



# FEMA

Grant Programs Directorate  
Federal Emergency Management Agency  
U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
Washington, DC 20472

---

## PORT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM FIELD REVIEW FORM

This form supports the field level project review process and helps streamline the associated documentation requirements for all ports under the Port Security Grant Program (PSGP).

46 USC 70107 is the legislative authority for the Federal Maritime Security Coordinator (FMSC)/Captain of the Port (COTP) to review, comment, and make determinations on projects submitted under the PSGP as referenced in the PSGP Guidance and Application Kit. Field-level reviews are managed by the COTP having jurisdiction for the port area, in coordination with the local Maritime Administration director and appropriate personnel from the Area Maritime Security Committee (AMSC) as identified by the COTP. In reviewing project proposals or Investment Justification (IJs), the COTP is required to make a determination that the security project addresses or corrects Coast Guard identified vulnerabilities in port security and supports compliance with Area Maritime Transportation Security Plans and facility security plans. The COTP should recommend the level of funding for each project (full, partial, or none) and provide comments as appropriate. This process is best accomplished through coordination with the AMSC, whose members serve in an advisory capacity to the COTP.

Each project proposal must be listed and described on an Investment Justification (IJ) document and must support at least one of the five PSGP Priorities as outlined in the PSGP Guidance and Application Kit. For Group 1 and Group 2 ports participating in the FA process and having an approved Port-Wide Risk Management Plan (PRMP), projects must address the vulnerabilities outlined in the port's PRMP and must support the Area Maritime Security Plan (AMSP) and/or Facility Security Plans (FSP). Exceptions to this requirement may be made upon recommendation by the field review team based on a project's ability to mitigate newly identified security risks within the port area. For port areas that do not have an approved PRMP, proposed projects must support the port's AMSP and/or applicable FSPs and must provide a clear benefit to port security. Specifics regarding funding priorities and project eligibility are included in the attached form and presented in greater detail in the PSGP Guidance and Application Kit.

When conducting the review and making determinations, projects should be rated using the criteria and scale outlined in the attached form below. The COTP and MARAD representative are strongly encouraged to make any comments to either fund, partially fund, or deny the projects submitted. To support coordination and regionalization of security projects and avoid potential duplication of effort, AMSC members representing state and local agencies should coordinate the review results with the applicable State Administrative Agency (SAA) and State Homeland Security Advisor(s).

**FMSC/MARAD REP COMMENTS AND COTP/AMSC FIELD REVIEW FORM**

Criteria	Description	Scale
<b>Criteria 1</b>	Projects that support the national port priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enhancement of port area’s MDA</li> <li>▪ Enhancement of port area’s IED prevention, detection, protection, response and recovery capabilities</li> <li>▪ Port Resilience and Recovery Capabilities</li> <li>▪ Training and exercises</li> <li>▪ TWIC implementation projects</li> </ul>	0 = Not applicable, project does not address one of the National Priorities 1 = Project will be marginally effective in addressing one of the National Priorities 2 = Project will be moderately effective in addressing one of the National Priorities 3 = Project will be very effective in addressing one of the National Priorities 4 = Project will be extremely effective in addressing one of the National Priorities 5 = Project will be extremely effective in addressing one of the National Priorities and moderately effective in addressing at least one additional National Priority 6 = Project will be extremely effective in addressing one of the National Priorities and very effective in addressing at least one additional National Priority 7 = Project will be extremely effective in addressing more than one of the National Priorities 8 = Project will be extremely effective in addressing ALL of the National Priorities
<b>Criteria 2</b>	Projects that address priorities outlined in the applicable AMSP, as mandated under the MTSA and/or the FEMA PRMP	0 = Project is not responsive to the AMSP 1 = Project is marginally responsive to the AMSP 2 = Project is moderately responsive to the AMSP 3 = Project is very responsive to the AMSP 4 = Project is extremely responsive to the AMSP
<b>Criteria 3</b>	Projects that address additional security priorities based on the COTP’s expertise and experience with the specific port area	0 = Project will not impact additional security priorities 1 = Project will have a marginal impact on additional security priorities 2 = Project will have a moderate impact on additional security priorities 3 = Project will have a substantial impact on additional security priorities 4 = Project will have a major impact on additional security priorities
<b>Criteria 4</b>	Projects that offer the highest potential for risk reduction for the least cost	0 = Project offers no risk reduction potential for the cost 1 = Project offers marginal risk reduction potential for the cost 2 = Project offers moderate risk reduction potential for the cost 3 = Project offers good risk reduction potential for the cost 4 = Project offers outstanding risk reduction potential for the cost



1. This area should be used to capture COTP/MARAD/AMSC comments. A 10-15 line paragraph should be provided for each project.
2. Although not required for award consideration, it would be helpful if the COTP also identifies the attack scenarios that the project will assist in mitigating. This information may assist the National Review Panel in understanding the capabilities of the project and will help support FEMA's efforts to develop performance metrics for PSGP.

Example:

IJ 1: This project will enhance maritime security risk mitigation by adding another layer of detection and deterrence capabilities along with immediate C2 functionality for this specific area. (Full Funding Recommendations could be: Recommend full funding due to the capability and capacity this project will enhance). (Partial Funding Recommendation: Recommend partial funding by removing these items from the project (list items and reason for removal, e.g. remove 5 Handguns @ \$1,000 each, total \$5,000 - unallowable cost). This project addresses the following program priorities: IED Detection/Prevention/Response/Recovery. The following attack scenarios are addressed by this project . . . .

COTP Signature:
