August 9, 2005

To: Local Governments, State and Regional Agencies, Indian Tribal Governments, Private Non-Profit Organizations Submitting Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Applications Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Ivan and Jeanne

From: W. Craig Fugate, State Coordinating Officer

Subject: Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Planning Funding Summary

Program Summary

The Department of Community Affairs, Division of Emergency Management (DEM) is pleased to announce the availability of Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) Planning funds as a result of the recent Presidential Disaster Declarations (FEMA-1539, 1545, 1551, 1561 DR-FL). The HMGP is authorized by Section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief Act and is designed to assist communities in implementing mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to people and property from natural hazards and their effects. The amount of funding available is based on 7.0% of the total federal mitigation funds provided to the state under the HMGP. DEM is soliciting applications and encourage all eligible applicants to identify eligible mitigation planning projects and submit them for funding consideration. The application should address eligible long-term mitigation planning activities designed to reduce the community's overall risk to hazards and support both the State Standard Mitigation Plan and the Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS). The HMGP Planning applications will be funded on a competitive basis, the scoring criterion is attached and should used as a guide when completing application. The application period will close September 12, 2005. Therefore, all applications must be postmarked by September 12, 2005. The DEM encourages and welcomes the submittal of complete applications at anytime during this cycle.
Application Timeline

The deadline for the submission of applications for the HMGP funds is September 12, 2005 (postmarked). Applications will only be accepted from eligible applicants as defined below. Please provide four completed copies of the State of Florida Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Planning Application and all appropriate attachments, which may be obtained at the DEM website located at http://www.floridadisaster.org/brm/hmgp.htm.

Alternatively, you may contact the DEM directly at (850) 413-9884. In order to be considered, completed applications must be sent to the following address:

Florida Department of Community Affairs  
Division of Emergency Management  
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100  
ATTN: Leroy Thompson

NFIP Participation: All applicants must be in an NFIP participating community, if they have been identified through the NFIP as having Special Flood Hazard Areas. In addition, the community must not be on probation, suspended or withdrawn from the NFIP. For more information see the State of Florida NFIP Community Status Report at http://www.dca.state.fl.us/brm.

Minimum Program Eligibility

Eligible Applicants: are local governments, state agencies, federally recognized Indian Tribal governments and private non-profit organizations and institutions.  
Eligible Activities: include mitigation projects that will result in protection of public or private property from natural hazards. Eligible projects include:

- Plan Development other than LMS
- Risk Assessment Updates
- Research and Development that supports hazard mitigation planning
- Studies, that are not funded by other federal agencies
- GIS Enhancements
- Public Education and Outreach

At this time, the state will not consider funding request to develop or update Local Mitigation Strategies. All projects submitted must meet the following minimum criteria to be considered for funding:
• Conform with the State Mitigation Plan and the respective community’s Local Mitigation Strategy;
• Is technically feasible;
• Provide a beneficial impact upon the designated disaster area;
• Conform to all applicable environmental laws, and regulations and executive orders;
• Solve a problem independently or constitutes a functional part of a solution;
• Is in an NFIP participating community that is not on probation or have been suspended from NFIP; and
• Meet all applicable state and local codes and standards

Cost-Share Requirements

Under the HMGP, FEMA will contribute up to 75 percent (75%) of the total amount approved under the grant award to implement eligible cost-effective mitigation measures. The applicant must provide the remaining 25 percent (25%) non-federal share. All contributions, cash or in-kind services, are acceptable as part of the non-federal share. Requirements for in-kind contributions can be found in 44 Code Federal Regulations, Section 13.24. In-kind contributions must be directly related to the eligible project cost. In-kind resources are those personnel, materials, equipment and supplies owned, controlled and operated by the applicant or a third party contributor. Applicants are encouraged to link HMGP funds with other state, local and private sources.

If there are any questions regarding the allocation of funds or the project review and selection criteria, please call the Mitigation Planning staff at (850) 922-5269.

