



DRAFT
Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy
Implementation Guidance for Fiscal Year 2013

August 2013

Table of Contents

1.0 BAY AREA HOMELAND SECURITY STRATEGY.....2

2.0 UASI GRANT PROGRAM OVERVIEW2

3.0 THE 2013 FEDERAL BUDGET.....2

4.0 ROLE OF THE WORK GROUPS3

5.0 ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.....4

 STEP 1 FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.....5

 STEP 2 REGIONAL SUSTAINMENT PRIORITIES.....5

 STEP 3 MAJOR CITY ALLOCATIONS.....7

 STEP 4 ADDITIONAL UASI FUNDING.....7

 STEP 5 THE STATE’S 20% HOLD BACK.....10

6.0 WORK GROUP MEETINGS12

APPENDIX A PROJECT TEMPLATE.....13

1.0 Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy

In 2012 the Bay Area Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) conducted a region-wide risk validation analysis and capabilities assessment along with capabilities assessments across the region's twelve counties/operational areas. The results of these efforts were used to update the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) mandated Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy for the Bay Area UASI in 2013.

The 2013 *Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy* (Strategy) is a comprehensive, data driven document that outlines the Bay Area's risks, capabilities, vision, structure, and goals and objectives for homeland security. Having such a strategy ensures the Bay Area is in the best possible position to clearly track and articulate its risks and capability needs to local leaders, the State of California and DHS when seeking resources to reduce that risk and satisfy those capability needs.

The following sets forth **interim** guidance for the Bay Area to implement the region's Strategy in the form of homeland security projects for FY 2013. This guidance is interim due to the fact that the FY 2013 federal DHS grant guidelines have not been issued and the Bay Area does not know its funding allocation at this time. Moreover, this guidance only sets forth the methodology to be used to allocate FY 2013 UASI funding. It does not include the rules governing allowable expenses under the UASI grant for FY 2013 such as personnel costs, etc. Therefore, this guidance will change to reflect such rules once final DHS guidelines are issued. Over the coming weeks and months, the Bay Area UASI Management Team will hold a series of meetings to review this guidance in more detail and answer any questions stakeholders may have.

2.0 UASI Grant Program Overview

Since its inception in FY 2003, the intent of the UASI program has been to enhance regional terrorism preparedness in major metropolitan areas by developing integrated systems for terrorism prevention, protection, response, and recovery. Ultimately, the FY 2013 UASI program is intended to provide financial assistance to address the unique regional, multi-discipline terrorism preparedness planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercise needs of high-threat, high-density urban areas.

Activities implemented with UASI funds **must** support terrorism preparedness. However, as noted in the *Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy*, many capabilities which support terrorism preparedness simultaneously support preparedness for other hazards, including natural disasters and major accidents. Any FY 2013 Bay Area UASI funded projects **must** demonstrate the dual-use quality for any activities implemented that are not explicitly focused on terrorism preparedness.

3.0 2013 Federal Budget

It is expected that Congress will pass the DHS FY 2013 budget in December of 2012, which will include funds for all state and local homeland security grants.

4.0 Role of the Work Groups

For FY 2013, the Bay Area is once again utilizing regional subject matter expert working groups to develop and review proposed projects. These projects will be developed using the FY 2013 project template attached to this guidance as Appendix A. Each work group is assigned a goal or set of goals from the *Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy*. The work groups will develop and review regional projects designed to implement the goal(s) and objectives from the Strategy for which they have responsibility. These regional projects may be developed from and/or solicited by operational areas, special districts, or sub-regions within the 12 county Bay Area UASI. There is no limit as to the number of projects that each work group may develop and submit. Each work group will develop a list of prioritized projects based on the Regional Risk Analysis Center gap scores. Work Groups will provide scalable solutions and annotate projects that are “Shovel Ready” or have the ability to be completed within 6 months of funding allocation. Each Work Group will be responsible for identifying a Work Group lead POC to the UASI Management Team.

