



Homeland Security

The Office of Grants & Training (G&T) has completed the FY 2007 HSGP mid-term review. As described in Information Bulletin #239, draft Investment Justification submissions were reviewed against the criteria included in the FY 2007 HSGP guidance by a G&T review panel consisting of the assigned Preparedness Officer and one other G&T representative.

This document provides information on common themes that were found during the mid-term review process. Recommendations related to specific sections in the Investment Justification are outlined below, as well as additional technical information relative to the Investment Justification template.

Themes from Specific Sections Within the Investment Justification

- **Overall Investment Justification Question:** The response should outline not only the risks faced by the State or Urban Area, but how these risk considerations resulted in the proposed Investments. This question allows applicants to frame risk in the context within which they are operating and how it informs the Investments they are proposing with FY 2007 HSGP funding.
- **Baseline:** The response should include a description of why the Investment was selected over other options.
- **Funding Plan:** Proposed activities should be reflected in the appropriate allowable cost categories (e.g., planning, organization, equipment, training, exercises, and management & administration) as outlined in the grant guidance. For example, plans to hire intelligence analysts should appear in the organization section of the funding plan in accordance with the provisions outlined in the grant guidance.
- **Milestones:** The period of performance for HSGP is 36 months from the date of award. The start- and end-dates in the milestones section should reflect that the period of performance for these grants will begin approximately in August 2007. The milestones that are included should collectively present a clear sequence of events that build on one another during implementation.
- **Project management:** The response should discuss specific project manager roles and responsibilities and contracts management structure. The responses should provide project management detail that is specific to each Investment. If the project manager and associated roles and responsibilities are the same for all Investments, the response should explain why that is appropriate.
- **Impact:** The purpose of the impact section is to outline what the Investment will achieve in terms of capabilities and how that impact will be measured. The response should include performance measures including outputs and outcomes. Output measures evaluate the direct products of the Investment (e.g., specific plans that will be developed during implementation, number of personnel trained). Outcome measures more substantively address the impact that the outputs have had on building specific capabilities and addressing the overall mission (e.g., shorter response times, enhanced statewide interoperability). The Target Capabilities List (available at www.llis.dhs.gov) includes performance measures for critical tasks associated with each capability and thus

is a useful reference when completing the impact section. In addition, the response should address how the proposed outcomes mitigate the risks that were outlined in the Overall Investment Justification question.

The Investment Justification Reference Manual includes general considerations to consider when finalizing submissions (see page 17-18), as well as a specific response checklist for each section. Applicants are encouraged to review these resources as submissions are finalized in the coming weeks.

Multi-State/Multi-Urban Area Investments

Multi-State/multi-Urban Area Investments must achieve outcomes that could not be accomplished if individual States or Urban Areas tried to address them independently. The Investments are likely to be more complex given the unique regional governance and implementation challenges that may be involved. Each participating applicant must outline the specific components of the multi-State/multi-Urban Area Investment for which it would be responsible, and include that Investment in its own submission. These proposals must be reflected in the applications of all participating States and Urban Areas in order to be considered by the multi-State/multi-Urban Area panel. Multi-State/multi-Urban Area Investments must demonstrate coordination among all parties who will implement proposed activities during the grant period of performance. The peer review panel dedicated to multi-State/multi-Urban Area Investments will review and score submissions from each of the applicants participating in proposed multi-State/multi-Urban Area activities.

Applicants are *strongly encouraged* to include multi-State/multi-Urban Area Investments as a separate Investment in their portfolio. This will allow the peer reviewers to focus on and effectively evaluate the unique programmatic aspects presented by multi-State/multi-Urban Area Investments. Multi-State/multi-Urban Area Investments will be reviewed using the same criteria as other Investments. However, the review panel focusing on these Investments will also consider additional criteria specific to multi-State/multi-Urban Area proposals, which are detailed on page 22 of the FY 2007 HSGP guidance. Submitting multi-State/multi-Urban Area activities as separate Investments positions applicants to more thoroughly communicate their approach and address all relevant evaluation criteria.

Technical Requirements with the Excel Template

Upon receipt of Investment Justification materials on April 5, G&T will immediately import all information included in the Excel template into a database that will be used to generate reports both for applicants and for the peer reviewers. If the Excel file is corrupted—through altering tab names, changing cell properties, or adding/deleting worksheets within the template—this import process will not be successful. *In order to ensure that the import process goes smoothly, it is critical that applicants follow the guidance outlined below:*

- Do not copy, add, remove, rename, or move worksheets within the Excel template. If you have distributed individual worksheets to points of contact for completion during the application period, you should copy and paste the final text into a clean version of the original template (attached to this message) rather than inserting all the worksheets into a

new file. When copying and pasting text, be sure to highlight the actual text that you are intending to copy. Do not copy cells or text boxes.

