection equipped patrol and fire fighting response vehicles/vessels, provided they will be used primarily for port/facility security and/or response operations. Marine firefighting vessels must be designed and equipped to meet NFPA 1925: Standard on Marine Firefighting Vessels
- Firefighting foam and PKP powder may be purchased by public fire departments which have jurisdictions in a port area and would respond to an incident at an MTSA regulated facility. MTSA facilities may also receive funding for this purpose. Funding will be limited to a one-time purchase based on a worst-case incident at the facility or facilities.
- Equipment such as telecommunications, computers, and systems to support State and local agency participation in Interagency Operations Centers (IOC) for port security to include virtual IOC capabilities

Grantees (including sub-grantees) that are using FY 2011 PSGP funds to support emergency communications activities should comply with the *FY 2011 SAFECOM Guidance for Emergency Communication Grants*, including provisions on technical standards that ensure and enhance interoperable communications. Emergency communications activities include the purchase of Interoperable Communications Equipment and technologies such as voice-over-internet protocol bridging or gateway devices, or equipment to support the build out of wireless broadband networks in the 700 MHz public safety band under the Federal Communications Commission Waiver Order. SAFECOM guidance can be found at <http://www.safecomprogram.gov>.

Grantees interested in developing a public safety broadband network in the 700 MHz band in their jurisdictions must adhere to the technical standards set forth in the FCC Waiver Order, or any succeeding FCC orders, rules, or regulations pertaining to broadband operations in the 700 MHz public safety band. If any future regulatory requirement (from the FCC or other governmental entity) results in a material technical or financial change in the project, the recipient must submit a revised budget, associated documentation, and other material, as applicable, for review and approval by the Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC), or SWIC equivalent. Upon approval by the SWIC, the grantee shall then forward the approval and associated documentation to FEMA GPD. The recipient shall also ensure projects support the Statewide Communication Interoperability Plan (SCIP) and are fully coordinated with the full-time SWIC in the State of the project.

Grantees (and sub-grantees) are required to provide the AEL number for all communications equipment purchased with grant award funding (plus a description of the equipment and the quantity purchased of each item) to the FEMA GPD once items are procured as part of periodic programmatic grant reporting.

Specific Guidance on Sonar Devices

The four types of allowable sonar devices are: imaging sonar, scanning sonar, side scan sonar, and 3-dimensional sonar. These types of sonar devices are intended to support the detection of underwater improvised explosive devices and enhance MDA. The eligible types of sonar, and short descriptions of their capabilities, are provided below:

- *Imaging sonar*: A high-frequency sonar that produces “video-like” imagery using a narrow field of view. The sonar system can be pole-mounted over the side of a craft or hand carried by a diver.
- *Scanning sonar*: Consists of smaller sonar systems that can be mounted on tripods and lowered to the bottom of the waterway. Scanning sonar produces a panoramic view of the surrounding area and can cover up to 360 degrees.
- *Side scan sonar*: Placed inside of a shell and towed behind a vessel. Side scan sonar produces strip-like images from both sides of the device.
- *3-dimensional sonar*: Produces 3-dimensional imagery of objects using an array receiver

Other Allowable Costs:

Maintenance and Sustainment

The use of FEMA preparedness grant funds for maintenance contracts, warranties, repair or replacement costs, upgrades, and user fees are allowable under all active and future grant awards, unless otherwise noted. Grantees are reminded that supplanting is not permitted with PSGP grant funds. Maintenance contracts and warranties, repair and replacement costs, upgrades, and/or user fees for equipment that was not originally purchased with preparedness grant funding (or provided by DHS components listed in IB 336) may not be subsequently paid for with preparedness grant funding. Please refer to GPD’s IBs 336 and 348, located at <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/bulletins/index.shtm>.

- **Maintenance Contracts and Warranties.** To increase the useful life of the equipment, maintenance contracts and warranties may be purchased using grant funding from one fiscal year to cover equipment purchased with funding from a different fiscal year. The use of grant funding for the purchase of maintenance contracts and warranties must meet the following conditions:
 - Maintenance contracts and warranties may only be purchased for equipment that has been purchased using FEMA preparedness grant funding or other Federal grant funding as allowed by GPD IB 293
 - To avoid supplementing Congressional appropriations for specific programs, maintenance contracts and warranties must be purchased using funds from the same grant program used to purchase the original equipment
 - The term of the maintenance contract or warranty shall not exceed the period of performance of the grant to which the contract is being charged
- **Repair and Replacement Costs.** The cost of repair and replacement parts for equipment purchased using FEMA preparedness grant funding is an

allowable expense, except for those included in IB 293 Repair and replacement parts may only be purchased for equipment that has been purchased using FEMA preparedness grant funding.

- To avoid supplementing Congressional appropriations for specific programs, repair and replacement parts must be purchased using the same grant program used to purchase the original equipment
- **Upgrades.** FEMA preparedness grant funding may be used to upgrade previously purchased allowable equipment. For example, if the grantee purchased risk management software with Homeland Security Grant Programs (HSGP) funds in FY 2005 and would like to use FY 2011 grant funding to upgrade the software, this is allowable.
 - Upgrades may only be purchased for equipment that has been purchased using FEMA preparedness grant funding
 - To avoid supplementing Congressional appropriations for specific programs, upgrades must be purchased using the same grant program used to purchase the original equipment
- **User fees.** User fees are viewed as costs for specific services required to maintain and provide continued operation of equipment or systems. An example would be the recurring service fees associated with handheld radios or mobile data computers.
 - User fees may only be paid for equipment that has been purchased using FEMA preparedness grant funding
 - To avoid supplementing Congressional appropriations for specific programs, user fees must be paid for using the same grant program used to purchase the original equipment. The service time purchased shall not exceed the period of performance of the grant to which the user fee is being charged

Grantees must comply with all the requirements in 44 CFR Part 13 and 2 CFR Part 215.

Specific Guidance on Construction and Renovation Projects

The following types of construction and renovation projects are allowable under the FY 2011 PSGP provided they address a specific vulnerability or need identified in a security plan (i.e. FSP, PRMP, BCRTP, and/or AMSP) or otherwise support the maintenance/sustainment of capabilities and equipment acquired through PSGP funding:

- MDA Fusion Centers
- IOCs for port security
- Port Security Emergency Communications Centers
- Buildings to house generators that support risk mitigation
- Vessel maintenance and security facilities (e.g. repair shops, dock house, ramps, and docks for existing port security assets)
- Hardened security fences/barriers at access points
- Any other building or physical facility that enhances access control to the port/facility area

To be considered eligible for funding, fusion centers, operations centers, and communications centers must offer a port-wide benefit and, to the extent possible, support information sharing and coordination of operations among regional interagency and other port security partners.

Eligible costs for construction may not exceed the greater of \$1,000,000 per project or such greater amount as may be approved by the Secretary, which may not exceed ten percent (10%) of the total amount of the grant, as stated in 46 U.S.C. § 70107(b)(2).

Grant recipients are not permitted to use FY 2011 PSGP funds for construction projects that are eligible for funding under other Federal grant programs. PSGP funds may only be used for construction activities directly related to port security enhancements.

All proposed construction and renovation activities must undergo an Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation (EHP) review, including approval of the review from FEMA, prior to undertaking any action related to the project. These types of projects have the potential to affect environmental resources and historic properties through ground disturbance, impact to wetlands, floodplains, coastal zones, and other water resources, alteration of historically-significant properties, and impact to threatened and endangered species, and migratory birds. While all projects receiving Federal funding require an EHP review, any applicant that is proposing a construction project under the FY 2011 PSGP should pay special attention to the EHP requirements contained in *Section II, Part I.B.5.5.6* of the Guidance. Failure of a grant recipient to meet these requirements may jeopardize Federal funding.