The work groups and their areas of responsibility concerning projects for FY 2013 are:

- **Risk Management/Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Work Group**
 - Regional planning and risk management projects under Bay Area Strategy Goal 1.
 - Regional intelligence, information sharing and infrastructure protection projects under Bay Area Strategy Goal 2.
- **Communications Work Group**
 - Regional communications projects under Bay Area Strategy Goal 3.
- **Regional Exercise & Training/CBRNE Working Group**
 - Regional CBRNE projects under Bay Area Strategy Goal 4
 - Regional training and exercise program projects under Bay Area Strategy Goal 8.
- **Regional Catastrophic Planning Team and Public Health Working Group**
 - Regional public health and medical projects under Bay Area Strategy Goal 5
 - Regional community preparedness and emergency planning projects under Bay Area Strategy Goal 6
 - Regional recovery projects under Bay Area Strategy Goal 7.

The Bay Area Management Team will conduct meetings to review the project template and answer any questions of the participants. The Management Team will also prepare and submit the grant application to the State of California for submittal to DHS.

Work groups are strongly encouraged to integrate Federal, State and local grant and general funds when developing FY 2013 projects, with an understanding that the rules governing the use of those funds may vary from funding source to funding source, with an understanding that the rules governing the use of those funds may vary from funding source to funding source.

5.0 Role of the Hubs

For FY 2013, the Bay Area is once again utilizing Hub groups to develop and review proposed projects developed by the working groups. The planning Hubs will be based on the geographical location of the agencies based on North, East, South and West Bay Areas. Hub proposed projects will be developed using the FY 2013 project template attached to this guidance as Appendix A and sent to the working group with subject matter expertise on the project to evaluate and resubmit to the Hub for secondary review. Each Hub will review the overall lists of working group prioritized proposals and select projects from the list and develop prioritized Hub list based on regional need and local capabilities based on the set of goals from the *Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy*. Hubs will provide scalable solutions and annotate projects that are “Shovel Ready” or have the ability to be completed within 6 months of funding allocation. The Hubs will develop and review regional projects designed to implement the goal(s) and objectives from the Strategy. There is no limit as to the number of projects that each Hub may develop and submit. Each Hub will develop a list of prioritized projects based on the Regional funding risk allocation formula. However, total funding available to each Hub group may be capped as discussed later in this guidance.

Each HUB will be responsible for identifying a HUB lead POC to the UASI Management Team.

The Bay Area UASI Management Team will conduct meetings to review the project template and answer any questions of the participants. The Management Team will also prepare and submit the Approval Authority approved grant application to the State of California for submittal to DHS.

Hubs are strongly encouraged to integrate Federal, State and local grant and general funds when developing FY 2013 projects, with an understanding that the rules governing the use of those funds may vary from funding source to funding source.

5.0 Role of the Advisory Group

For FY 2013, the Bay Area is once again utilizing the UASI Advisory Group to review proposed projects. These projects will be reviewed based on the Regional Risk Analysis

Center Gap Analysis and the set of goals from the *Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy*. The Advisory Group will review the list of Hub projects to reduce duplication of effort, confirm prioritization of projects based on attainable mitigation of regional risk, and review for compliance with the Strategy and applicable UASI, CalEMA and FEMA guidance.

The Bay Area Management Team will facilitate meetings to review the Hub projects and answer any questions of the Advisory Group. The Management Team will also prepare and submit the grant application to the State of California for submittal to DHS.

6.0 Allocation of Funding

Since the FY 2013 budget has not been determined, the Bay Area will operate under the assumption that the FY 2013 funding will be approximately equal to the amount allocated in FY 2012 – \$26,423,268 – until such time as DHS determines otherwise. This assumption will allow the region to have projects drafted and approved in the event the level of funding is at or near the FY 2012 amount. Such a process is far more efficient than assuming a very low level of funding and then trying to develop projects at the last moment when the actual level of funding is higher than the amount originally assumed. Based on a \$26 million allocation, the Bay Area will allocate funding and develop projects using the following process:

Step 1 Federal Requirements

As in year's past, by statute, any UASI allocation must set aside no less than 25% of the total allocation for law enforcement terrorism prevention activities (LETPA). LETPA includes the cost of intelligence analysts, counter terrorism training for law enforcement, etc. A detailed description of LETPA and requirements across planning, organization, equipment, training and exercise solution areas will be outlined in greater detail in the final iteration of this guidance.

One of DHS' highest priorities in FY 2012 was the enhancement of state and major urban area fusion centers (i.e. the Northern California Regional Intelligence Center (NCRIC)). Although not a statutory requirement, in FY 2012, DHS **required** that in the state or urban area in which one of the DHS-recognized state or Major urban area fusion centers reside, at least one investment justification must address funding support for that recognized fusion center. However, there was no minimum percentage or dollar amount associated with this requirement.