- Do not alter the formatting (including tab names, cell properties, etc.) or add/remove cells, rows, or columns in the Excel template.
- Submit one Excel file per applicant. During the mid-term review, individual Investments were frequently submitted as separate files. For the final submission through Grants.gov, all State Investments must be included in a single Excel file; similarly, all Urban Area Investments must be included in a single Excel file.
- Include the State or Urban Area name in the name of the final Excel file submitted through Grants.gov.
- Complete the Excel worksheets consecutively. Do not leave blank worksheets *in between* completed ones. Any unused worksheets should remain intact within the template rather than being deleted.
- Do not embed Word documents into the Excel file, because that information will not be captured. Only images or Excel organization charts may be inserted as attachments.
- Refer to the Technical Guidance section of the Investment Justification User's Guide for additional tips (http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/grants_hsgp.htm).

Final applications must be submitted via Grants.gov not later than 11:59 PM Eastern Standard Time, April 5, 2007. FY 2007 is the first time that HSGP applications will be submitted through Grants.gov. Please ensure that you allow enough time to complete all steps of the application process—including valid registration with the Central Contractor Registry (CCR)—prior to the final deadline. Given that this is a competitive program, it is imperative that applicants submit their materials on time. G&T recommends that you not wait until late on April 5, given that you may encounter delays through the Grants.gov system if application volume is heavy.

Additional questions may be directed to your Preparedness Officer or the Centralized Scheduling and Information Desk at askcsid@dhs.gov, 1-800-368-6498.

Office of Grants and Training
Department of Homeland Security

State/Territory: Massachusetts
 Urban Area (if applicable):

Overall Submission

| Question | Investment Justification |
|---|---|
| The applicant provides a response to the "Overall Background" question within the text/character limits, and no spelling errors. | Yes, although spellcheck is strongly recommended |
| The total request for SHSP, UASI, or LETPP funding does not exceed the recommended funding cap for the State/Territory or Urban Area. | The total request exceeds the recommended funding cap |
| The total request for MMRS and CCP funding does not exceed the award amount for the State/Territory. | Correct |
| The State/Territory is not requesting UASI funds; OR the Urban Area is not requesting SHSP, LETPP, MMRS, or CCP funds. | Correct |
| The submission does not contain spelling errors and meets character requirements. | Spellcheck is strongly recommended |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Need to proofread and spellcheck.</p> | |

Individual Investments

Baseline

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| The Investment Name and Total Funding Requested fields are completed. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| The Total Funding Requested equals the HSGP total amount from the "Funding Plan Table." | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| The Phase of the Investment is identified (Ongoing or New). | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| The applicant indicates whether the Investment was included in the FY 2006 HSGP Investment Justification submission by providing the name of the FY 2006 Investment is entered; or the field is blank if the Investment was not included. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |

State/Territory: Massachusetts
 Urban Area (if applicable):

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| If the Investment was included in the FY 2006 HSGP request, the total amount of funding the Investment received from FY 2006 HSGP funds is entered; or the field is blank/\$0. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The applicant describes the current state of the Investment and outcomes and objectives completed to date. | X | X | X | X | | X | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| The applicant describes the capability gaps(s) the Investment is intended to address. | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| The applicant describes why the Investment was selected over other options. | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Investments 5,7,8 – Need to elaborate on outcomes, capability gaps Investments 7,8 – Need to elaborate as to why these investments were chosen as a priority</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategy

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | |
| The response provides linkage between the Investment and Initiative from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan. | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | | | | | |
| The response provides linkage between the Investment and Homeland Security Strategy goals and objectives. | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | | | | | |
| The explanation provides linkage between the Investment and the primary Target Capability. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | | | | | |
| The response identifies National Priorities supported by the Investment. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Investments 2, 9 – Establish linkages between the Investments and the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan Investments 5, 8 – Establish linkages between the Investments and the Homeland Security Strategy Investment 8 – Establish linkage between Investment and relevant target capabilities</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

State/Territory: Massachusetts
 Urban Area (if applicable):

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Funding Plan

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| Application indicates funding in at least one solution area, and one Funding Source element (SHSP, LETPP, UASI, MMRS, CCP). | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| The funds identified under "M&A" are not more than 7.4% of the total request for HSGP funds. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| If funds are entered in the "other" category, the applicant identifies what the "other" sources of funds are. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| For each solution area that funds are entered for HSGP, the applicant provides a narrative response for that/those solution area(s). | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| The explanation references activities, services, or products for the solution area (This checklist item does not evaluate whether <i>appropriate</i> activities, services, or products are referenced). | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| The explanation describes how the funds will be used specifically towards this Investment. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Investment #5 – Ensure that all funding equates to the funding descriptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Milestones

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

State/Territory: Massachusetts
 Urban Area (if applicable):

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| At least one milestone is identified. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Each milestone provides a description of the milestone activities as well as start and end dates (This checklist item does not evaluate whether the description of the milestone is <i>clear</i>). | X | X | | | | X | | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Milestones collectively present a sequence of events that will allow the Investment to reach its objectives for this period of performance (This checklist item does not evaluate whether the description of the milestone is <i>clear</i>) | X | X | X | | X | X | X | | X | X | | | | | | |
| For each milestone identified: A description of related tasks/activities and a planned start date and an end date within the FY 2007 HSGP period of performance are provided. | X | X | | | | X | | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Comments: Need to be more clear with milestones (start and end dates, sequencing) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Project Management

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | |
| The applicant describes the project management team, including at least the project manager and contracts management structure. | | X | | | | X | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| The response identifies and describes a project manager role, specifically referencing the responsibilities of the project manager position as well as the decision-making authority; if the project manager is the same as in other Investments, the response explains why this is appropriate. | | | | | X | | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| The response describes a contracts management structure | | | | | | X | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| The response describes, at a high-level, the operational roles, responsibilities, and subject matter expertise required to manage the Investment. | X | X | | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | | | | | |
| Comments: Fragmented sentences Lack of details Incomplete sentences Do not cut-and-paste description related to Project Management team. For each Investment there should be a relevant description of the Project Management team and their specific responsibilities. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

State/Territory: Massachusetts
 Urban Area (if applicable):

Investment Challenges

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| At least one Investment Challenge is identified. | x | x | x | x | | x | x | x | x | X | | | | | |
| For each identified challenge, a brief description of the mitigation strategy, a probability of occurrence, and a level of impact is provided. | X | | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Investment #5 – Need to identify investments and mitigation strategies Investments #2, 3 – Need mitigation strategy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Impact

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| The response describes specific outcomes that will determine the Investment's success, including what will be measured. | | x | x | x | | | x | | x | X | | | | | |
| The response includes specific outputs that lead to outcomes, including what will be measured. | | x | | x | | | x | | x | X | | | | | |
| The response references performance measures and metrics from the TCL. | | | | | | | | | x | X | | | | | |
| The response describes how the outcomes will mitigate risks outlined in the Overall Investment Justification Question. | | x | | x | | | x | x | x | X | | | | | |
| The response describes how the capabilities developed by this Investment will be maintained/sustained long term, or the response describes why the Investment will not be maintained/sustained long term. | | | | | | x | x | x | x | X | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Need more focus on outcomes versus outputs Performance measurement of investments needs to be more adequately addressed Consider long-term sustainment activities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

State/Territory: Massachusetts
 Urban Area: Boston

Overall Submission

| Question | Investment Justification |
|---|---|
| The applicant provides a response to the "Overall Background" question within the text/character limits, and no spelling errors. | Yes |
| The total request for SHSP, UASI, or LETPP funding does not exceed the recommended funding cap for the State/Territory or Urban Area. | Correct |
| The total request for MMRS and CCP funding does not exceed the award amount for the State/Territory. | N/A |
| The State/Territory is not requesting UASI funds; OR the Urban Area is not requesting SHSP, LETPP, MMRS, or CCP funds. | Correct |
| The submission does not contain spelling errors and meets character requirements. | Yes, although Spellcheck is strongly recommended regardless |
| Comments: #8 – Clarify – is this a multi-state/UA investment? Box says "no" but following box indicates a "yes." | |

Individual Investments

Baseline

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| The Investment Name and Total Funding Requested fields are completed. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The Total Funding Requested equals the HSGP total amount from the "Funding Plan Table." | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The Phase of the Investment is identified (Ongoing or New). | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The applicant indicates whether the Investment was included in the FY 2006 HSGP Investment Justification submission by providing the name of the FY 2006 Investment is entered; or the field is blank if the Investment was not included. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |

State/Territory: Massachusetts
 Urban Area: Boston

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| If the Investment was included in the FY 2006 HSGP request, the total amount of funding the Investment received from FY 2006 HSGP funds is entered; or the field is blank/\$0. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The applicant describes the current state of the Investment and outcomes and objectives completed to date. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The applicant describes the capability gaps(s) the Investment is intended to address. | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The applicant describes why the Investment was selected over other options. | X | X | X | | | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategy

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| The response provides linkage between the Investment and Initiative from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The response provides linkage between the Investment and Homeland Security Strategy goals and objectives. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The explanation provides linkage between the Investment and the primary Target Capability. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The response identifies National Priorities supported by the Investment. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

State/Territory: Massachusetts
 Urban Area: Boston

Funding Plan

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| Application indicates funding in at least one solution area, and one Funding Source element (SHSP, LETPP, UASI, MMRS, CCP). | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The funds identified under "M&A" are not more than 7.4% of the total request for HSGP funds. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| If funds are entered in the "other" category, the applicant identifies what the "other" sources of funds are. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | |
| For each solution area that funds are entered for HSGP, the applicant provides a narrative response for that/those solution area(s). | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The explanation references activities, services, or products for the solution area (This checklist item does not evaluate whether <i>appropriate</i> activities, services, or products are referenced). | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| The explanation describes how the funds will be used specifically towards this investment. | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Investment #7 – No funding is identified for Exercises, but written description follows thereafter. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Investment #8 – Funding identified only in three categories (Planning, Equipment, M&A) but the written descriptions thereafter apply to all POETE areas. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Milestones

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| At least one milestone is identified. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Each milestone provides a description of the milestone activities as well as start and end dates (This checklist item does not evaluate whether the description of the milestone is <i>clear</i>). | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Milestones collectively present a sequence of events that will allow the Investment to reach its objectives for this period of performance (This checklist item does not evaluate whether the description of the milestone is <i>clear</i>) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |

State/Territory: Massachusetts
 Urban Area: Boston

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| For each milestone identified: A description of related tasks/activities and a planned start date and an end date within the FY 2007 HSGP period of performance are provided. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Project Management

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | | | |
| The applicant describes the project management team, including at least the project manager and contracts management structure. | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The response identifies and describes a project manager role, specifically referencing the responsibilities of the project manager position as well as the decision-making authority; if the project manager is the same as in other Investments, the response explains why this is appropriate. | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| The response describes a contracts management structure | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The response describes, at a high-level, the operational roles, responsibilities, and subject matter expertise required to manage the Investment. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments: Refrain from “cutting and pasting” the same project management team for each Investment. Each project management team should be individual to the investment. Elaborate on the contracts-management structure in place. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Investment Challenges

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | | | |
| At least one Investment Challenge is identified. | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | | | | | | | | |
| For each identified challenge, a brief description of the mitigation strategy, a probability of occurrence, and a level of impact is provided. | X | x | x | X | x | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |

State/Territory: Massachusetts
 Urban Area: Boston

Comments:

Impact

| Question | Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| The response describes specific outcomes that will determine the Investment's success, including what will be measured. | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | | | | | |
| The response includes specific outputs that lead to outcomes, including what will be measured. | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | | | | | |
| The response references performance measures and metrics from the TCL. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The response describes how the outcomes will mitigate risks outlined in the Overall Investment Justification Question. | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | | | | | |
| The response describes how the capabilities developed by this Investment will be maintained/sustained long term, or the response describes why the Investment will not be maintained/sustained long term. | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | | | | | |
| Comments: Performance measurement of investments needs to be more adequately addressed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



FEMA

Dear FY 2008 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Applicant,

As in FY 2007, FEMA employed a peer review process to evaluate the Anticipated Effectiveness of proposed FY 2008 HSGP Investment Justifications (IJs) from each State, Territory, Urban Area (UA), and Tribe. Approximately 160 peer reviewers, representing all eligible applicant groups, participated in the FY 2008 review process and provided scores on the Anticipated Effectiveness of proposed Investments and direct feedback for each applicant.

The attached Award Package includes:

- Anticipated Effectiveness Summary
- Investment Score Summary
- IJ Feedback
- Multi-Applicant Investment Summary (if applicable)
- Multi-Applicant Investment Feedback (if applicable)

The following page provides instructions on how to read your Award Package. If you have any questions regarding your Award Package, please contact your GPD Program Analyst at (800) 368-6498.

Thank you,

Grant Programs Directorate
Federal Emergency Management Agency



FEMA

How to Read the FY 2008 HSGP Award Package

Anticipated Effectiveness Summary:

The first document in your Award Package is the Anticipated Effectiveness Summary. This document contains your overall Anticipated Effectiveness score, percentile ranking, individual Investment's Effectiveness scores and their respective percentile ranks.

The Anticipated Effectiveness Summary contains various terms and statistics regarding your IJ. FEMA GPD has defined some of these terms for you so that you can better understand your results:

Award Package Guide

| | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipated Effectiveness Score: The IJ Anticipated Effectiveness score is listed with bonus points from Multi-Investments included in the total, if applicable • National Average: Represents the average Anticipated Effectiveness score of all State, Territory, and Urban Area Investments | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Percentile Ranking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentile Rank: Represents how the applicant performed relative to its peers within the same funding pool (SHSP, UASI, or Tribe) |
| <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Investment Details</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment Scores: Investments are listed in descending order (highest to lowest) based on Investment scores. The Investment scores are also ranked graphically in a bar chart to the right of the Investment score (Relative Investment Percentile Rank Chart), to show performance of the Investment relative to the Investment scores of all State, Territory and Urban Area applicants. • Portfolio Score and Ranking: In the last row of the Investment Details section of the scorecard, the IJ portfolio score is listed with a bar chart comparison to all State, Territory, and UASI Investment portfolio scores (in the Relative Investment Percentile Chart) • Highest 15%: Represents the top 15% of Investments submitted across all State, Territory, and UASI Investments | |
| <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Anticipated Effectiveness Score Details</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category Averages: The average score for the six categories across all Investments submitted by the applicant • Category National Averages: Represents the average category scores of all State, Territory, and Urban Area Investments | |

The second page of the Anticipated Effectiveness Summary is the score summary for each of the Investments submitted. This table provides the overall Investment's score, comprehensive score, and the score for each of the six major categories. The national average for each of these categories is listed at the top of the chart for comparison.

IJ Feedback:

The second document in your Award Package is the IJ feedback collected by the peer review panel. For FY 2008, feedback was collected for the Investment Justification as a whole and it was not required of the panel to provide specific feedback for each Investment. **The content of the IJ feedback that you are receiving from the peer review panel is uncensored by FEMA;** only minor formatting and spelling errors were corrected for the applicant's convenience.