Furthermore, FY 2011 PSGP recipients using funds for construction projects must comply with the *Davis-Bacon Act*. Grant recipients must ensure that their contractors or subcontractors for construction projects pay workers employed directly at the work-site no less than the prevailing wages and fringe benefits paid on projects of a similar character. Additional information, including Department of Labor wage determinations, is available from the following website <http://www.dol.gov/compliance/laws/comp-dbra.htm>. See also, *Section II, Part I.B.5.5.6*, Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation Compliance, and *Section II, Part I.B.1.1.4* for requirements related to Duplication of Benefits.

Specific Guidance on Explosives Detection Canine Teams (EDCT)

The USCG has identified canine (K-9) explosive detection as the most effective solution for the detection of vehicle borne IEDs. When combined with the existing capability of a port or ferry security/police force, the added value provided through the addition of a canine team is significant. EDCTs are a proven, reliable resource to detect explosives and are a key component in a balanced counter-sabotage program. EDCTs also provide the added psychological deterrent achieved solely through their presence.

Eligibility for funding of EDCTs is restricted to:

- U.S. Ferry Systems regulated under 33 CFR Parts 101, 103, 104, and the passenger terminals these specific ferries service under 33 CFR Part 105
- MTSA regulated facilities
- Port authorities, port police and local law enforcement agencies that provide direct layered security for these U. S. Ferry Systems and MTSA regulated facilities and are defined in the AMSP, FSP, or VSP

Applicants may apply for up to \$450,000 (\$150,000/year for three years) to support this endeavor. At the end of the grant period (36 months) grantees will be responsible for maintaining the heightened level of capability provided by the EDCT.

EDCT Eligible Costs. Funds for these EDCTs may **not** be used to fund drug detection and apprehension technique training. Only explosives detection training for EDCTs will be funded. The PSGP EDCT funds may only be used for **new** capabilities/programs and cannot be used to pay for existing capabilities/programs (e.g. K-9 teams) already supported by the port area or system. Non-supplanting restrictions apply.

Eligible costs include:

- Contracted K-9 and Handler providing services in accordance with PSGP guidance
- Salary and fringe benefits of new full or part-time K-9 handler positions
- Training and certifications (travel costs associated with training for full or part time agency handlers, and canines are allowable)
- Equipment costs
- Purchase and train a K-9 (training specific to the detection of common explosives odors is allowable)
- K-9 maintenance costs (K-9 costs include but are not limited to: veterinary, housing, and feeding costs)

Ineligible EDCT costs. Ineligible costs include but are not limited to:

- Hiring costs
- Meals and incidentals associated with travel for initial certification
- Vehicles used solely to transport canines

EDCT Certification. Each EDCT, composed of one dog and one handler, must be certified by an appropriate, qualified organization. Such K-9 should receive an initial basic training course and weekly maintenance training sessions thereafter to maintain the certification. The basic training averages ten weeks for the canine

team (handler and canine together) with weekly training and daily exercising. Comparable training and certification standards, such as those promulgated by the TSA Explosive detection canine program, the National Police Canine Association (NPCA), the U.S. Police Canine Association, (USPCA) or the International Explosive Detection Dog Association (IEDDA) may be used to meet this requirement. Certifications and training records will be kept on file with the grantee and made available to DHS upon request.

EDCT Submission Requirements. Successful applicants will be required to submit an amendment to their approved VSP or FSP per 33 CFR Parts 104 and/or 105 detailing the inclusion of a canine explosive detection program into their security measures.

The grantee will ensure that a written plan or standard operating procedure (SOP), exists that describes EDCT deployment policy to include visible and unpredictable deterrent efforts and on-call EDCTs rapid response times as dictated by the agency's FSP or VSP. The plan must be made available to FEMA and USCG upon request.

The grantee will comply with requirements for the proper storage, handling and transportation of all explosive training aids in accordance with BATF Federal Explosive Law and Regulations as outlined in publication ATF P 5400.7 (09/00).

Additional EDCT Resources Available for K-9 Costs. The PSGP, while providing the ability to defray some start up costs, does not cover any recurring costs associated with EDCT programs. However, the Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP) and HSGP are two additional DHS grant programs that can provide funding for certain operational costs associated with heightened states of alert within the port area and nationally. DHS strongly encourages applicants to investigate their eligibility, and potential exclusions, for these resources when developing their canine programs.

- 3. Unallowable Costs.** The following projects and costs are considered ineligible for award consideration:
- The development of risk/vulnerability assessment models and methodologies
 - Cost of conducting vulnerability assessments to evaluate and make recommendations with respect to security
 - Projects in which Federal agencies are the primary beneficiary or that enhance Federal property, including voluntary sub-components of a Federal agency
 - Projects that study technology development for security of national or international cargo supply chains (e.g., e-seals, smart containers, container tracking or container intrusion detection devices)
 - Proof-of-concept projects
 - Projects that do not provide a compelling security benefit (e.g., primarily economic or safety vs. security)

- Projects that duplicate capabilities being provided by the Federal government (e.g., vessel traffic systems)
- Proposals in which there are real or apparent conflicts of interest
- Business operating expenses (certain security-related operational and maintenance costs are allowable – see “Maintenance and Sustainment” and “Operating Costs” for further guidance)
- TWIC card fees
- Signage, projects for placarding and billboards, or hard fixed structure signage
- Reimbursement of pre-award security expenses
- Outfitting facilities, vessels, or other structures with equipment or items providing a hospitality benefit rather than a direct security benefit. Examples of such equipment or items include, but are not limited to: office furniture, CD players, DVD players, AM/FM radios, TVs, stereos, entertainment satellite systems, Entertainment cable systems and other such entertainment media, unless sufficient justification is provided
- Weapons and associated equipment (i.e. holsters, optical sights, and scopes), including, but not limited to: non-lethal or less than lethal weaponry including firearms, ammunition, and weapons affixed to facilities, vessels, or other structures
- Expenditures for items such as general-use software (word processing, spreadsheet, graphics, etc), general-use computers, and related equipment (other than for allowable M&A activities, or otherwise associated) preparedness or response functions), general-use vehicles and licensing fees
- Other items not in accordance with the AEL or previously listed as allowable costs
 - Land acquisitions and right of way purchases
 - Funding for standard operations vehicles utilized for routine duties, such as patrol cars and fire trucks
 - Fuel costs (except as permitted for training and exercises)
- Exercise(s) that do not support maritime security preparedness efforts
- Patrol Vehicles and Fire Fighting Apparatus, other than those CBRNE detection equipped vehicles for port area and/or facility patrol or response purposes
- Providing protection training to public police agencies or private security services to support protecting VIPs or dignitaries

PART III.

ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

46 U.S.C. §70107 states that a grant program shall be established for the allocation of funds based on risk to implement AMSPs and FSPs among port authorities, facility operators, and State and local government agencies required to provide port security services. In administering the grant program; national, economic, energy, and strategic defense concerns based upon the most current risk assessments available shall be taken into account.

Congress has specifically directed DHS to apply these funds to the highest risk ports. In support of this, the PSGP includes a total of 145 specifically identified critical ports. Based upon USCG recommendations, these ports are aggregated into 90 discrete port funding areas. As described below, “All Other Port Areas” covered by an AMSP are eligible to apply for grant funds from a PSGP funding pool created for that purpose.

Within the PSGP, the following entities are specifically encouraged to apply:

- Owners or operators of federally regulated terminals, facilities, U.S. inspected passenger vessels or ferries as defined in the MTSA and Title 33 of the CFR Parts 101, 104, 105, and 106
- Area Maritime Security Committee general body members per 33 CFR Part 103 who are recognized as such by the Captain of the Port and are required to provide port security services. Specifically, eligible applicants include port authorities, port police, local law enforcement agencies, port and local fire departments, and facility fire brigades that have jurisdictional authority to respond to incidents in the port
- Group I and II Fiduciary Agents (FAs) who are applying on behalf of eligible AMSC members

As a condition of eligibility, all PSGP applicants are required to be fully compliant with relevant Maritime Security Regulations (33 CFR Parts 101-106). Any open or outstanding Notice of Violation (NOV), as of the grant application submission deadline date, which has been issued to an applicant, and the applicant has (1) failed to pay within 45 days of receipt; (2) failed to decline the NOV within 45 days of receipt (in which case a finding of default will be entered by the Coast Guard in accordance with 33 CFR § 1.07-11(f)(2)); or (3) the applicant has appealed the NOV as provided for in 33 CFR § 1.07-70 and is in receipt of a final appeal decision from Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, as described in 33 CFR § 1.07-75, and has failed to come into compliance with the final adjudication within the

timelines noted therein, will not be allowed to make application for a Port Security Grant. COTP will verify security compliance eligibility during the field review process.

Ineligible Entities

The PSGP will not accept applications or investment justifications from an applicant or sub-applicant for the purpose of providing a service or product to otherwise eligible entity.

Port Area Group Designations

Table 2 lists the specific port areas by Group that are eligible for funding through the FY 2011 PSGP.

Group I and II Port Areas

Seven port areas have been selected as Group I (highest risk) and 48 port areas have been selected as Group II. Each Group I and Group II port area has been designated a specific amount of money based upon the FY 2011 risk analysis.

Port areas identified as Group I or II last year are required to continue with the FA process but have the option of selecting a new FA to deal specifically with the FY 2011 PSGP award. Those port areas newly identified as Group I or II will have the option of selecting an FA and beginning the FA process, or opting out of the FA process. If opting out of the FA process, individual eligible entities must apply directly to FEMA and applicants must comply with all requirements of Group III and All Other Port Areas, with the identified port's allocation of money incorporated within the respective Group III or "All Other Port Areas" funding pool.

For Group I and II port areas (excluding newly identified port areas that opt out) the FY 2011 PSGP will only accept applications from the FA for that port area. All individual entities (including ferry systems) within one of these port areas will apply for PSGP funds through their port area's designated FA.

Group III Port Areas

Group III port areas will compete for the funding identified in their corresponding Group. Eligible Group III port entities will submit their application and associated documentation directly to FEMA. Group III Port Areas are allowed to receive grant funds from their geographically proximate higher Group if the project has regional impact across the entire port area, but not from both funding groups for the same project. If a higher Group is selected, the application procedures for that Group will apply.

All Other Port Areas

Ports not identified in Group I, II, or III will compete for the funding identified for the "All Other Port Areas" Group, and will submit their application and associated documentation directly to FEMA. "All Other Port Areas" are allowed to receive grant funds from their geographically proximate higher Group if the project has regional impact across the entire port area, but not from both funding groups for the same

project. If a higher Group is selected, the application procedures for that Group will apply.

Table 2: FY 2011 PSGP Port Area Groupings

Group	State/Territory	Port Area	FY 2011 Target Allocation
I	California	Los Angeles-Long Beach Long Beach Los Angeles	\$24,535,511
		San Francisco Bay Carquinez Strait Martinez Oakland Richmond San Francisco Stockton	\$16,987,452
	Louisiana	New Orleans Baton Rouge Gramercy New Orleans Plaquemines, Port of South Louisiana, Port of St. Rose	\$17,115,720
	New Jersey / Pennsylvania / Delaware	Delaware Bay Camden-Gloucester, NJ Chester, PA Marcus Hook, PA New Castle, DE Paulsboro, NJ Philadelphia, PA Trenton, NJ Wilmington, DE	\$11,985,963
	New York / New Jersey	New York, NY and NJ	\$30,191,410
	Texas	Houston-Galveston Galveston Houston Texas City	\$25,048,496
	Washington	Puget Sound Anacortes Bellingham Everett Olympia Port Angeles Seattle Tacoma	\$15,152,848

Group	State/Territory	Port Area	FY 2011 Target Allocation	
II	Alabama	Mobile	\$1,000,000	
	Alaska	Anchorage	\$1,000,000	
	California	San Diego	\$3,063,166	
		Port Hueneme	\$1,000,000	
	Connecticut	Long Island Sound	\$1,402,443	
		Bridgeport		
		New Haven		
		New London		
	Florida	Jacksonville	\$1,576,810	
		Port Everglades	\$1,241,524	
		Miami	\$2,176,413	
		Tampa Bay	Port Manatee	\$2,575,864
			Tampa	
			Port Canaveral	
			Panama City	\$1,000,000
		Pensacola	\$1,000,000	
	Georgia	Savannah	\$1,430,137	
	Guam	Apra Harbor	\$1,128,750	
	Hawaii	Honolulu	\$2,762,408	
		Barbers Point, Oahu Honolulu, Oahu		
	Indiana/ Illinois	Southern Tip Lake Michigan	\$3,453,295	
		Burns Waterway Harbor, IN		
		Chicago, IL		
		Gary, IN		
		Indiana Harbor, IN		
	Kentucky	Louisville	\$1,000,000	
	Louisiana	Lake Charles	\$1,130,308	
		Port Fourchon/The LOOP	\$1,000,000	
		Morgan City	\$1,000,000	
	Massachusetts	Boston	\$2,608,606	
Maryland	Baltimore	\$1,611,108		
Maine	Portland	\$1,000,000		
Michigan	Detroit	\$1,000,000		
Minnesota	Minneapolis-St. Paul	\$1,367,755		
	Minneapolis St. Paul			
Minnesota/ Wisconsin	Duluth-Superior, MN and WI	\$1,000,000		
Missouri	Kansas City	\$1,246,121		
Missouri/ Illinois	St. Louis, MO and IL	\$1,774,033		
Mississippi	Pascagoula	\$1,000,000		
North Carolina	Wilmington	\$1,416,831		
	Morehead City	\$1,000,000		

Group	State/Territory	Port Area	FY 2011 Target Allocation
II	New York	Albany	\$1,000,000
		Buffalo	\$1,455,521
	Ohio	Cincinnati	\$1,000,000
		Cleveland	\$1,000,000
		Toledo	\$1,026,792
	Pennsylvania	Pittsburgh	\$1,000,000
	Puerto Rico	San Juan	\$1,102,390
		Ponce	\$1,000,000
	South Carolina	Charleston	\$1,398,123
	Tennessee	Memphis	\$1,681,812
		Nashville	\$1,000,000
	Texas	Sabine-Neches River Beaumont Port Arthur	\$2,765,422
		Corpus Christi	\$2,112,660
		Freeport	\$1,354,561
		Hampton Roads Newport News Norfolk Harbor	\$3,102,229
	Virginia	Hampton Roads Newport News Norfolk Harbor	\$3,102,229
	Washington/ Oregon/ Idaho	Columbia-Snake River System Kalama, WA Longview, WA Portland, OR Vancouver, WA Benton, WA Clarkston, WA Ilwaco, WA Kennewick, WA Pasco, WA Walla Walla, WA Whitman County, WA Astoria, OR Boardman, OR The Dalles, OR Hood River, OR St. Helens, OR Umatilla, OR Lewiston, ID	\$1,543,618
	West Virginia	Huntington - TriState	\$1,000,000

