Interim
Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy
Implementation Guidance for Fiscal Year 2012

January 2012

Table of Contents

1.0 Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy

In 2011, 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 2012.

The 2012 *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 2012. This guidance is interim due to the fact that the FY 2012 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 2012 UASI funding. It does not include the rules governing allowable expenses under the UASI grant for FY 2012 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 2012 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 2012 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 2012 Federal Budget

On December 17, 2011 Congress passed the DHS FY 2012 budget, which included $1,349,681,000 for all state and local homeland security grants. This is an enormous cut when compared to prior years and, unlike in previous years, this amount is a single block of funding from which the Secretary of Homeland Security must allocate various grant programs (UASI, MMRS, SHSP, TSGP, etc.) at her discretion. This means the UASI and other grant programs do not have a specific funding amount at this time and no program is assured funding from the Secretary, except that Congress did provide $50 million for Operation Stonegarden and no less than $100 million for "areas at the highest threat of a terrorist attack." This $100 million may serve as a baseline for the UASI program, but that is not assured given certain ambiguities in the statutory language. After further accounting for FEMA's 6.8% off the top cut for the agency's management and administration (M&A) and the $231.6 million for national training programs, $876,221,692 remains for all state and local homeland security programs (excluding Operation Stone Garden, FEMA M&A, National Training, and $100 million for high threat areas).[1]

Once the Secretary allocates the approximately $876 million in funding among the programs, she must then distribute the funds within those programs based upon risk: threat, vulnerability and consequence. The Secretary must make her allocation and distribution decision within 60 days of the bill's being signed into law. At this time, the 60 days will likely expire sometime in mid-February 2012 at which point the Bay Area will know its actual UASI allocation. However, it is likely such a decision from the Secretary will come sooner than mid-February and the Bay Area must be prepared for an earlier date.

4.0 Role of the Work Groups

For FY 2012, the Bay Area is once again utilizing regional work groups to develop and review projects. These projects will be developed using the FY 2012 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. However, total funding available to each work group may be capped as discussed later in this guidance. The work groups and their areas of responsibility concerning projects for FY 2012 are:

---

[1] The bill separately funds the Emergency Management Performance Grant at $350 million and the Assistance to Firefighters Grant at $675 million.

- **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**
  - 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 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 grant application to the State of California for submittal to DHS.

Work groups are strongly encouraged to integrate UASI, State Homeland Security Program (SHSP), Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS), Citizen Corps (CCP) and general funds when developing FY 2012 projects, with an understanding that the rules governing the use of those funds may vary from funding source to funding source.

5.0 Allocation of Funding

Since the FY 2012 budget does not allocate a specific amount of funding for the UASI program and the Secretary has not decided how much funding to provide to the UASI program, the Bay Area will operate under the assumption that the FY 2012 funding will be approximately equal to the amount allocated in FY 2010 – $34,000,000 – 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 2010 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 $34 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 2011 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 2011, DHS **required** that in the state or urban area in which one of the 72 DHS-recognized 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 amounted 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 2012 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 2012, 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 2012 sustainment projects for the Bay Area UASI:

FY 2012 Sustainment Projects

Goal	Goal Title & Projects	FY 2012 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 2012.

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 A, 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 grant guidelines and 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 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 2011 Bay Area regional capabilities assessment.

The following are the priority capabilities, their corresponding goal and objective number in the *Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy* for FY 2012, and the work groups responsible for developing projects for their implementation. In addition to completing an initiative, every project developed by a work group for FY 2012 **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)

Given the likelihood of cuts to the Bay Area's total UASI allocation in FY 2012, **it is possible and likely that work groups will develop projects that will <u>not</u> be funded in FY 2012.** Such projects may be carried over into FY 2013 for review for potential funding in that or future years or placed on a list in the event there are unspent UASI funds.

The allocation of funding to each of the goals listed in the chart on the following page is based, in part, upon prior funding allocations to each goal in previous grant cycles as well as risk relevance and capability gaps in each of the capabilities listed. The funding allocation is at the goal level and not at the objective level. There is no requirement that funding be divided evenly among the objectives/capabilities tied to each goal. Therefore, in theory, 100% of funding allocated to a goal could go to only one of the eligible objectives/capabilities tied to that goal.

Funding Allocations by Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy Goal

Bay Area Strategy Goal	Capabilities and Objectives	% of Funding	Estimated Funding[2]
Goal 1 Develop a Regional Risk Management and Planning Program	Risk Management (Objective 1.1)	10%	$1,873,048
	Planning (Objective 1.1)		
Goal 2 Enhance Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Capabilities	Counter Terrorism and Law Enforcement (Objective 2.1)	16%	$2,996,877
	Information Gathering and Recognition of Indicators and Warnings (Objective 2.2)		
	Critical Infrastructure Protection (Objective 2.5)		
Goal 3 Strengthen Communications Capabilities	Communications (Objective 3.1)	28%	$5,244,534
Goal 4 Strengthen CBRNE Detection, Response, and Decontamination Capabilities	CBRNE Detection (Objective 4.3)	20%	$3,746,096
	On-site Incident Management (Objective 4.7)		
	Responder Safety and Health (Objective 4.8)		
	Public Safety and Security (Objective (4.9)		
Goal 5 Enhance Medical, Public Health and Mass Care Preparedness	Medical Surge (Objective 5.2)	8%	$1,498,438
	Fatality Management (Objective 5.7)		
Goal 6 Strengthen Emergency Planning and Citizen Preparedness Capabilities	EOC Management (Objective 6.1)	10%	$1,873,048
	Mass Care (Objective 6.4)		
	Community Preparedness (Objective 6.5)		

---

[2] These amounts are strictly an estimate based upon the region being allocated $34 million in FY 2012 UASI funding. These amounts do not account for the State's potential 20% holdback.