The collected feedback was based upon the three discussion questions listed in the gray box. Discussion questions were provided as a guide for panels and reviewers **were not required** to answer all discussion questions. Numbers linked to discussion questions where no feedback is provided indicates the panel chose not to provide feedback for that discussion question. Other comments and feedback not related to discussion questions are listed as bullet points.

Multi-Applicant Bonus Summary and Investment Feedback (if applicable):

If your State or UA participated in a Multi-Applicant submission, your package will also contain a bonus summary for the Investment that was included in the Multi-Applicant submission. Multi-Applicant feedback was collected for the Investment that was included in the Multi-Applicant submission. Feedback may contain overall suggestions for each partner, or call out suggestions for specific submitting partners. This method of collection was up to the discretion of the peer review panel. Additionally the Multi-Applicant feedback was centered on five discussion questions. However, like with standalone IJs, discussion questions were only used as a guide for panels and reviewers were not required to answer all discussion questions.

Anticipated Effectiveness Summary: Boston Urban Area

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|-----|---------|-----|
| <p>FY 2008 Anticipated Effectiveness Score (includes bonus, if applicable):</p> <p style="font-size: 24pt; text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;">81 points</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Percentile Ranking*</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Boston Urban Area scored higher than 41% of the 60 FY 2008 UASI submissions. The FY 2007 Percentile Ranking is also shown for historical comparison.</p> <p style="font-size: 10pt;">*Percentile ranking shows an applicant's performance relative to all Urban Area applicants. A percentile ranking of 75%, for example, indicates that the applicant scored higher than 75% of all Urban Area applicants (and lower than 25% of all other Urban Area applicants).</p> | | | | |
| <p>FY 2008 National Average 80 points</p> <p>FY 2007 National Average 82 points</p> | <table style="margin-top: 10px; font-size: 10pt;"> <tr> <td>FY 2008</td> <td style="text-align: right;">41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY 2007</td> <td style="text-align: right;">38%</td> </tr> </table> | FY 2008 | 41% | FY 2007 | 38% |
| FY 2008 | 41% | | | | |
| FY 2007 | 38% | | | | |

Investment Details

The section below details each Investment's effectiveness score, ordered from highest to lowest, and provides its relative percentile ranking against the national averages of all submitted Investments, including State, Territory and Urban Areas.

| # | Investment Name | Investment Score | Percentile Rank | Relative Investment Percentile Rank |
|---|--|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| + | 1 Communications Interoperability | 94 | 96% | |
| | 3 Regional CBRNE Tactical Rescue Team | 87 | 71% | |
| | 7 Medical Surge, Mass Prophylaxis and Pandemic Flu Preparedness | 81 | 46% | |
| | 6 Regional Evacuation, Mass Care & Shelter | 81 | 44% | |
| | 2 Regional Intelligence and Information Sharing | 79 | 37% | |
| | 5 Critical Infrastructure/Site Protection and Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Preparedness | 76 | 31% | |
| | 4 Regional Homeland Security Integrated Training and Exercise Program | 76 | 30% | |
| | Portfolio Score (1-3) | 2 | 41% | |
| + Investment was among the highest 15% scoring Investments of all submissions | | | | |

Anticipated Effectiveness Score Details

The Investment Score is comprised of the six Investment category scores shown below (I - VI), which were combined with the Comprehensive Investment Score. The scores below represent the average across all Investments for each category compared to the national average.

| | Investment Score Average (Out of 100) | I. Strategy (Out of 100) | II. Funding Plan (Out of 100) | III. Milestones (Out of 100) | IV. Program Management (Out of 100) | V. Investment Challenges (Out of 100) | VI. Impact (Out of 100) | Comprehensive Investment Score (Out of 100) |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Boston UA | 82 | 90 | 66 | 76 | 95 | 73 | 80 | 79 |
| National Average | 80 | 82 | 83 | 79 | 83 | 72 | 77 | 79 |

Investment Summary

| Boston Urban Area | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| Investment Score Categories | Investment Score (Out of 100) | I. Strategy (Out of 100) | II. Funding Plan (Out of 100) | III. Milestones (Out of 100) | IV. Program Management (Out of 100) | V. Investment Challenges (Out of 100) | VI. Impact (Out of 100) | Comprehensive Investment Score (Out of 100) |
| National Average | 80 | 82 | 83 | 79 | 83 | 72 | 77 | 79 |
| Investment 1 - Communications Interoperability | | | | | | | | |
| Investment Score Summary | 94 | 92 | 77 | 88 | 100 | 85 | 100 | 94 |
| Investment 2 - Regional Intelligence and Information Sharing | | | | | | | | |
| Investment Score Summary | 79 | 84 | 71 | 65 | 94 | 77 | 77 | 71 |
| Investment 3 - Regional CBRNE Tactical Rescue Team | | | | | | | | |
| Investment Score Summary | 87 | 87 | 80 | 80 | 94 | 79 | 89 | 86 |
| Investment 4 - Regional Homeland Security Integrated Training and Exercise Program | | | | | | | | |
| Investment Score Summary | 76 | 95 | 37 | 63 | 94 | 71 | 73 | 73 |
| Investment 5 - Critical Infrastructure/Site Protection and Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Preparedness | | | | | | | | |
| Investment Score Summary | 76 | 92 | 59 | 65 | 89 | 60 | 75 | 71 |
| Investment 6 - Regional Evacuation, Mass Care & Shelter | | | | | | | | |
| Investment Score Summary | 81 | 87 | 73 | 92 | 97 | 58 | 73 | 76 |
| Investment 7 - Medical Surge, Mass Prophylaxis and Pandemic Flu Preparedness | | | | | | | | |
| Investment Score Summary | 81 | 94 | 68 | 82 | 94 | 79 | 70 | 84 |