In FY 2011, the Bay Area UASI's Investment Justification number two satisfied the DHS fusion center requirement. It is most likely that this DHS mandate will continue into FY 2013 and the Bay Area will operate under that assumption unless informed otherwise by DHS. Virtually any funding set aside for fusion center activities would also satisfy part or all of the 25% set aside for LETPA activities (depending on the amount of funding allocated for fusion center activities and the total amount of UASI funding received by an urban area).

The last federal requirement is the State of California's potential hold back of up to 20% of the region's total UASI allocation for State projects. This issue is addressed in more detail in section 5, step 5 herein.

Step 2 Regional Sustainment Priorities

Once federal requirements are known and satisfied, the region will identify and provide sustainment funding for those regional projects the Bay Area has determined must be sustained for this fiscal year. In the event the level of funding received by the Bay Area is less than that amount needed to fully sustain the projects listed for sustainment in FY 2013, each project will receive a percentage of the available funding equal to the current percentage it would receive if \$11,193,005 were allocated to the Bay Area as outlined in the table on the next page. Since management and administration of the grant is an amount equal to 5% of the total allocation, the actual amount available for projects under an \$11,193,005 allocation would be \$10,633,355. The following are the FY 2013 sustainment projects for the Bay Area UASI:

DRAFT

FY 2013 Sustainment Projects

Goal	Goal Title & Projects	FY 2013 Funding	% of Total Funding
1	Planning and Risk Management		
	Risk Management Project	\$436,800	4.1%
2	Information Analysis & Infrastructure Protection		
	NCRIC	\$4,000,000	37.6%
	COPLINK - San Mateo Maintenance	\$360,000	3.4%
	COPLINK - Santa Clara Maintenance	\$290,000	2.7%
	ARIES – Contra Costa Maintenance	\$354,000	3.3%
4	CBRNE Response		
	Resource Typing Database	\$100,000	0.9%
8	Regional Exercise & Training		
	Regional T&E Team	\$1,692,555	15.9%
	Training	\$1,700,000	16.0%
	Exercises	\$1,700,000	16.0%
Total Project Funding:		\$10,633,355	
Management & Administration		\$559,650	5%
Grand Total:		\$11,193,005	

Each regional sustainment project shall be submitted by the project lead for that sustainment project to the Bay Area UASI Management Team using the project template in Appendix A. The Management Team will ensure all elements of the sustainment projects meet UASI grant requirements for FY 2013.

Step 3 Major City Allocations

Assuming the Bay Area receives UASI funding in excess of \$11,193,005 of which \$10,633,355 is for pre-determined core regional projects as outlined above, the Bay Area will allocate the additional funding to the three major cities in the region: San Francisco, San Jose and Oakland under the following methodology:

Accounting first for the 5% for management and administration, if the amount of available UASI funding for projects is \$3 million or more above the \$10,633,355, each major city shall receive a \$1 million allocation. If the additional UASI funding for projects is less than \$3 million, each major city shall receive an equal share of the available project funding. If no UASI funding is available beyond the \$10,633,355 needed to sustain the projects listed above, the major cities shall receive no UASI allocation. Under no circumstances will a single major city receive a UASI allocation in excess of \$1 million.

All projects funded under the major city allocation **must** have a UASI project template from Appendix B, or set of templates as the case may be, that accounts for the entire amount to be spent by each city. Major city projects may be developed to support any one or more of the goals and objectives in the *Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy*. Each major city project must be vetted through the UASI Management Team for compliance with UASI policy. The Management Team will then submit the projects to the Advisory Group and Approval Authority for final approval.

Step 4 Additional UASI Funding

Assuming the Bay Area receives UASI funding in excess of the amount necessary to fund the sustainment projects and the major city projects, the Bay Area will then allocate excess project funding to those projects developed by the region's work groups and Hubs that:

- Enhance the region's priority capabilities: those capabilities most relevant/important based on the region's risk profile and/or that have a low level of ability based upon the results of the 2012 Bay Area regional capabilities assessment developed through the Regional Risk Analysis Center.