The following attachments are provided to assist you in submitting qualified project applications:

Attachment A: Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Planning Application
Attachment B: Application Scoring Criteria
Attachment C: FEMA: Mitigation Planning Grant Applications: Guidance on Developing the Scope of Work

WCF/Ltw

Attachments
ATTACHMENT A

HMGP
PLANNING
APPLICATION
This application is for all Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA Region IV) Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) Planning proposals. Please complete ALL sections and provide the documents requested. If you require technical assistance with this application, please contact your State Emergency Management Division at (850) 922-5269.

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Title / Brief Descriptive Project Summary: _____

1. Applicant (Organization): _____

2. Applicant Type:
   - ☐ State or Local Government
   - ☐ Recognized Native American Tribe
   - ☐ Private Non-Profit

3. County: _____

4. State Legislative District(s): _____ Congressional District(s): _____

5. Federal Tax I.D. Number: _____

6. FIPS Code*: _____ (*if your FIPS code is not known, please fill out FEMA Form 90-49 (Attachment A) so that the Department may obtain a FIPS code for you)

7. Does the Community have a FEMA approved Local Mitigation Strategy?
   - If Yes, what is the date of approval? _____
   - If No, what is the status of the current LMS? _____

8. National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Community Identification Number (this number can be obtained from the FIRM map for your area): _____

9. NFIP Community Rating System Class Number: _____

10. NFIP Last Community Assistance Visit Date: _____
11. **Point of Contact:**
   - [ ] Ms. [ ] Mr. [ ] Mrs.  First Name: _____  Last Name: _____
   - Title: _____
   - Street Address: _____
   - City: _____  State: _____  Zip Code: _____
   - Telephone: (____) _____  Fax: (____) _____
   - Email Address (if available): _____

12. **Application Prepared by:**
   - [ ] Ms. [ ] Mr. [ ] Mrs.  First Name: _____  Last Name: _____
   - Title: _____  Telephone: (____) _____  Fax: (____) _____

13. **Authorized Applicant Agent (proof of authorization authority required)**
   - [ ] Ms. [ ] Mr. [ ] Mrs.  First Name: _____  Last Name: _____
   - Title: _____  Telephone: (____) _____  Fax: (____) _____
   - Street Address: _____
   - City: _____  State: _____  Zip Code: _____
   - Signature:_________________________________________________  Date: ________________________
     *(Authorized Applicant Agent/Authorized Representative)*

14. Attach a letter of endorsement for the project from the county’s Local Mitigation Strategy Coordinator.

**Section I. Project Description**

**A. Hazards to be Mitigated / Level of Protection**

1. Select the type of hazards the proposed project will mitigate:
   - [ ] All Hazards  [ ] Flood  [ ] Wind  [ ] Storm surge  [ ] Hurricane
   - [ ] Fire  [ ] Other (list): _____

2. Identify the type of proposed project:
   - [ ] Plan Development*
   - [ ] Risk Assessments
   - [ ] Research and Development
   - [ ] Studies not funded by other Federal Agencies
   - [ ] GIS Improvements
   - [ ] Other: _____

*Funds will not be provided to update exciting Local Mitigation Strategies. However the development of other plans that supports the Local Mitigation Strategies will be considered for funding.*
Section II. Project Information (Must be Completed in Detail)

The State of Florida Mitigation Strategy requires that all planning related projects submitted for mitigation funding be consistent with the community’s LMS, the State’s Mitigation Plan, and the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 and their associated planning requirements. The following questions address how your project intends to accomplish some of these aspects.

1. Clearly identify and describe the need or problem, provide a detailed description of the proposed project or activity and show how it meets the need or solves the identified problem.

2. Identify long and short-term tangible benefits of this project coupled with the availability of resources necessary to continue the project. Additionally, identify parties that will benefit from this project, (Ex. County Wide, Statewide or Designated Target Area)

3. Clearly describe how the proposed project or activity is consistent with and supports the community’s LMS or the State Mitigation Plan activities. (Florida’s State Mitigation Plan is located at http://www.florida-disaster.org/brm/State-Mitigation-Strategy/State-Mitigation-Strategy.htm)

4. Describe the planning process used in the selection of this particular method or approach to solving the problem and why this is the most feasible alternative.