Applicant: **MA - Boston Urban Area**
Investment Justification Feedback

Investment Justification feedback was based on the questions below. Questions were provided as a guide for discussion during panel sessions. Feedback corresponds to the numbered question in the gray box.

1. What were the strongest Investments in the application, and why?
2. What additional information, enhanced detail, and/or further justification would improve the Investments?
3. Across the entire IJ, did any of the responses to questions within a specific category (e.g. Strategy, Implementation, Impact) consistently show room for improvement? If so, how can applicants improve responses within these categories?

• Other Comments and Feedback

1. Overall, the concept of the investments were good, but it was not effectively articulated (i.e. address how the investment will be implemented). Overall, Investments had a better explanation of their SPR and Homeland Security Plan (for example, Investment 3 and 4). Overall, funding plans lacked detail. Refer to Investment 1 equipment category which served as an effective example of how funding strategies should be described.
2. Investment 4, Equipment funding strategy should have been listed under training and exercises. Appears that the same regional planner is being unrealistically tasked with oversight of multiple investment activities, (i.e. planning and exercise activities). If this is not the case, it should have been more clearly articulated. Formatting the outcomes and outputs so that they are clearly identifiable would be helpful.
3. Investments do not explain coordination between UASI and State regarding training and exercise programs. Coordinating with the State and other SMEs could have been explained in the impact statement. (For example, Investment 6 and State Investment 2 correlate with each other, but there is no explanation of coordination efforts). Funding activities under Organization cannot be unallowable and more appropriate for M&A. Overall, more in depth description in overall statement and explain acronyms. Investment 3 served as a good example of investment specific challenges, but overall challenges need to be individualized and not cut and pasted to across all investments. Overall, the sustainment category needs to be specific to each investment (i.e. cut and pasting for implementation and sustainment is not always effective)

Other

- Org charts would have been helpful to clarify project management and government structure.

FY 2009 HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM

Dear State Administrative Agency,

In the following package, you will find scoring and feedback information related to your Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Investment Justification (IJ) submitted to FEMA's Grant Programs Directorate. Each IJ has undergone an extensive peer review process that has culminated in the development of Effectiveness scores and detailed IJ feedback. Please note that the IJ feedback within the IJ Feedback form was generated directly by peer reviewers during the FY 2009 HSGP peer review conference.

The attached Scoring and Feedback Package includes:

- Effectiveness Summary
- Investment Justification Feedback
- Appendix: Instructions on how to read the Effectiveness Summary

If you have any questions regarding the Scoring and Feedback Package, please contact your Program Analyst at 800-368-6498.

Sincerely,

FEMA's Grant Programs Directorate



FEMA

FEMA GPD
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

APPENDIX

How to Read the FY 2009 HSGP Scoring and Feedback Package

Effectiveness Summary

The first document in your Scoring and Feedback Package is the Effectiveness Summary. This document contains the final Effectiveness Score for your Investment Justification (IJ). It also provides percentile ranking and individual Investment scores. The table below outlines the structure of the Effectiveness Summary and terminology to assist you in understanding your scores.

Effectiveness Summary Guide

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Effectiveness Score Summary</p> <p><i>This section provides applicants with their FY 2009 Effectiveness Score, as well as the comparable information from FY 2008 and FY 2007. It also provides the National Average Effectiveness Scores and your Percentile Ranking within the national average.</i></p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overall Effectiveness Score: The final Effectiveness score for your IJ is listed with bonus points from Multi-Applicant Investments and Cost Sharing included in the total, if applicable ▪ Peer Review Score: Score given to the IJ before including multi applicant and cost sharing bonus points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Average: Represents the FY 2009 average Effectiveness Score across peers within the same funding pool (SHSP, UASI, or Tribe) ▪ Percentile Ranking: Represents how the applicant performed relative to peers within the same funding pool (SHSP, UASI, or Tribe) |
| <p>Effectiveness Score Overview</p> <p><i>The scores in this section represent the applicant's average scores across all Investments for each category, five Investment Category scores, Comprehensive Investment Score, and Portfolio Score compared to the national average.</i></p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Category Averages: The average score for the five categories across all Investments submitted by the applicant ▪ Category National Averages: Represents the average category scores across all Investments submitted by peers within the same funding pool (SHSP, UASI, Tribe) ▪ The Comprehensive Score evaluates individual Investments by considering how effectively the sections of the Investment support each other; the Investment's goals and objectives; an ability to execute the proposed Investment; and how well the Investment is expected to assist the applicant in building and/or enhancing capability. ▪ The Portfolio Score section evaluates the IJ as a whole by considering overall consistency and clarity, overall effectiveness to reduce risks, ability to build and/or enhance capabilities, as well as overall cohesiveness and coordination across the portfolio of Investments. The portfolio score is not affected by the number of Investments. | |
| <p>Investment Score Details</p> <p><i>This section details each Investment's Effectiveness score, ordered by Investment Score.</i></p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Investment Scores: Investments are listed in descending order (highest to lowest) based on Investment scores located in the right-hand column ▪ Highest 15%: Represents the top 15% of Investments submitted by peers within the same funding pool (SHSP, UASI, Tribe) | |