The following are the priority capabilities, their corresponding goal and objective number in the *Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy* for FY 2013, and the work groups are responsible for developing projects for their implementation that must be reviewed by the Hubs and then finally reviewed by the Advisory Group for recommendation to the Approval Authority. In addition to completing an initiative, every project developed by a work group and Hub for FY 2013 **must** directly enhance or sustain capabilities in these areas.

Risk Management/Information Analysis Work Group

Goal 1 Develop a Regional Risk Management and Planning Program

- Risk Management (Objective 1.1)
- Planning (Objective 1.1)

Goal 2 Enhance Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Capabilities

- Counter Terrorism and Law Enforcement (Objective 2.1)
- Information Gathering and Recognition of Indicators and Warnings (Objective 2.2)
- Critical Infrastructure Protection (Objective 2.5)

Communications Work Group

Goal 3 Strengthen Communications Capabilities

- Communications (Objective 3.1)

Regional Training and Exercises/CBRNE Work Group

Goal 4 Strengthen CBRNE Detection, Response, and Decontamination Capabilities

- CBRNE Detection (Objective 4.3)
- On-site Incident Management (Objective 4.7)
- Responder Safety and Health (Objective 4.8)
- Public Safety and Security (Objective 4.9)

Regional Catastrophic Planning Team

Goal 5 Enhance Medical, Public Health and Mass Care Preparedness

- Medical Surge (Objective 5.2)
- Fatality Management (Objective 5.7)

Goal 6 Strengthen Emergency Planning and Citizen Preparedness Capabilities

- Emergency Public Information and Warning (Objective 6.2)

Goal 7 Enhance Recovery Capabilities

- Economic and Community Recover (Objective 7.2)
- Restoration of Lifelines (Objective 7.4)

Once the projects are developed by the work groups within their allotted budget, the Advisory Group will then review those projects using the following criteria, which shall be applied on a pass/fail or yes/no basis:

Work Group, Hub and Advisory Group Project Review Criteria

- The project has a direct nexus to enhancing terrorism preparedness – the project has a direct nexus to either, preventing, protecting against, mitigating the damage from, responding to or recovering from threats or acts of terrorism, **and**

- The project maintains an existing priority capability, e.g., maintains a NIMS Typed response team, or is a self-contained project that will be completed or completes a phase of a larger initiative or completes the overall initiative already underway, e.g., completing equipment upgrades for a Regional Communications System Authority, **and**
- The proposed project provides clear linkage between the project and the listed Strategy objective(s) and how the project will support implementation of the objective(s), addresses capability gaps from the regional 2011 Bay Area capability assessment, and buys down regional risk, **and**
- Each project is regional insofar as it directly benefits 3 or more OA's in the Bay Area region, **and**
- The project budget is of a reasonable amount with each element of the project tied directly to a funding amount specified in the project budget section of the template.

All projects must satisfy all five criteria in order to be put forward to the Hubs, Advisory Group and Approval Authority. In the event any project does not meet all the criteria, the Advisory Group will provide a written explanation to the relevant Hub outlining the basis for why any one or all of the criteria are not satisfied and the Hub will be given time to update the proposal with the work group, to be set by the Advisory Group, to amend the project and resubmit it to the Advisory Group for a second review.

In the event available funding for projects is of such a small amount that allocating the funding across all of the goals and objectives listed above would prove unworkable, as determined by the Advisory Group, the funding shall be allocated among the goals based on a methodology below.

For the Funding Reallocation Process:

1. Jurisdictions and programs should have the ability to transfer funds to another approved project within the existing allocation of their agreement to a project that can be completed within the closing period of the grant. If the jurisdiction or program does not have any projects that can be completed then;
2. The jurisdiction or program should have the unspent grant allocation transferred to another jurisdiction or program within their Hub that has projects that can be completed within the closing period of the grant. Jurisdictions or programs within a Hub may neutrally transfer funds from one grant year to another grant year. If the jurisdictions or programs within a Hub do not have any projects that can be completed then;
3. The Hub should have the unspent grant allocation transferred to another Hub's approved projects that can be completed within the closing period of the grant. Hubs may neutrally transfer funds from one grant year to another grant year.

The UASI Management Team should assist jurisdictions and Hubs with:

- a. Identifying projects that are on the list from (Item #1 above)
- b. Identifying opportunities for potential neutral transfers of funding from one grant year to another
- c. Monitoring the status of time sensitive projects
- d. Ensuring that UASI documentation for the transfer of funding is completed as expeditiously as possible.