5. Identify applicant project match.

6. Describe the applicant(s) experience and ability to perform the proposed work.

Tie Breaker – Answer the following question:
Describe any previous hazard mitigation planning and implementation activities in the community, that you have completed and that supports mitigation planning in the State of Florida.
Section III. Budget/Costs

In this section, provide details of all the estimated costs of the project; do not include contingency costs in the budget.

A. Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Cost per Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Labor  (Include equipment costs -- please indicate all "soft" or in-kind matches)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Fees Paid  Include any other costs associated with the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Task</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated Project Cost $_____  

D. Under A. Materials, B. Labor and C. Fees Paid, provide a detailed justification on each item where funding is requested.
E. Funding Sources  (round figures to the nearest dollar)

The maximum FEMA share for HMGP projects is 75%. The other 25% can be made up of Local funds as well as in-kind services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated FEMA Share</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Percentage _____%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Non-Federal Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Local Share</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Percentage _____%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other Non-Federal Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$</th>
<th>Percentage _____%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Estimated Total Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$</th>
<th>Percentage _____%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section IV. Project Milestones/Schedule of Work

List the milestones in this project by providing an estimated time-line for the critical activities not to exceed a period of 3 years for performance. (e.g. Data Gathering, Risk Assessment, etc.)

1. **Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex., Date Gathering, Risk Assessments etc</th>
<th>Number of Days to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is the estimated start date?

3. What is the estimated completion date and how was it determined?
Section V. Maintenance

The following questions are to give assurance on the plan’s maintenance, please answer each question and give a brief explanation.

1. Will the Plan be maintained on a regular basis?

2. Does the applicant have staff available to maintain the project? If not, how do you plan to obtain the necessary staff?

3. What is the estimated cost of maintenance on an annual basis?
Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Planning Application
Proposed Project and Scoring Criteria Summary

All points awarded will be based on information provided in Section II of the application. The project application is in a narrative question/answer format, flexibility is provided to the Applicant in presenting the information, e.g., the Applicant need not repeatedly detail the description of the project in order to address individual criteria areas.

Shown on the left of each scoring criteria area, is the maximum number of points that may be awarded for that specific criteria area; this score information is provided here for your information purposes only. The scoring criteria listed below, is presented only as a brief summary statement of the more detailed information that is required in the submission. Each of the six (6) questions should be clearly and fully addressed in the project application. Explicitly detailed information on the full range of points that may be awarded for every scoring criteria listed is provided in this packet. Careful attention must be paid to the guidance, so that the application includes all the information necessary to ensure receipt of the maximum number of points possible. Failure to clearly answer any of the required questions will result in the scoring of zero (0) points for each of the questions not addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAX PTS.</th>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Information (Section II of Application)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1. Clearly identify, describe and document the need or problem, provide an in-depth explanation of the project, and show how it meets the need/solves the identified problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2. Identify and demonstrate long- and/or short-term tangible benefits of this project coupled with the availability of resources necessary to continue the project, if it is a continuing project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3. Clearly describe the project’s consistency with the State Mitigation Plan or the applicable Local Mitigation Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>4. Describe the planning process used to select this particular method or approach to solving the problem, and why it was chosen over other available alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5. Identify Applicant’s matching funds, either cash or in-kind, if any and include supporting documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6. Provide evidence of the abilities and qualifications of those persons proposed to work on the project if funded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

425 maximum total points

Tiebreaker - Answer the following question:

1) Describe any previous hazard mitigation planning and implementation activities in the community, or that you have completed that supports mitigation planning in the State of Florida.

After completing the narrative, use the above information as a “check list” to review the application. To ensure the maximum points, be certain the application contains a clearly identified and thorough discussion of every scoring criteria contained in the above.
Section I. Scoring Criteria Detail

The following information is to be used for fully developing the project presentation. Individual review committee members score each application independently of each other, often resulting in a range of scores for the same application. Reviewers may award a point score anywhere within the point range for the criteria being addressed. The specific point awards discussed in this section are provided to serve as benchmarks.

1. Clearly identify and describe the need or problem, provide a detailed description of the proposed project or activity and show how it meets the need or solves the identified problem.