Group	State/Territory	Port Area	FY 2011 Target Allocation
III	Alaska	Valdez	\$11,751,450
	Alabama	Guntersville	
	Arkansas	Helena	
	California	El Segundo	
		Sacramento	
	Florida	Fort Pierce	
		West Palm Beach	
	Georgia	Brunswick	
	Illinois	Peoria	
	Indiana	Mount Vernon	
	Massachusetts / Rhode Island	Narragansett/Mt. Hope Bays Fall River, MA Newport, RI Providence, RI	
	Michigan	Port Huron	
		Sault Ste Marie	
		Marine City	
		Muskegon	
		Monroe	
	Minnesota	Two Harbors	
	Mississippi	Vicksburg	
		Gulfport	
		Greenville	
	New Hampshire	Portsmouth	
	Ohio	Lorain	
	Oklahoma	Tulsa, Port of Catoosa	
	Oregon	Coos Bay	
	Pennsylvania	Erie	
	Puerto Rico	Guayanilla	
		Humacao	
		Jobos	
Tennessee	Chattanooga		
Texas	Port Lavaca-Point Comfort		
	Victoria		
	Brownsville		
Virginia	Richmond		
Wisconsin	Green Bay		
	Milwaukee		
All Other Port Areas	Eligible entities not located within one of the port areas identified above, but operating under an AMSP, are eligible to compete for funding within "All Other Port Areas" Group	\$11,751,450	
Total:			\$235,029,000

Presence on this list does not guarantee grant funding

B. Governance

National Incident Management System (NIMS) Implementation

In accordance with HSPD-5, *Management of Domestic Incidents*, the adoption of the NIMS is a requirement to receive Federal preparedness assistance, through grants, contracts, and other activities. The NIMS provides a consistent nationwide template to enable all levels of government, Tribal nations, nongovernmental organizations including voluntary organizations, and private sector partners to work together to prevent, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate the effects of incidents, regardless of cause, size, location, or complexity.

Federal FY 2010 NIMS implementation must be considered prior to allocation of any Federal preparedness awards in FY 2011. Since FY 2007, the National Integration Center (NIC) has advised State, Tribal nation, and local governments to self assess their respective progress relating to NIMS implementation objectives in the NIMS Compliance Assistance Support Tool (NIMSCAST).¹ The list of objectives against which progress and achievement are assessed and reported can be found at <http://www.fema.gov/emergency/nims/ImplementationGuidanceStakeholders.shtm#item2>.

All State, Tribal nation, and local government grantees should update their respective NIMSCAST assessments and, if necessary, submit a Corrective Action Plan via NIMSCAST for FY 2010. Corrective Action Plans are only required if a jurisdiction fails to meet one of the NIMS implementation activities. Comprehensive information concerning NIMS implementation for States, Tribal nations, local governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector is available through the NIC at FEMA's NIMS Resource Center at www.fema.gov/nims.

State, Tribal, and local governments should continue to implement NIMS training guidance (course curricula and instructor qualifications) contained in the *Five-Year NIMS Training Plan*, released in February 2008 and any successor guidance released by FEMA. [Note: Coursework and training developed and/or delivered by National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG) meet the course and instructor requirements of the *Five-Year NIMS Training Plan*]. NIMS training guidance is available on FEMA's NIMS Resource Center at www.fema.gov/emergency/nims/NIMSTrainingCourses.

The primary grantee/administrator of FY 2011 PSGP award funds is responsible for determining if sub-awardees have demonstrated sufficient progress in NIMS implementation to disburse awards.

¹ As defined in the *Homeland Security Act of 2002* (Public Law 107-296), the term "State" means "any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any possession of the United States" 6 U.S.C. 101 (14)

C. Other

Fiduciary Agent (FA) Requirement

The FA will serve as the principal point of contact with FEMA for application and management and administration of Group I and II PSGP awards. The FA is responsible for ensuring that all sub-recipients are compliant with the terms and conditions of the award, including the organizational audit requirements of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations and Federal Acquisition Regulation.

Fiduciary Agent (FA) Process

For the past five rounds of funding, each Group I and Group II port area was required to select a single entity to act as the FA for that port area. Those port areas remaining in Group I and Group II have been designated a specific allocation of money for which eligible entities within that port area may apply for through the FA.

The FA, however, is NOT the decision maker as to the use of these funds. The awards are conditioned so that a regional consensus on maritime security risk mitigation, in conjunction with the COTP with any advice from the AMSC, must be reached. The AMSC is the advisory committee to the COTP.

Group I and II port areas identified in the FY 2007 Supplemental PSGP, the FY 2008 PSGP, the FY 2009 PSGP, the FY 2010 PSGP are required to continue with the FA process and have the option of retaining their current FA or selecting a new FA to work specifically with the FY 2011 PSGP award.

Those port areas newly identified as Group II will have the option of selecting an FA and beginning the FA process, or opting out of the FA process. If opting out of the FA process, individual eligible entities will apply directly to FEMA for funding within the Group they originally resided, and applicants must comply with all requirements of Group III and All Other Port Areas, with the identified port's allocation of money incorporated within the respective Group III or "All Other Port Areas" funding pool. If a newly identified Group II port area opts out of the FA process this port area will be competing for funding with the other ports within the Group they opted to stay.

For Group I and II port areas, the FY 2011 PSGP will only accept applications from the FA for that port area. All individual entities within one of the Group I and II port areas will apply for PSGP funds through their port area's designated FA.

Fiduciary Agent Selection for Group I and Group II Port Areas

For FY 2011, Group I and Group II port areas will have the option of continuing with their current FA or selecting a new FA. If a port area AMSC elects to change their FA, the designated COTP will review the request for concurrence and forward the written request to the FEMA Program Office for approval with an information copy to USCG Headquarters (CD-5412).

Requests to change FAs must be submitted to FEMA on **June 3, 2011**. Newly designated Group I or II port areas must follow this same process. The focus of the FA review/approval process is to ensure that the selected entity/person is qualified to manage the assigned grant administration responsibilities.

Port-Wide Risk Management Planning for Group I and Group II Port Areas

In order to receive FY 2011 PSGP funds, Group I and Group II port areas are required to have in place an approved PRMP. They are also highly encouraged, but not required, to develop a BC RTP. For purposes of regional strategic planning, Group I and II port areas must take into consideration all other port areas covered by their AMSP in their plans and Investment Justifications.

The PRMP and BC RTP will align with and support the port areas' AMSP and the National Preparedness Guidelines, considering the entire port system strategically as a whole, and will identify and execute a series of actions designed to effectively mitigate security risks associated with the system's maritime critical infrastructure and key resources.

Building on the successes of previous years, during FY 2011, Group I and Group II ports are to seek PSGP funding which will ensure alignment with the programs and projects identified within the Plan(s) aimed at the following priorities:

- Expand the emphasis on port-wide partnerships, regional management of risk, port resilience/recovery, and business continuity/resumption of trade
- Expand the emphasis on regional maritime security risk management
- Expand the knowledge and protocols for maritime business continuity/resumption of trade under MDA
- Prioritize port-wide security strategies and actions that address surface, underwater, and land-based threats
- Target best risk-mitigation strategies achieving sustainable port-wide security and business continuity/resumption of trade planning
- Provide the basis for aligning specific grant-funded security projects under this and future year PSGP awards within the requirements of the AMSP

Deliverables for Existing Group I and Group II Port Areas

Existing Group I and II port areas are required to submit Investment Justifications before or on the end of application period by June 20, 2011 through the ND Grants system.