Goal 7 Enhance Recovery Capabilities	Economic and Community Recover (Objective 7.2)	8%	$1,498,438
	Restoration of Lifelines (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 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 work group projects must satisfy all five criteria in order to be put forward to the Approval Authority. In the event any project does not meet all the criteria, the Advisory Group will provide a written explanation to the relevant work group outlining the basis for why any one or all of the criteria are not satisfied and the work group will be given time, 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 work group 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 to be determined by the Advisory Group. Projects funded under this alternative allocation method shall still require a project template from the relevant work group(s) with that template subject to review by the Advisory Group using the 5 bulleted work group project review criteria listed above.

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 2012 turns out to be. In the event the Bay Area receives $34 million in UASI funding, the State may retain up to $6.8 million of that funding. In the likely event the State takes part or all of the 20%, this hold back by the State will be applied in the following order until the amount of funding is reached in order to satisfy the State's 20% hold back amount:

- First, among those projects developed by the work groups with each goal's projects losing a percentage equal to that goal's percentage allocation of funding. For example, under Step 4, the Communications Goal will lose .28 cents on each dollar given up for the State and the CBRNE Goal will lose .20 cents, etc.
- Second, evenly among those projects developed by the major cities. Thus, if after the work group based projects, the State's hold back still requires $400,000, each major city shall forfeit $133,333.
- Third, among the sustainment projects with each sustainment project losing a percentage equal to that project's percentage allocation of funding.

Hypothetical: In the event the Bay Area receives a $15 million UASI allocation the State could retain up to $3 million leaving the Bay Area with $12 million in UASI funds. Under this example $12 million in funding would be impacted in the following way(s):

1. $750,000 for UASI M&A (not impacted)
2. $10,633,355 for regional sustainment projects (not impacted)
3. $3 million for all three major cities of which $2,383,355 is deducted for the State's 20% hold back leaving $205,548 per major city.
4. $616,645 for regional projects, $3 million of which is deducted for the States 20% hold back leaving no funding for work group projects.

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 2012 project template. These meetings will occur as outlined in the draft timeline below.

Draft FY 2012 UASI Grant Timeline

Activity	When	Who
Work Group Meetings #1 Training on Strategy Implementation Guidance, and Project Template	Jan 19, 2012 -Proposed projects due Feb 9, 2012 Jan 25, 2012 -Proposed projects due Feb 22, 2012 Jan 26, 2012 -Proposed projects due Feb 16, 2012	CBRNE/T&E 9 am – 11:30 am Risk Mgmt/Info Analysis 1pm – 3:30 pm Communications 1pm – 3:30 pm RCPT (Medical/Public Health, EM, & Recovery) 1:30 – 4 pm
Work Group Meetings #2 Vet and Prioritize Projects	Feb 16, 2012 Feb 23, 2012 Feb 29, 2012	CBRNE/T&E 9 am – 11:30 am Risk Mgmt/Info Analysis 1pm – 3:30 pm RCPT (Medical/Public Health, EM, & Recovery) 1:30 – 4 pm Communications 1pm – 3:30 pm
Advisory Group - review vetted & prioritized proposed projects	Mar 22, 2012	Advisory Group
Approval Authority – review & approve vetted & prioritized proposed projects recommended by the Advisory Group	Apr 12, 2012	Approval Authority
Prepare FY 2012 UASI grant application for submittal to CalEMA	Apr 18, 2012 (approximate date pending release of FEMA guidelines & CalEMA timeline)	BAUASI Management Team

Appendix A
FY 2012 PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

I.B Project Name:

I.C Total Project Cost:	Annual Sustainment Costs:

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 *Check the Bay Area goal(s) that this project directly supports.*
1	☐	Develop a Regional Risk Management and Planning Program
2	☐	Enhance Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Capabilities
3	☐	Strengthen Communications Capabilities
4	☐	Strengthen Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and Explosives (CBRNE) Detection, Response, and Decontamination Capabilities
5	☐	Enhance Medical and Public Health Preparedness
6	☐	Strengthen Emergency Planning and Citizen Preparedness
7	☐	Enhance Recovery Capabilities
8	☐	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**
☐ Planning	$
☐ Organization	$
☐ Equipment	$
☐ Training	$
☐ 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**
☐ SHSP	$
☐ CCP	$
☐ MMRS	$
☐ General Funds	$
☐ 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	

011212 Agenda Item #8: DRAFT 2012 Implementation Guidance- Exhibit A

IV. Project Impacts and Outcomes

IV.A Project Outcomes: Describe the <u>regional</u> 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.

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 2012 UASI grant. No start date should begin before January 1, 2013 and no end date should end after September 30, 2014.			
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:	
☐	This project is a maintenance project.
☐	This project is a self-contained project.
☐	This project is part of an ongoing initiative.
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.	

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.