Identify any demonstrated mitigation need that will be addressed by the proposed project. Reference any documentation identifying and describing the need. Indicate whether the need is identified by statute, rule, plan or other legal requirement. Copies of the statute, rule, plan or other legal requirement will need to be referenced as appendix items to be submitted at a later date. If the need is not identified by statute, rule, plan or other requirement, explain how this need was determined. Explain what the proposed project is and describe the extent to which the proposed project will address the demonstrated mitigation need. Identify the expected result or improvement in mitigation efforts in the State.

75 points – Mitigation need to be addressed by the proposed project is clearly and succinctly identified; support confirming the need is properly identified; application clearly, succinctly and rationally explained in depth what the project is and how and why the proposed project will address the wind mitigation need; application clearly, succinctly and rationally identifies a certain and credible positive effect on, or improvement in wind mitigation/RCMP performance.

37 points – application provides an explanation of how or why the proposed project addresses the problem, but the explanation is incomplete; application identifies a plausible and probable positive effect on, or improvement in, the problem identified;

0 points -; the identified problem is not supported or confirmed; application fails to explain how or why the proposed project will address the identified problem; project will not have a positive effect on, or improve, the identified problem.

2. Identify long and short-term tangible benefits of this project coupled with the availability of resources necessary to continue the project. Additionally, identify parties that will benefit from this project, (Ex. County Wide, Statewide or Designated Target Area)

Each application must indicate whether the project is either a short-term project, long-term project, or a combination. If a combination, then the application must clearly indicate both short and long term mitigation benefits, and how the proposed project will achieve both types of benefits. If the application indicates that the project has benefits which are short-term, long-term or both, and the applicant fails to clearly and plainly indicate such benefits, the scoring will so reflect.

Describe the specific mitigation benefits, both direct and indirect, of the proposed project. Indicate whether the proposed project will provide tangible, immediate benefits that will further state wind mitigation objectives. If so, identify the specific benefits, and the specific mitigation objectives. Indicate the expected commencement date, completion date, and milestones of the project. Include any supporting documentation.

If a proposed project is intended to initiate a longer-term program, indicate the mitigation benefits of this long-term program. Indicate the basis for the expectation that this project will achieve those benefits, describing any testing, forecasting, methodology, studies or analysis used to support the forecast of benefits.

75 points - application clearly, rationally and succinctly indicates the type and time frame for the mitigation benefits; clearly and succinctly describes the specific benefits, clearly and rationally explains whether they are direct or indirect, and includes significant supporting documentation; clearly and succinctly identifies reasonable commencement and completion dates, and appropriate milestones of the project; clearly identifies any testing,
analysis, studies, forecasting, or methodology underlying the forecasted long-term benefits; studies, forecasts, 
analysis, testing or methodology are sound and support projected long-term benefits; resources to support long-
term projects are clearly identified, described and firmly committed, as demonstrated by supporting documentation;

37 points - application indicates the type and time frame for mitigation benefits; describes the specific benefits, 
though some points may be omitted, or unclear; includes adequate supporting documentation; identifies feasible 
commencement and completion dates, and milestones of the project; supports the forecasted long-term benefits in 
some reasonable and rational manner; projected long-term benefits are credible; resources to support long-term 
projects are identified, and presumably committed;

0 points - fails to adequately identify the type and time frame of wind mitigation benefits; fails to describe 
mitigation benefits, or explain them, or description, explanation or connection is not clear or rational, or 
equivocates; no supporting documentation, or inadequate supporting documentation; commencement and 
completion dates are not supplied or are unreasonable or unrealistic; milestones are not supplied or are 
inappropriate; testing, analysis, methodology, forecasting, or studies are not supplied, or are unsound, or are not 
supportive of claimed benefits; resources to support long-term projects are not identified, or are inadequate, or 
are not firmly committed.

3.  Clearly describe how the proposed project or activity is consistent with and supports the 
community’s LMS or the State Mitigation Plan.  (Florida’s State Mitigation Plan is located at 

Describe the manner and extent to which the proposed project is consistent with the State Mitigation Plan or the 
respective LMS. Identify the particular items in the State Mitigation Plan or LMS, which are relevant to the project; 
link the consistency of the project with the State Mitigation Plan or LMS rationally, clearly and comprehensively.