IJ Feedback

In FY 2009, peer reviewers provided specific feedback for each IJ. The feedback was based on the three discussion questions listed on the IJ Feedback form (questions are specifically in the gray box). Discussion questions were provided as a guide for the peer review panels.

- Please note that reviewers **were not required** to answer all discussion questions. Numbers linked to discussion questions where no feedback is provided indicates the panel chose not to provide feedback for that discussion question. Other comments and feedback not related to discussion questions are listed as bullet points, or separated by spaces.
- Please note the IJ feedback content that you are receiving from the peer review panel is uncensored by FEMA and only minor formatting and spelling errors were corrected for the Applicant's convenience.

Multi-Applicant Investment Summary

States, Urban Areas and territories that submitted a Multi-Applicant Investment will receive a Multi-Applicant Investment Summary that includes the bonus points awarded for each Multi-Applicant Investment submission. Feedback may contain overall suggestions for each partner or call out suggestions for specific submitting partners. Please note that feedback was provided only by the peer review panel.

Cost Sharing Summary

States, Urban Areas, territories, and tribes that submitted a cost sharing proposal will receive a summary that describes how the bonus points were determined.



Applicant: MA - Boston Urban Area

Investment Justification Feedback

Investment Justification feedback was based on the questions below. Questions were provided as a guide for discussion during panel sessions. Feedback corresponds to the numbered question in the gray box.

The Investment Justification (IJ) feedback within this form was generated directly by peer reviewers during the FY 2009 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Peer Review Conference. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) did not provide input into the IJ feedback.

1. What were the strengths of the Investment Justification as a whole?
2. What were the strongest Investments in the application, and why?
3. What additional information, enhanced detail, and/or further justification would improve individual Investments?
4. Other Comments and Feedback

1. Investment Justification Strengths

- i. Investment Justification includes building upon/updating to past work.
- ii. Investment Justification includes complete cycle on planning, training, and exercises.
- iii. Investment 5 addresses special needs population effectively.

2. Investment Justification Strongest Investments

- i. CBRNE – Investment 6 has good accomplishments and milestones.
- ii. Information Sharing – Investment 5 has good accomplishments and milestones.

3. Additional Information Needed

- i. The references in Section II.B. do not not directly correlate to the sections in the Homeland Security/Urban Area and Strategy goals and objectives.
- ii. Proposed equipment purchases were not detailed enough in the Funding Plan (III.A.) section.
- iii. In Investments 1-3, challenges listed often do not reflect or thoroughly explain the most significant barriers to success.

4. Other Comments and Feedback

- i. Excessive abbreviations/acronyms (e.g. IMAT) made it difficult for the review panel to focus on the content.
- ii. While the panel notes that the incorrect strategy document was referenced, the scoring was not reduced in the subsequent sections.
- iii. Investments continually referred to first responders as opposed to emergency responders which is inconsistent with NIMS/ICS.



FY 2009 HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM

MA - Boston Urban Area: Effectiveness Score Summary

Effectiveness Score Summary

| Fiscal Year | Overall Effectiveness Score | Peer Review Score | Multi-Bonus Score | Cost Sharing Bonus Score | National Average ¹ | Effectiveness Score Percentile Ranking | Percentile Ranking ² |
|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | | | | 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100% | |
| 2009 | 83 | 83 | N/A | N/A | 79 | 2009 [Bar chart showing 63% ranking] | 63% |
| 2008 | 81 | 81 | N/A | N/A | 80 | 2008 [Bar chart showing 41% ranking] | 41% |
| 2007 | 82 | 82 | N/A | N/A | 82 | 2007 [Bar chart showing 38% ranking] | 38% |

¹ National Average: Represents the FY 2009 average Effectiveness score across peers within the same funding pool (SHSP, UASI, or Tribe)

² Percentile Ranking: Represents how the applicant performed relative to peers within the same funding pool (SHSP, UASI, or Tribe)

Effectiveness Score Overview

The Investment Score is comprised of the five Investment category scores, which are combined with the Comprehensive Investment Score. The Investment Scores are combined with the Portfolio Score to create the Effectiveness Score. The scores below represent the average across all Investments for each category compared to the national average.