The designated Fiduciary Agent for each port area will submit this package, which must contain the following documents:

- Complete Investment Justifications
- Individual Budgets for each Investment Justification
- Total Budget for entire award
- COTP Field Review Forms

PART IV.
**APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION
INFORMATION**

A. Address to Request Application Package

FEMA makes all funding opportunities available on the Internet at <http://www.grants.gov>. If you experience difficulties accessing information or have any questions please call the Grants.gov customer support hotline at (800) 518-4726.

Application forms and instructions are available at Grants.gov. To access these materials, go to <http://www.grants.gov>, select “Apply for Grants,” and then select “Download Application Package.” Enter the CFDA and/or the funding opportunity number located on the cover of this announcement. Select “Download Application Package,” and then follow the prompts to download the application package. To download the instructions, go to “Download Application Package” and select “Instructions.”

B. Content and Form of Application

- 1. Application via Grants.gov.** All applicants must file their applications using the Administration’s common electronic “storefront” – <http://www.grants.gov>. Eligible grantees must apply for funding through this portal, accessible on the Internet at <http://www.grants.gov>.

The application must be started and submitted using Grants.gov after Central Contractor Registration (CCR) is confirmed. The on-line application includes the following required form:

- Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance

When applicants apply through <http://www.grants.gov>, the Standard Form 424 in the initial Grants.gov application will need to be submitted. The Standard Form 424 will be retrieved by ND Grants and the system will automatically populate the relevant data fields in the application. Because FEMA will need to conduct an initial review of the application prior to the submission deadline of June 20, 2011, grantees are encouraged to initiate and complete the Standard Form 424 submission within Grants.gov by **no later than June 13, 2011**. Upon the completion of the initial review, FEMA will determine whether an application should proceed further and the applicant will be notified to complete their submission by fulfilling additional

application requirements (e.g., budget, Investment Justification, Work Plan, etc.) listed below by **no later than June 20, 2011**.

The application must be completed and final submission made through the ND Grants system located at <https://portal.fema.gov>. If you need assistance registering for the ND Grants system, please contact FEMA's Enterprise Service Desk at (888) 457-3362. Applicants are encouraged to begin their ND Grants registration at the time of solicitation to ensure they have adequate time to start and complete their application submission. The ND Grants system includes the following required forms and submissions:

- Standard Form 424A, Budget Information (Non-construction)
- Standard Form 424B, Standard Assurances (Non-construction)
- Standard Form 424C, Budget Information (Construction)
- Standard Form 424D, Standard Assurances (Construction)
- Standard Form LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (if the grantee has engaged or intends to engage in lobbying activities)
- Grants.gov (GG) Lobbying Form, Certification Regarding Lobbying
- FEMA Form 20-16C, Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements
- Investment Justification (FEMA Form 089-5)
- Detailed Budget Worksheet

The program title listed in the Catalog of Federal Disaster Assistance (CFDA) is "*Port Security Grant Program*." The CFDA number is **97.056**.

- 2. Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Number.** The applicant must provide a DUNS number with their application. This number is a required field within <http://www.grants.gov> and for CCR. 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.
- 3. Valid CCR.** The application process also involves an updated and current registration by the applicant, which must be confirmed at <http://www.ccr.gov>.
- 4. Investment Justification (IJ).** As part of the FY 2011 PSGP application process, applicants must develop a formal IJ that addresses each initiative being proposed for funding. A separate IJ should be submitted for each proposed project. Each entity within a Group III or All Other Port Area may apply for up to three projects. Due to the nature of the FA process, FAs are not limited to three projects. IJs must demonstrate how proposed projects address gaps and deficiencies in current programs and capabilities. The IJ must demonstrate the ability to provide enhancements consistent with the purpose of the program and guidance provided by

FEMA. Applicants must ensure that the IJ is consistent with all applicable requirements outlined in this application kit.

The IJ must address or answer the following questions:

- Is your organization a member of the AMSC?
- Is your facility a MTSA regulated facility?
- If you are a MTSA regulated facility, what is your facility's operation?
- If you are not a regulated facility under MTSA, do you have a facility security plan, and if you have a plan what authority approved your security plan?
- Have you applied for any other security related grants, and if you have what grant program and when?
- If you are a recognized Law Enforcement Agency, how many MTSA regulated facilities or vessels are in your immediate area of responsibility?
- How many members of your company or agency have taken an Incident Command System course: ICS 100, ICS 200, ICS 300, ICS 700, and ICS 800?
- If you are a Fire Department, how many MTSA regulated facilities and MTSA regulated vessels are in your immediate area of responsibility?
- Is your organization listed in a risk mitigation plan, and if so, which ones?
- Is there a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) in place for this investment, to share this investment with other agencies?

Group I and II Port Areas

Group I and II IJs must be submitted with the grant application as a file attachment within <https://portal.fema.gov>.

Group III and All Other Port Areas

Group III and All Other Port Areas will submit their PSGP grant application, the associated Investment Justifications to include Detailed Budgets and associated MOUs/MOAs as a file attachment within <https://portal.fema.gov> before or on the application deadline date and time. The individual investments comprising a single application must take place within the same port area. Private MTSA regulated companies that operate in more than one eligible port area must submit separate applications for investments within the port area in which the facility or vessel is located.

Applicants will find an Investment Justification Template in *Section I, Part VI.A*. This worksheet may be used as a guide to assist applicants in the preparation of the IJ.

Applicants must provide information in the following categories for each proposed Investment:

- Background
- Strategic and program priorities
- Impact
- Funding and Implementation Plan

Applicants must use the following file naming convention when submitting required documents as part of the FY 2011 PSGP:

COTP Zone Abbreviation_Port Area_Name of Applicant_ IJ Number
(Example: Hous_Galveston_XYZ Oil_IJ#1)

- 5. Detailed Budget.** All applicants must provide detailed budgets for the funds requested at the time of application. The budget must be complete, reasonable, and cost-effective in relation to the proposed project. The budget should provide the basis of computation of all project-related costs (including M&A) and any appropriate narrative.

The review panels must be able to thoroughly evaluate the projects being submitted based on the information provided here. Applicants must ensure they provide an appropriate level of detail within the Detailed Budget to clarify intent as to what is being purchased.

Applicants will find a sample Budget Detail Worksheet in *Section I, Part VI.B*. This worksheet may be used as a guide to assist applicants in the preparation of the budget and budget narrative.

- 6. Memorandum of Understanding/Memorandum of Agreement (MOU/MOA) Requirement.** State and local agencies, as well as consortia or associations that are required to provide security services to MTSA regulated facilities pursuant to an AMSP, are eligible applicants. However, the security services provided must be addressed in the regulated entities' security plans. A copy of an MOU/MOA with the identified regulated entities will be required prior to funding, and must include an acknowledgement of the security services and roles and responsibilities of all entities involved. This information may be provided using one of the attachment fields within <https://portal.fema.gov>.