100 points - consistent in every respect- particular items in the plan are identified and the consistency of the project 
with the State Mitigation Plan or LMS is rationally, clearly and comprehensively explained;

50 points - substantially consistent - some items in the State Mitigation Plan or LMS are identified and the 
consistency is rationally explained, though the project may not be consistent in every respect;

0 points - inconsistent in every respect - few or no items in the State Mitigation Plan or LMS are identified, 
consistency is not explained or the explanation is not rational, clear or comprehensive.

Are any local mitigation plans applicable to the proposed project? If so, identify the applicable plans, county and 
municipality, and describe the manner and extent to which the project is consistent with those local mitigation plans. 
Identify the specific plan elements, goals, strategies or objectives that will be impacted and describe how the project 
will favorably impact them. If any letters of consistency or support have been received from applicable local 
emergency management agencies or local governments, reference them in the narrative.

4.  Describe the planning process used in the selection of this particular method or approach to solving the 
problem and why this is the most feasible alternative?

Identify the mitigation issues to be addressed and the reasonably available potential methods and approaches to 
tackle them. Identify any studies or analyses of the issue. Identify any applicable industry standards or policies.

Describe the particular method and approach chosen for this project. Explain why this method and approach was 
chosen over the other available alternatives. Identify any literature or data supporting the use of this method and 
approach.

Identify any previous attempts by the applicant or by other entities to address this or similar issues. Describe the 
method and approaches used in the previous attempts and indicate whether the attempts succeeded or failed, and 
briefly explain why. Indicate any previous attempts to use this particular approach and method, and whether the 
previous attempts achieved the desired results.
100 points - potential methods and approaches are identified, explained and analyzed; studies, analyses, standards and policies are identified and rationally applied to the project; project method and approach are clearly, rationally and concisely identified and explained; choice of method and approach is conclusively appropriate for the project;

50 points - some potential methods and approaches are identified, but identification is incomplete, or some methods and approaches are unexplained, or the analysis is incomplete; the method and approach is not consistent with some standards, studies or policies; choice of method and approach is deemed appropriate, even if some questions or concerns remain;

0 points - potential methods and approaches are not identified, or insufficiently identified, and are unexplained, or irrationally or not clearly explained; project method and approach is not identified or explained; project method and approach is not appropriate for addressing problem or achieving goal; or the explanation is not clear or rational, given the scope and potential of the project.

5. Identify Applicant’s project match. [Maximum score 50 points]

Describe the source and type of any funds that will be provided from other sources to match the proposed project. Attach appropriate official documentation (e.g., board minutes or resolutions or similar assurances) to indicate the firm commitment of the proposed cash matching funds. The Transmittal Letter can also be considered an appropriate official document if it clearly states the total amount of the cash match being committed and is signed by an official with the authority to fully commit the cash funds (e.g., chairman of the board, mayor or similar official). Indicate these funds in a percent format and a specific dollar figure. This information should agree with the budget information provided.

If any other funds have been applied for or received by the Applicant for the proposed project or a similar project, describe the source and type of funds, terms and conditions applicable to their use, term of availability, and consequences, if any, of failure to receive the funds. All matches committed, whether in-kind or cash, must clearly represent an unconditional commitment of currently available funds.

50 points – Greater than 25% match;

25 points – 25% match;

0 points - 0 match; if the documentation does not indicate the firm commitment of funds then no points shall be awarded, i.e.- the application must include documentation evidencing the firm commitment of the funds in order for those funds to be credited as match.

6. Discuss the Applicant(s) experience and ability to perform the proposed work. [Maximum score 25 points]

Identify the relative experience of all persons proposed to work on the project. Provide evidence of the abilities and qualifications of each as it relates to the project's specific requirements.

Describe the availability to the applicant of the resources, including any personnel, detailed in the project budget, and any anticipated delays expected to occur between the time an award is accepted and the commencement of the project. Demonstrate that the personnel and other resources identified are those necessary and appropriate to accomplish the project.