| | Portfolio Score (Out of 100) | Strategy Average (Out of 100) | Funding Plan Average (Out of 100) | Accomplishments Average (Out of 100) | Challenge Mitigation Average (Out of 100) | Impact Average (Out of 100) | Comprehensive Investment Score Average (Out of 100) | Investment Score Average (Out of 100) |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| MA - Boston Urban Area | 82 | 60 | 78 | 87 | 90 | 91 | 88 | 84 |
| UASI National Average | 71 | 82 | 86 | 77 | 68 | 77 | 72 | 77 |

Investment Score Details

The section below details each Investment's Effectiveness score, ordered by Investment Score.

| # | Investment Name | Strategy Score (Out of 100) | Funding Plan (Out of 100) | Accomplishments (Out of 100) | Challenge Mitigation (Out of 100) | Impact (Out of 100) | Comprehensive Investment Score (Out of 100) | Investment Score (Out of 100) |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| + 4 | Communications Interoperability | 61 | 97 | 91 | 100 | 100 | 92 | 91 |
| + 5 | CBRNE Detection, Response and Decontamination | 61 | 84 | 93 | 92 | 100 | 95 | 90 |
| + 2 | Critical Infrastructure Protection | 67 | 75 | 96 | 92 | 95 | 97 | 89 |
| 6 | Medical Surge and Mass Prophylaxis | 64 | 66 | 90 | 92 | 90 | 93 | 85 |
| 3 | Information Sharing and Collaboration | 61 | 70 | 86 | 92 | 95 | 95 | 85 |
| 7 | Planning and Community Preparedness | 58 | 92 | 86 | 83 | 90 | 85 | 83 |
| 1 | Implement the National Incident Management System and National Response Framework | 50 | 59 | 69 | 83 | 65 | 57 | 61 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

+ Investment was among the highest 15% scoring Investments of all UASI submissions.





FEMA

July 27, 2010

Dear Boston Urban Area Security Initiative Point for Contact:

This package includes scoring and feedback information related to your Urban Area's Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Investment Justification (IJ) submission to FEMA's Grant Programs Directorate (GPD). All IJs were reviewed using an online peer review process, which resulted in Investment Scores and Peer Reviewer Comments.

Investment Scores

Each IJ was reviewed by at least five reviewers. Your scores for each Investment and the overall Portfolio are provided in the attached Score Summary Sheet. Scores were on a scale of 1 – 5. The national average for all UASI investments was 3.76; the national average for all UASI portfolio scores was 3.74. Unlike in previous years, IJ's were not given a final summary score.

The scores reflect peer reviewers' consideration of each investment's consistency and clarity, anticipated effectiveness in reducing risk, ability to build and/or enhance capabilities, as well as overall cohesiveness and coordination across the portfolio of Investments.

Peer Reviewer Comments

During the review process, peer reviewers provided specific feedback for each IJ. The feedback covered a range of topics including, but not limited to, the quality of the submission and any considerations for improving future applications, project planning, or implementation efforts. The feedback included here represents the opinions of individual peer reviewers and does not reflect a consensus opinion. FEMA did not provide input into the feedback.

If you have any questions regarding the Scoring and Feedback Package, please contact your Program Analyst at (800) 368-6498.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Judy H. Hampton".

Judy H. Hampton, Director
Grant Development and Administration Division
Grant Programs Directorate

Cc: Dennis Donehoo

FY 2010 HSGP Investment Justification Effectiveness Score Summary

UA: Boston

| | Investment Name | Score | Peer Reviewer Comments |
|---|--|-------|---|
| 1 | Implement NIMS and the National Response Framework | 3.88 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment 7- Strategy section vaguely restates TCs without directly referencing specific objectives or tasks to achieve results. |
| 2 | Critical Infrastructure Protection | 4.00 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investments 2 and 5 referred to goal #5, there was no goal 5 in the 2009 or 2010 UASS. Investment 6 referred to Goal #7, there were only 4 goals. Very clear and concise strategy/description. Milestones were thought out. |
| 3 | Information Sharing and Collaboration | 4.17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Boston UASI did a great job of explaining the program objectives throughout their Investment Justification. 2. Investment 7: There are additional Target Capabilities that could be supported through this particular investment. |
| 4 | Communications Interoperability | 4.17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Boston Urban Area submission shows a clear and concise structure across all investment justifications. In all IJs, a capability gap is identified or implied. Furthermore, the writer(s) detail what the project will do / how funds will be used to address stated capability gaps which is further elaborated on in the milestone section. The milestones in and of themselves, show a progressive series of steps toward the completion of the fy10 portion of the project. All investments support the selected target capabilities, however in some cases, target capabilities not selected could potentially be applicable. Specific feedback includes: |
| 5 | CBRNE Detection, Response and Decontamination | 4.25 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment 4: Intelligence and Information sharing target capability does not fit well with this project, but other selected TCs match well. |
| 6 | Strengthen Planning and Community Preparedness | 4.13 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was nice detail throughout all most all of the investments and it was easy to have a very clear picture of what was being proposed and gage the level in which the investments fit into the scoring questions. |
| 7 | Medical Surge and Mass Prophylaxis | 3.75 | |
| | Portfolio Score | 4.00 | |