The MOU/MOA must address the following points:

- The nature of the security that the applicant agrees to supply to the regulated facility (waterside surveillance, increased screening, etc.)
- The roles and responsibilities of the facility and the applicant during different Maritime Security (MARSEC) levels
- An acknowledgement by the facility that the applicant is part of their facility security plan

If the applicant is mentioned as a provider of security services under the port's AMSP, in lieu of an MOA/MOU, written acknowledgement from the AMSC members, or a letter from the Federal Maritime Security Coordinator validating this status, will be acceptable. *In addition, MOA/MOUs submitted in previous PSGP award rounds will be acceptable, provided the activity covered also addresses the capability being requested through the FY 2010 PSGP.*

If applicable, the signed MOU/MOA for State or local law enforcement agencies and/or consortia providing layered protection to regulated entities must be submitted with the grant application as a file attachment within <https://portal.fema.gov>. A sample MOU/MOA can be found in *Section I, Part VI.C*.

COTP Zone Abbreviation_Port Area_Name of Applicant_MOU
(Example: Hous_Galveston_Harris County_MOU)

- 7. Sensitive Security Information (SSI) Requirements.** Information submitted in the course of applying for funding or reporting under certain programs or provided in the course of an entity's grant management activities under those programs which is under Federal control is subject to protection under SSI, and must be properly identified and marked. SSI is a control designation used by the Department of Homeland Security related to protecting information related to transportation security. It is applied to information about security programs, vulnerability and threat assessments, screening processes, technical specifications of certain screening equipment and objects used to test screening equipment, and equipment used for communicating security information relating to air, land, or maritime transportation. The applicable information is spelled out in greater detail in 49 CFR 1520.7.

For the purposes of the Port Security Grant Program, all Investment Justifications shall be considered SSI and treated as such. This means labeling as SSI and password protecting appropriate documents prior to submission. The passwords for protected documents must be sent (separate of the documents) to the following e-mail address AskCSID@dhs.gov.

The subject line of the email should identify:

- Applicant name
- Application number

The body of the e-mail should clearly identify:

- Applicant name
- IJ number and/or summary description
- COTP area
- POC information

NOTE: A single password should be provided for all SSI documents within the same application.

C. Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation (EHP) Compliance

FEMA is legally required to consider the potential impacts of all grant-funded projects on environmental resources and historic properties. For PSGP and other preparedness grant programs, this is accomplished via FEMA's EHP Review.

Grantees must comply with all applicable EHP laws, regulations, and EOs in order to draw down their FY 2011 PSGP grant funds. Any project with the potential to impact natural resources or historic properties cannot be initiated until FEMA has completed the required FEMA EHP review. Grantees that implement projects prior to receiving EHP approval from FEMA risk de-obligation of funds.

Not all projects require a FEMA EHP review. For example, the following activities would not require a FEMA EHP review: planning and development of policies or processes; management, administrative or personnel actions; classroom-based training; table top exercises; and, acquisition of mobile and portable equipment (not involving installation). However, any proposed project funded through PSGP that involves the installation of equipment, ground-disturbing activities, new construction, or modification/renovation of existing buildings or structures must undergo the FEMA EHP review process.

If a FEMA EHP review is required, you will receive notification from your Program Analyst (PA) on the type of EHP documentation needed for the FEMA EHP review. In these instances, grantees must complete the FEMA EHP Screening Form (OMB Number 1660-0115/FEMA Form 024-0-01) and submit it, with all supporting documentation, to the GPD EHP team at GPDEHPInfo@fema.gov. If you have any additional questions please contact CSID at (800) 368-6498, Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. EST. Refer to IBs 329, 345, and 356 (located at <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/bulletins/index.shtm>) and *Section II, Part I.B.5.5.6* for further details on EHP requirements.

D. Submission Dates and Times

All submissions will be received by **no later than 11:59 p.m. EDT, June 20, 2011**. Late applications will neither be considered nor reviewed. Only applications started through <http://www.grants.gov> and completed through the ND Grants system located at <https://portal.fema.gov> will be accepted.

PART V.

APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION

A. Review Criteria

The four core PSGP application review criteria are as follows:

- **Criteria #1.** Projects that support PSGP funding priorities identified in the PSGP *Guidance and Application Kit* package:
 - Enhancement of the port area's MDA (e.g., access control/standardized credentialing, command and control, communications, and enhanced intelligence sharing and analysis) capabilities
 - Enhancement of the port area's prevention, protection, response and recovery capabilities (e.g., capabilities that would help mitigate potential IED, CBRNE attacks via small craft, underwater swimmers, or onboard passenger and vehicle ferries)
 - Projects that enhance port resilience and recovery
 - Training and exercises
 - TWIC implementation projects (minus application and card purchase costs)
- **Criteria #2.** Projects that address priorities outlined in the applicable AMSP, as mandated under the MTSA and/or the PRMP
- **Criteria #3.** Projects that address additional security priorities based on the COTP's expertise and experience with the specific port area
- **Criteria #4.** Projects that offer the highest potential for risk reduction for the least cost

B. Review and Selection Process

1. **Initial Screening.** FEMA will conduct an initial review of all FY 2011 PSGP applications for completion. Applications passing this review will be grouped by port area and provided to the applicable COTP for further review.
2. **Field Review.** Field-level reviews will be managed by the applicable COTP in coordination with the Director of the U.S. Department of Transportation's Maritime Administration's Gateway Office and appropriate personnel from the AMSC, to include Federal, State, and local agencies, as identified by the COTP. To support coordination of and regionalization of security grant application projects with State and Urban Area homeland security strategies, as well as other State and local security plans, AMSC members representing State and local agencies should coordinate the results with the applicable State administrative agency or agencies and State homeland security advisor(s).

Field reviews for all Groups occur immediately following the initial screening. Each specific project is scored for compliance with criteria enumerated in the previous section. The purpose of the COTP Review is to identify a prioritized list of eligible maritime security risk mitigation projects for funding within the area of responsibility (AOR), for all Groups within the AOR. The COTP will use the COTP Field Review Form to review all projects. This form may seek the following information:

- A total score for each proposal received with each port being ranked from highest to lowest in terms of their contributions to regional risk reduction and cost effectiveness; and
- A specific notation if other entities within the port region have similar capabilities
- A specific notation as to whether there is a need for or lack of the redundant capability

After completing field reviews, COTPs will submit the field review project scores and prioritized lists through the appropriate route to FEMA who will begin coordination of the national review process.

- 3. National Review.** Following the field review, a National Review Panel (NRP) will convene with subject matter experts drawn from DHS and the Department of Transportation (DOT). The purpose of the National Review is to identify a final, prioritized list of eligible projects for funding. The NRP will conduct an initial review of the prioritized project listings for each port area submitted by the USCG's COTP to ensure that the proposed projects will accomplish intended risk mitigation goals. The NRP will validate and normalize the Field Review COTP Project Priority List and provide a master list of prioritized projects by port area.²

A risk-based methodology will then be applied to the National Review Panel's validated, prioritized list for each port area in all groups. The algorithm considers the following factors to produce a comprehensive national priority ranking of port security proposals:

- Relationship of the project to one or more of the national port security priorities
- Relationship of the project to the local port security priorities
- COTP ranking (based on each COTP's prioritized list of projects)
- Risk level of the port area in which the project would be located (based on a comprehensive risk analysis performed by DHS)

² The NRP will have the ability to recommend partial funding for individual projects and eliminate others that are determined to be duplicative or require a sustained Federal commitment to fully realize the intended risk mitigation. The NRP will also validate proposed project costs. Decisions to reduce requested funding amounts or eliminate requested items deemed inappropriate under the scope of the FY 2011 PSGP will take into consideration the ability of the revised project to address the intended national port security priorities and achieve the intended risk mitigation goal. Historically, the PSGP has placed a high priority on providing full project funding rather than partial funding.