25 points - the experience, abilities and qualifications of all persons is identified, and clearly, rationally and succinctly related to the proposed project; the materials and other necessary items are clearly identified, described, and are available without qualification or delay;

13 points - the experience, abilities and qualifications of most persons involved in the project is identified, and accurately related to the proposed project; the crucial materials and other absolutely necessary items are identified and available, though there may be some tolerable qualification or delay;
0 points - the experience, abilities and qualifications of all pertinent persons is not identified, or is not related to the proposed project; materials and other necessary items are not identified or are clearly incomplete or deficient for the project; the availability of the materials and necessary items is not indicated, or the indications are that there will be significant delays or problems in obtaining them.

Tiebreaker - Answer the following question:

1) Describe any previous hazard mitigation planning and implementation activities in the community, or you have completed that supports mitigation planning in the State of Florida.

Section II. Selection/Award Procedures

Applications shall be scored by the review committee in accordance with the terms and conditions described in the NOFA.

* Applications shall be scored by the review committee independently and the scores shall be totaled and averaged. Thereafter, the committee shall evaluate the scores and arrive through consensus at preliminary scores and rankings.

* Preliminary scores and rankings shall be prepared within each category based upon the total number of points earned with the overall highest number of points determining priority for funding.

* The review committee shall recommend the scores and preliminary rankings to the State Hazard Mitigation Office for review and approval within the 60 days following the application deadline date.

* Once approved, final scores and rankings shall be provided to each applicant via a formal letter.

* Funds shall be offered to the Applicant with the overall highest score, then to the Applicant with the next highest score, and so on, until all funds have been offered or all eligible applications have been funded; funding for the final program offered funds may be in a partial amount, depending upon the remainder of funding.

* Contractual agreements between the Department and awarded Applicants will be developed and executed to implement all funded applications.
ATTACHMENT C

FEMA MITIGATION PLANNING GRANT APPLICATIONS

GUIDANCE ON DEVELOPING THE SCOPE OF WORK
INTRODUCTION

Organizations of many kinds rely on grant funding to carry out their missions. Whether a potential grantee is applying to receive funds made available on a formula basis or is competing against other organizations for assistance, the applicant's skill at navigating the application process contributes substantially to their success. Perhaps no part of this process is more critical than the development of the Statement of Work, or SOW. Especially in the case of competitive grant programs, grantors want to know not only what the applicant wishes to accomplish using the funds, but also that the applicant truly understands how to plan and carry out the actions needed to achieve their objective.

This document provides guidance on developing an SOW as part of an application for mitigation planning grant funds under the competitive Pre-Disaster Mitigation program (PDM-C), Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP), and Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) program. It describes the types of information that an applicant or sub-applicant (henceforth referred to as “applicant”) should include in their SOW to ensure that it is of sufficient scope and detail for the application to be appropriately reviewed and, if applicable, scored. The elements discussed are examples of items to be included in the SOW; they are not required to be included as written here. Additionally, the elements may be used individually to request funding for development of specific parts of a plan, or they may be used in combination to create a SOW covering the entire planning process.

GENERAL GUIDELINES

First and foremost, a Statement of Work is an initial road map for how the applicant proposes to make use of grant funds to achieve their objective. It is also the applicant’s chance – probably their only chance – to demonstrate to the grantor their ability to use the grantor’s money effectively and appropriately. For this reason, it is important to ensure that the SOW clearly states what is to be accomplished and establishes how, by whom, where, and when it will be done.

SOWs are generally narrative in nature. While there is no universally applicable format for SOWs, they generally comprise an introduction; a list of tasks, actions, and/or deliverables; and a timetable. The introduction should include an overview of the proposed action and a background statement that establishes the context in which the funded action will be carried out, e.g., how the proposed action meets program objectives and supports the goals established in the applicant’s strategic plans. This should be followed by a description of the outcomes and/or deliverables at a level of detail that is sufficient to justify the funds requested; to clearly identify the discrete tasks, procurements, and other actions that will be undertaken; and to establish metrics for performance. This discussion may address factors such as the type of contract to be used, the personnel qualifications needed for various roles, whether work is to be performed at a contractor’s office or on-site, and the standards against which the deliverable will be measured. Finally, the SOW should include a set of milestones that includes the estimated start date, critical interim dates, and the anticipated completion date. This schedule can be described in different ways, such as in terms of absolute calendar dates or as a timeline that begins counting days, weeks, or months starting with the date of award.
DEVELOPING A MITIGATION PLANNING GRANT SOW

The mitigation planning grant application Statement of Work should describe the development of a multi-hazard mitigation plan that complies with FEMA’s regulatory requirements. As described above, a mitigation planning SOW should consist of two main elements, in this case a description of the planning process and a timeline for plan development. Both of these sections should clearly demonstrate the applicant’s familiarity with the applicable regulatory requirements and the available technical and programmatic guidance.