Any unspent sustainment single project funding over \$250,000 should be distributed proportionately to each Hub (based on the current Hub funding risk allocation formula) for projects that can be completed within the closing period of the grant.

Step 5 The State's 20% Hold Back

Finally, the State of California is authorized to hold back up to 20% of the Bay Area's UASI allocation whatever the final funding level for 2013 turns out to be. In the event the Bay Area receives \$26 million in UASI funding, the State may retain up to \$5.2 million of that funding.

6.0 Work Group Meetings

The Bay Area UASI Management Team will host a series of work group meetings to review this Strategy Implementation Guidance and the FY 2013 project template. These meetings will occur as outlined in the draft timeline below.

Draft FY 2013 UASI Grant Timeline

Activity	When	Who
Work Group Meetings #1 Training on Strategy Implementation Guidance, Project Template, & Evaluation Criteria	TBD	CBRNE/T&E Risk Mgmt/Info Analysis Communications RCPT (Medical/Public Health, EM, & Recovery)
Work Group Meetings #2 Vet and Prioritize Projects	TBD	CBRNE/T&E Risk Mgmt/Info Analysis Communications RCPT (Medical/Public Health, EM, & Recovery)
North Bay Hub Meeting #3 Vet and Prioritize Projects	TBD	North Bay Hub
East Bay Hub Meeting #3 Vet and Prioritize Projects	TBD	East Bay Hub
South Bay Hub Meeting #3 Vet and Prioritize Projects	TBD	South Bay Hub
West Bay Hub Meeting #3 Vet and Prioritize Projects	TBD	West Bay Hub Meeting
Advisory Group - review vetted & prioritized proposed projects	Mar 28, 2013	Advisory Group
Approval Authority – review & approve vetted & prioritized proposed projects recommended by the Advisory Group	Apr 11, 2013	Approval Authority
Prepare FY 2013 UASI grant application for submittal to CalEMA	Apr 18, 2013(approximate date pending release of FEMA guidelines & CalEMA timeline)	BAUASI Management Team

Appendix A FY 2013 PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

I.A. Primary Point of Contact Information:	
Name	
Agency	
Position Title	
Phone	
Fax	
Email	

I.B Project Name:	
Requestor	Information:

I.C Total Project Cost:	Annual Sustainment Costs:
Funding Code Information:	

I.D MISSION AREAS					
Place an X in the box(s) that correspond to the mission area your project supports					
Prevent	Protect	Respond	Recover	Mitigation	

I.E Description - Briefly describe exactly what the project entails and what would be accomplished by funding the project. Describe what, if any, existing capabilities the Bay Area Region currently has in place concerning this project such as any plans developed, training delivered, or equipment purchased, etc.
--

II. ALIGNMENT WITH THE BAY AREA HOMELAND SECURITY STRATEGY

II.A BAY AREA SECURITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES		
<i>Check the Bay Area goal(s) that this project directly supports.</i>		
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	Develop a Regional Risk Management and Planning Program
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	Enhance Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Capabilities
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strengthen Communications Capabilities
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strengthen Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and Explosives (CBRNE) Detection, Response, and Decontamination Capabilities
5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Enhance Medical and Public Health Preparedness
6	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strengthen Emergency Planning and Citizen Preparedness
7	<input type="checkbox"/>	Enhance Recovery Capabilities
8	<input type="checkbox"/>	Enhance Homeland Security Exercise, Evaluation and Training Programs

II.B List each Objective and Implementation Step (by number) from the Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy the project supports, and explain how the project supports the Objective and addresses gaps from the 2011 regional capability assessment.

OBJECTIVE	IMPLEMENTATION STEP(S)	EXPLAIN HOW THE PROJECT SUPPORTS IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBJECTIVE	EXPLAIN WHICH GAP(S) FROM THE 2011 REGIONAL CAPABILITIES ASSESSMENT THIS PROJECT WILL HELP ADDRESS.

III. FUNDING

III.A Provide the Proposed Funding amount for this project towards applicable Planning, Organization, Equipment, Training, and Exercises (POETE) elements. (Please check the appropriate box(es) on the left side for all that may apply). Also, for each funding area selected, provide a brief narrative describing the items or services being funded.