The NRP will be asked to evaluate and validate the consolidated and ranked project list resulting from application of the algorithm and submit their determinations to FEMA. The NRP may request additional information or clarification from applicants. Applicants receiving requests from the NRP will have 30 days from the date of the request to respond. FEMA will have the final approval authority on all projects.

Funds will not be made available for obligation, expenditure, or drawdown until the applicant's budget and budget narrative have been approved by FEMA.

The applicant must provide a detailed budget for the funds requested. The detailed budget must be submitted with the grant application as a file attachment within www.grants.gov. The budget must be complete, reasonable, and cost-effective in relation to the proposed project. The budget should provide the basis of computation of all project-related costs, any appropriate narrative, and a detailed justification of M&A costs.

C. Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates

FEMA will evaluate, act on applications, and make awards on or before September 30, 2011.

D. Intergovernmental Review

Executive Order 12372 requires applicants from State and local units of government or other organizations providing services within a State to submit a copy of the application to the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC), if one exists, and if this program has been selected for review by the State. Applicants must contact their State SPOC to determine if the program has been selected for State review. Executive Order 12372 can be referenced at <http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/codification/executive-order/12372.html>. The names and addresses of the SPOCs are listed on OMB's home page available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_s poc.

PART VI. OTHER INFORMATION

A. Investment Justification Template

Investment Heading	
Port Area	
State	
Applicant Organization	
Investment Name	
Investment Amount	\$

I. Background

Note: This section only needs to be completed once per application, regardless of the number of Investments proposed. The information in this section provides background and context for the Investment(s) requested, but does not represent the evaluation criteria used by DHS for rating individual Investment proposals.

I. Provide an overview of the port area, MTSA regulated facility, or MTSA regulated vessel	
Response Type	Narrative
Page Limit	Not to exceed 1 page
Response Instructions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of Operations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify COTP Zone ○ Identify eligible port area ○ Identify exact location of project site (i.e. physical address of facility being enhanced) ○ Identify who the infrastructure (project site) is owned or operated by, if not by your own organization • Point(s) of contact for organization (include contact information): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify the organization's Authorizing Official for entering into grant agreement, including contact information (include sub-grantee entering agreement within Group 1 and 2 port areas under FA process) ○ Identify the organization's primary point of contact for management of the project(s) • Ownership or Operation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify whether the applicant is: (1) a private entity; (2) a State or local agency; or (3) a consortium composed of local stakeholder groups (i.e., river groups, ports, or terminal associations) representing federally regulated ports, terminals, US inspected passenger vessels or ferries. • Role in providing layered protection of regulated entities (applicable to State or local agencies, consortia and associations only): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Describe your organization's specific roles, responsibilities and activities in delivering layered protection • Important features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Describe any operational issues you deem important to the consideration of your application (e.g., interrelationship of your operations with other eligible high-risk ports, etc.) • Ferry systems required data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure • Ridership data

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of passenger miles • Number of vehicles per vessel, if any • Types of service and other important features • System map • Geographical borders of the system and the cities and counties served • Other sources of funding being leveraged for security enhancements
Response	

II. Strategic and Program Priorities

II.A. Provide a brief abstract of the Investment list just ONE investment.	
Response Type	Narrative
Page Limit	Not to exceed 1/2 page
Response Instructions	Provide a succinct statement summarizing this Investment
Response	

II.B. Describe how the Investment will address one or more of the PSGP priorities and Area Maritime Security Plan or COTP Priorities (how it corresponds with PRMP for Group I and II)	
Response Type	Narrative
Page Limit	Not to exceed 1/2 page
Response Instructions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe how, and the extent to which, the investment addresses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enhancement of Maritime Domain Awareness ○ Enhancement of IED and CBRNE prevention, protection, response and recovery capabilities ○ Port resilience and recovery capabilities ○ Training and exercises ○ Efforts supporting the implementation of TWIC • Area Maritime Security Plan and/or Captain of the Port Priorities
Response	

III. Impact

III.A. Describe how the project offers the highest risk reduction potential at the least cost.	
Response Type	Narrative
Page Limit	Not to exceed 1/2 page
Response Instructions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss how the project will reduce risk in a cost effective manner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discuss how this investment will reduce risk (e.g., reduce vulnerabilities or mitigate the consequences of an event) by addressing the needs and priorities identified in earlier analysis and review.
Response	

III.B. Describe current capabilities similar to this Investment	
Response Type	Narrative
Page Limit	Not to exceed 1/2 page
Response Instructions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe how many agencies within the port have existing equipment that are the same or have similar capacity as the proposed project • Include the number of existing capabilities within the port that are identical or equivalent to the proposed project
Response	

IV. Funding & Implementation Plan

- Complete the IV.A. to identify the amount of funding you are requesting for this investment only
- Funds should be requested by allowable cost categories as identified below
- Applicants must make funding requests that are reasonable and justified by direct linkages to activities outlined in this particular Investment

The following template illustrates how the applicants should indicate the amount of FY 2011 PSGP funding required for the investment and how these funds will be allocated across the cost elements.

IV.A. Investment Funding Plan	FY 2011 PSGP Request Total	Match (Optional)	Grand Total
<i>Maritime Domain Awareness</i>			
<i>IED and CBRNE Prevention, Protection, Response and Recovery Capabilities</i>			
<i>Training</i>			
<i>Exercises</i>			
<i>TWIC Implementation</i>			
<i>Operational Packages (OPacks)</i>			
<i>M&A</i>			
Total			

IV.B. Provide a high-level timeline, milestones and dates, for the implementation of this Investment such as stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions or purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. <u>Up to 10 milestones may be provided.</u>	
Response Type	Narrative
Page Limit	Not to exceed 1 page
Response Instructions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only include major milestones that are critical to the success of the Investment • Milestones are for this discrete Investment – those that are covered by the requested FY 2011 PSGP funds and will be completed over the 36-month grant period starting from the award date, giving consideration for review and approval process up to 12 months (estimate 24 month project period) • Milestones should be kept to high-level, major tasks that will need to occur (i.e. Design and development, begin procurement process, site preparations, installation, project completion, etc.) • List any relevant information that will be critical to the successful completion of the milestone (such as those examples listed in the question text above) <p><i>Note: Investments will be evaluated on the expected impact on security relative to the amount of the investment (i.e., cost effectiveness). An itemized Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative must also be completed for this investment. See following section for a sample format</i></p>
Response	

B. Sample Budget Detail Worksheet

Purpose. The Budget Detail Worksheet may be used as a guide to assist applicants in the preparation of the budget and budget narrative. You may submit the budget and budget narrative using this form or in the format of your choice (plain sheets, your own form, or a variation of this form). However, all required information (including the budget

narrative) must be provided. Any category of expense not applicable to your budget may be deleted.

A. Personnel. List each position by title and name of employee, if available. Show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time to be devoted to the project. Compensation paid for employees engaged in grant activities must be consistent with that paid for similar work within the applicant organization.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
		\$
Total Personnel		\$

B. Fringe Benefits. Fringe benefits should be based on actual known costs or an established formula. Fringe benefits are for the personnel listed in budget category (A) and only for the percentage of time devoted to the project.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
		\$
Total Fringe Benefits		\$

C. Travel. Itemize travel expenses of project personnel by purpose (e.g., staff to training, field interviews, advisory group meeting, etc.). Show the basis of computation (e.g., six people to 3-day training at \$X airfare, \$X lodging, \$X subsistence). In training projects, travel and meals for trainees should be listed separately. Show the number of trainees and unit costs involved. Identify the location of travel, if known. Indicate source of Travel Policies applied, Applicant or Federal Travel Regulations.