The SOW should begin with a short profile of the community that includes background information such as demographic data, recent mitigation activities, and population at risk. It should also state whether the proposed planning activity will result in an initial plan or in an update or enhancement to an existing plan; if the latter, the reason(s) for the update (e.g., acquisition of better data, recent disaster activity, changes in local growth and development trends) should be provided.

In a planning grant SOW, the description of the plan development process will typically comprise several sub-elements that, when completed, meet the applicable requirements promulgated in 44 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 201. These regulatory planning requirements are described in detail in FEMA’s March 2003 publication *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (available online at [http://www.fema.gov/fima/planning_toc4.shtml](http://www.fema.gov/fima/planning_toc4.shtml)). Additionally, the overall planning process is described in FEMA’s series of Mitigation Planning How-To guides, which are available at [http://www.fema.gov/fima/planhowto.shtm](http://www.fema.gov/fima/planhowto.shtm). The SOW should thoroughly document each of these steps, including not just what will be done, but also who will be responsible for the completion of each step (e.g., contract personnel or in-house staff), and who else will be involved in the process. It should also explain how the public and other interested jurisdictions, agencies, and organizations will be involved throughout (e.g., workshops, community outreach).

The work schedule should indicate the anticipated timeline for these steps and should allow sufficient time for State and FEMA review, preparation of any required revisions, subsequent reviews, formal plan adoption, and FEMA approval. While it is useful to include schedule information in the narrative description of each step of the process, the SOW should also include a timeline, table, or other summary display of the overall plan development timeline.

Sample Outline and Content for a Planning SOW

1. **Planning process.** The SOW should describe the overall process that will be used to develop the plan or section(s) thereof. This element should include the following information:
   - What – establishment of specific actions to be performed (e.g., hold public meetings and workshops to develop plan goals and objectives; solicit input regarding the feasibility of potential mitigation measures for each hazard and the prioritization of mitigation projects; review the final draft of the plan);
   - Who – identification of who will be involved in the planning process and what function(s) each will perform (e.g., who has overall responsibility for developing the plan? what tasks will be assigned to contractors? how will voluntary organizations support the planning effort?);
   - How – the means by which each action will be accomplished (e.g., meetings, workshops, research, document reviews, public input and comment);
   - When – the timeframe for completion (e.g., starting and completion milestones for each task, identified as number of calendar days after date of award); and
   - In the case of a multi-jurisdictional plan, a discussion of how each jurisdiction will participate in the planning process.
2. **Risk assessment.** The SOW should describe how the risk assessment component of the plan will be developed so as to provide sufficient information to enable the applicant to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions. As described in FEMA Publication 386-2, *Understanding Your Risks*, the risk assessment process has four phases:

- identifying hazards to determine which phenomena may impact the planning area;
- profiling the relevant hazards to understand their potential consequences;
- identifying assets such as structures, functions, and populations that are subject to losses or damage by the identified hazards; and
- estimating the potential losses that can result from occurrences of each type of hazard.

**Hazard Identification and Profiling:** The SOW should specify how the applicant intends to obtain information and data on the hazards to which the planning area is susceptible, describing what data is already available – if any – and how this information will be updated and/or augmented as part of the grant work. If possible, the SOW should identify the natural hazards that the jurisdiction will address in the plan, and if any hazards present an obvious threat but will not be covered in the plan, the SOW should explain why. Mapping of hazard areas should also be addressed if applicable, because while maps are not required by FEMA to be included in multi-hazard mitigation plans, their use supports planners’ decision making. FEMA recognizes that the purpose of the hazard identification process is to discover this type of information and that the applicant may make final decisions regarding treatment of certain hazards only after the risk assessment is underway or completed. FEMA recommends that the SOW address this contingency. Multi-jurisdictional plans should include identification both of hazards that could affect the entire planning area as well as those that are specific to individual participating jurisdictions.