ELEMENT		PROPOSED FUNDING
<input type="checkbox"/>	Planning	\$
<input type="checkbox"/>	Organization	\$
<input type="checkbox"/>	Equipment	\$
<input type="checkbox"/>	Training	\$
<input type="checkbox"/>	Exercises	\$
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS		\$

If applicable, provide the proposed funding amount from the project that can be obligated towards Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Activities (LETPA) funding.

\$

Planning

Organization

Equipment List the equipment and the Authorized Equipment List number from the www.rkb.us website

Training

Exercises

III. B Other Source(s) of funding that is being requested or utilized for this project (check the appropriate box(es) on the left side)

FUNDING SOURCE		PROPOSED FUNDING
<input type="checkbox"/>	SHSP	\$
<input type="checkbox"/>	CCP	\$
<input type="checkbox"/>	MMRS	\$
<input type="checkbox"/>	General Funds	\$
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other Grant Funds	\$
TOTAL OTHER FUNDING		\$

Other Funds: Explain how any non-UASI funds, such as general funds, SHSP, ASPR grants, etc., will be used to implement this project.

III.C. For each selected Strategy Objective(s)/Target Capability listed in Question II.B., provide the proposed funding amount to be obligated from this project. The total funding listed for all Objectives/Capabilities should equal the total funding for the project.

Strategy Objective/Target Capabilities (Capabilities Selected Must Match with Section II.B.)	Amount of Funding per Objective/Capability
Planning	
Communications	
Community Preparedness and Participation	
Risk Management	
Intelligence and Information Sharing and Dissemination	
Information Gathering and Recognition of Indicators and Warnings	
Intelligence Analysis and Production	
Counter Terror Investigation and Law Enforcement	
CBRNE Detection	
Critical Infrastructure Protection	
Food and Agriculture Safety and Defense	
Epidemiological Surveillance and Investigation	
Laboratory Testing	
On-Sight Incident Management	
Emergency Operations Center Management	
Critical Resource Logistics and Distribution	
Volunteer Management and Donations	
Responder Safety and Health	
Emergency Public Safety and Security	
Environmental Health	
Explosive Device Response Operations	
Fire Incident Response Support	
WMD and Hazardous Materials Response and Decontamination	
Citizen Evacuation and Shelter-in-Place	
Isolation and Quarantine	
Search and Rescue (Land-Based)	
Emergency Public Information and Warning	
Emergency Triage and Pre-Hospital Treatment	
Medical Surge	
Medical Supplies Management and Distribution	
Mass Prophylaxis	
Mass Care (Sheltering, Feeding, and Related Services)	
Fatality Management	
Structural Damage Assessment	
Restoration of Lifelines	
Economic and Community Recovery	

IV. Project Impacts and Outcomes

IV.A Project Outcomes: Describe the regional outcomes and benefits that will be achieved as a result of this project. When describing the regional outcomes and benefits, describe the number of operational areas in the region that will directly benefit from this project. The outcomes and benefits should demonstrate improvement towards building or maintaining capabilities and reducing risk.

DRAFT

V. Project Management

V.A Identify up to ten milestones, with start and end dates, which will be achieved within the twenty month (20) period of performance under the FY 2013 UASI grant. No start date should begin before January 1, 2014 and no end date should end after September 30, 2015.

MILESTONE NUMBER	MILESTONE NAME/DESCRIPTION	START DATE (MM/DD/YYYY)	END DATE (MM/DD/YYYY)
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			

8			
9			
10			

V.B Project Status. Place an X in the corresponding box:

<input type="checkbox"/>	This project is a maintenance project.
<input type="checkbox"/>	This project is a self-contained project.
<input type="checkbox"/>	This project is part of an ongoing initiative.
<input type="checkbox"/>	This is a "Shovel Ready" Project
<input type="checkbox"/>	This project can be completed within 6 months of funding allocation

Explain how funding for this project will either maintain a capability in the region, complete a self-contained project, or complete a larger initiative or a phase of a larger initiative of which this project is a part of? Explain how the project will result in completion.

equ

Inf

DRAFT

V.C Sustainment: Describe the long-term approach to sustaining the capabilities maintained or enhanced by this project without UASI funds once the grant performance period is over. To the extent funds are needed for sustainment in the future, will future grants be needed for sustainment or will local funds be used? If no funds are needed, explain why.

DRAFT