Purpose of Travel	Location	Item	Computation	Cost
				\$
Total Travel				\$

D. Equipment. List non-expendable items that are to be purchased. Non-expendable equipment is tangible property having a useful life of more than one year. (Note: Organization’s own capitalization policy and threshold amount for classification of equipment may be used). Expendable items should be included either in the “Supplies” category or in the “Other” category. Applicants should analyze the cost benefits of purchasing versus leasing equipment, especially high cost items and those subject to rapid technical advances. Rented or leased equipment costs should be listed in the “Contractual” category. Explain how the equipment is necessary for the success of the project. Attach a narrative describing the procurement method to be used.

Budget Narrative: Provide a narrative budget justification for each of the budget items identified.

Item	Computation	Cost
		\$
Total Equipment		\$

E. Supplies. List items by type (office supplies, postage, training materials, copying paper, and other expendable items such as books, hand held tape recorders) and show the basis for computation. (Note: Organization’s own capitalization policy and threshold amount for classification of supplies may be used). Generally, supplies include any materials that are expendable or consumed during the course of the project.

Supply Items	Computation	Cost
		\$
Total Supplies		\$

F. Consultants/Contracts. Indicate whether applicant’s formal, written Procurement Policy or the Federal Acquisition Regulations are followed.

Consultant Fees: For each consultant enter the name, if known, service to be provided, hourly or daily fee (8-hour day), and estimated time on the project.

Budget Narrative: Provide a narrative budget justification for each of the budget items identified.

Name of Consultant	Service Provided	Computation	Cost
			\$
Subtotal – Consultant Fees			\$

Consultant Expenses: List all expenses to be paid from the grant to the individual consultant in addition to their fees (i.e., travel, meals, lodging, etc.)

Budget Narrative: Provide a narrative budget justification for each of the budget items identified.

Item	Location	Computation	Cost
			\$
Subtotal – Consultant Expenses			\$

Contracts: Provide a description of the product or services to be procured by contract and an estimate of the cost. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. Any sole source contracts must follow the requirements set forth in 44 CFR Section 13.36.

Budget Narrative: Provide a narrative budget justification for each of the budget items identified.

Item	Cost
	\$
Subtotal – Contracts	\$
Total Consultants/Contracts	\$

G. Other Costs. List items (e.g., reproduction, janitorial or security services, and investigative or confidential funds) by major type and the basis of the computation. For example, provide the square footage and the cost per square foot for rent, and provide a monthly rental cost and how many months to rent.

Budget Narrative: Provide a narrative budget justification for each of the budget items identified.

Important Note: If applicable to the project, construction costs should be included in this section of the Budget Detail Worksheet.

Description	Computation	Cost
		\$
	Total Other	\$

H. Indirect Costs. Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a federally approved indirect cost rate. A copy of the rate approval, (a fully executed, negotiated agreement), must be attached. If the applicant does not have an approved rate, one can be requested by contacting the applicant's cognizant Federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct costs categories.

Description	Computation	Cost
		\$
	Total Indirect Costs	\$

Budget Summary - When you have completed the budget worksheet, transfer the totals for each category to the spaces below. Compute the total direct costs and the total project costs. Indicate the amount of Federal funds requested and the amount of non-Federal funds that will support the project.

Budget Category	Federal Amount	Non-Federal Amount
A. Personnel	\$	\$
B. Fringe Benefits	\$	\$
C. Travel	\$	\$
D. Equipment	\$	\$
E. Supplies	\$	\$
F. Consultants/Contracts	\$	\$
G. Other	\$	\$
H. Indirect Costs	\$	\$

Total Requested Federal Amount	Total Non-Federal Amount
\$	\$
Combined Total Project Costs	
\$	

C. Sample MOU/MOA Template

Memorandum of Understanding / Agreement Between [provider of layered security] and [recipient of layered security] Regarding [provider of layered security's] use of port security grant program funds

- 1. PARTIES.** The parties to this Agreement are the [Provider of Layered Security] and the [Recipient of security service].
 - 2. AUTHORITY.** This Agreement is authorized under the provisions of [applicable Area Maritime Security Committee authorities and/or other authorities].
 - 3. PURPOSE.** The purpose of this Agreement is to set forth terms by which [Provider of security service] shall expend Port Security Grant Program project funding in providing security service to [Recipient of security service]. Under requested FY 2011 PSGP grant, the [Provider of security service] must provide layered security to [Recipient of security service] consistent with the approach described in an approved grant application.
 - 4. RESPONSIBILITIES:** The security roles and responsibilities of each party are understood as follows:
 - (1). [Recipient of security service]
Roles and responsibilities in providing its own security at each MARSEC level
 - (2) [Provider of security service]
 - An acknowledgement by the facility that the applicant is part of their facility security plan.
 - The nature of the security that the applicant agrees to supply to the regulated facility (waterside surveillance, increased screening, etc).
 - Roles and responsibilities in providing security to [Recipient of security service] at each MARSEC level.
 - 5. POINTS OF CONTACT.** [Identify the POCs for all applicable organizations under the Agreement; including addresses and phone numbers (fax number, e-mail, or internet addresses can also be included).]
 - 6. OTHER PROVISIONS.** Nothing in this Agreement is intended to conflict with current laws or regulations of [applicable State] or [applicable local Government]. If a term of this agreement is inconsistent with such authority, then that term shall be invalid, but the remaining terms and conditions of this agreement shall remain in full force and effect.
 - 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.** The terms of this agreement will become effective on (EFFECTIVE DATE).
 - 8. MODIFICATION.** This agreement may be modified upon the mutual written consent of the parties.
 - 9. TERMINATION.** The terms of this agreement, as modified with the consent of both parties, will remain in effect until the grant end dates for an approved grant. Either party upon [NUMBER] days written notice to the other party may terminate this agreement.
- APPROVED BY:**

Organization and Title

Signature

(Date) (Date)

D. Other

The Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO)

The DNDO is responsible for developing the global nuclear detection architecture and acquiring and supporting the deployment of the domestic detection system to detect and report attempts to import or transport a nuclear device or fissile or radiological material, intended for illicit use. The DNDO is conducting both evolutionary (near-term) and transformational (long-term) research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) programs to improve the Nation's capabilities for detection and identification of rad/nuc materials. By integrating RDT&E programs with operational support responsibilities, DNDO will ensure technologies are appropriately deployed, with training materials and well-developed operational response protocols. Working with Federal, State, local, and Tribal partners, DNDO has piloted initial training programs and developed detection alarm protocols that can be customized for specific operational missions.

DNDO's activities support a layered defense incorporating a variety of detection capabilities to ensure the greatest probability of detection for radioactive substances entering and transported within the country. This layered detection strategy includes detection equipment and facilities that are specifically chosen based on the local operating environment.

While these technologies are a critical tool to combat terrorism, the nuclear threat is not one that can be effectively countered by technology alone. Accordingly, DNDO supports the development of preventative rad/nuc detection (PRND) capabilities across State, local and Tribal entities through training, exercise support, equipment test reports, and information sharing capabilities. These resources include: providing technical reachback support to Federal, State, local and Tribal operators; development of standardized training curricula and response protocols; conducting comprehensive assessments of existing technologies to inform application and acquisition; and the development of a national situational awareness and analysis capability through the Joint Analysis Center. Such resources can be used by State, local and Tribal entities to build or enhance a comprehensive PRND program, or to develop specific PRND capabilities in areas such as commercial vehicle inspection, special events screening, small maritime craft monitoring, and fixed infrastructure protection.