**Vulnerability Assessment:** The SOW should discuss specifically how the applicant intends to identify the types and numbers of structures, functions, and populations that are subject to losses or damage by the identified hazards. For example, it should contain a description of the intended methods and locations for conducting research and obtaining data (e.g., windshield surveys, state or regional databases, universities, etc.) and an identification of who will perform the research. The SOW should also present the methodology by which it intends to determine vulnerability of structures and calculate losses, and it should identify who will be responsible for this activity. If maps will be used in the plan to depict elements of vulnerability, the SOW should include a description of how the data will be integrated onto these maps and of the methodology for the mapping (e.g., use of acetate and paper maps or contracting for GIS support). These discussions should include a review of any data that is already available (e.g., critical facilities inventory, land use plans and development regulations) and a description of how the applicant will update and/or augment this information as part of the grant work. For multi-jurisdictional plans, the SOW should provide this information in such a way that each participating community is addressed.

3. **Hazard mitigation strategy.** The hazard mitigation strategy provides the jurisdiction’s blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, and the SOW should contain a description of the process by which the strategy will be developed and an identification of the participants in that process. In particular, the SOW should describe the development of goals and objectives that focus on reducing the risks from the identified natural hazards as well as the process by which a comprehensive range of mitigation actions will be identified, analyzed, and prioritized. For example, the SOW should describe how the community intends to develop a consensus on the goals and objectives of the plan and on the project priorities (e.g., via surveys, public meetings, and workshops). For multi-jurisdictional plans, each participating jurisdiction must have a local mitigation strategy specific to its exposure as described in the risk assessment.

4. **Additional State requirements (local plans only).** Local jurisdictions should identify and include in the SOW how any additional requirements set by the State emergency management agency will be addressed.
5. **Writing the plan document.** The SOW should address who will write the plan document and whether this will be accomplished using a contractor. It should specify all steps to be taken from initial draft to final publication and should describe how the document will be reviewed by the community, the State, and the FEMA Regional Office. This includes a description of the intended number of drafts to be produced based on the anticipated process of reviews and revisions. The SOW should allow time for these reviews, as well as for revisions and re-submission if necessary, into the work schedule. Experience has shown that it may be helpful to obtain a courtesy review by the appropriate FEMA Regional Office prior to formal adoption so that any necessary revisions can be made prior to final executive review.

6. **Plan adoption and approval.** The SOW should describe the process by which the applicant will document that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction (or of each jurisdiction requesting approval, if the plan is multi-jurisdictional). For example, local plans will be submitted to the State emergency management agency for review, then forwarded to the FEMA Regional Office for final review and approval, while State plans will be submitted to FEMA Regional Office for review and final approval; when a plan has been determined to meet all applicable requirements, FEMA considers it “approvable pending adoption,” at which point the jurisdiction can formally adopt the plan with the assurance that FEMA will approve it as soon as documentation of adoption is provided.

7. **Sample work schedule.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Calendar days from Award</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint a planning team 0 45              In-house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment – hazard identification &amp; profiling 30 120</td>
<td>Contract w/ Acme Plan Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment – asset identification and loss estimation 90 290</td>
<td>In-house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop mitigation strategy 200 300       In-house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete draft plan 300 700               In-house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review/revision of draft plan 730 830    State EMA / FEMA / In-house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan adoption 850 1000                    In-house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to FEMA for approval 1005 1095      FEMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Duration 1095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

FEMA has consistently emphasized the importance of the planning process in the development of a meaningful multi-hazard mitigation plan. This is because it is only through this process that a jurisdiction can develop the breadth and depth of knowledge necessary to take effective action to reduce its risks. So while there are common elements that should be addressed in nearly every planning grant Statement of Work, and although the way an applicant crafts their application for planning funds should reflect their understanding of – and commitment to – this general process, FEMA recognizes that every community’s needs are different. We encourage you to recognize and highlight the unique requirements and capabilities that set your jurisdiction apart, and we wish you success as you work toward the goal of a sustainable community.