

Grants Overhaul Initiative
Frequently Asked Questions

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

- Q: I'm currently a **UASI jurisdiction**, what happens to my grant?
- A: All current and former UASI jurisdictions are eligible to receive funding. Simply create your "combinations of governments," develop a plan approved by the PRC, and begin applying for funding. Better yet, even if you have never been an approved "urban area" under UASI, you may act like one under this new system.
- Q: What about **New York City**?
- A: The current Tier 1 UASI cities will still receive a direct funding allocation. States with these Tier 1 cities will be given a plus-up to their allocation to pass directly through to the city. The urban area's CPS, however, will need to be approved by the PRC to ensure consistency with state and national priorities.
- Q: What happens to **EMPG**?
- A: The current-day EMPG becomes the NPPG, is given a modest increase in funding, and made eligible for homeland security personnel also. Furthermore, since the SAA maintains all current authorities at their disposal, if you currently are given the authority to manage EMPG, you may continue to do so within the NPPG.
- Q: There is currently a **backlog of \$13 billion** in grant funding; does this proposal solve such backlogs from occurring in the future?
- A: Yes. All awarded project grants are available for 3 years without an option for extension. Since we are now just funding projects, 3 years should be more than plenty. After those three years, the funds will be reverted back to the state for reallocation. This will allow for greater visibility on the status of grants and more rapid remedial action where necessary.
- Q: My state maintains **separate emergency management and homeland security organizations**; does this proposal force us to combine them?
- A: Absolutely not, but it does encourage you to work closely together to determine state priorities and build state capabilities together to develop a true all-hazards system. This proposed system also allows local representatives to expand their involvement in these programs.
- Q: What happens to the **25 percent LETTP** carve out?
- A: While the specific carve-out is removed in this proposal, as an eligible applicant, significantly more funds are available for your use. Simply have an approved CPS and apply for funding against your projects.
- Q: What about all the "stuff" that has been **purchased over the past 10 years**?
- A: In order to effectively manage all the current available assets, this proposal recommends a two-tier approach. First, the initial CPS will include an inventory of all existing assets and subsequent strategies will go back 12 months. Secondly, in the equipment program, jurisdictions will now have the ability to transfer equipment between one another to ensure those assets "sitting in a closet" can be utilized.
- Q: What about some of the **consolidated grants with higher match percentages**?
- A: The NPIRM focuses on the functions of those consolidated grants versus actual program requirements currently in place. In some cases, the match level goes up while in other cases the

1 match is reduced. In order to gain the maximum amount of flexibility within NPIRM, a uniform
2 match requirement was necessary.
3

4 Q: How does this **promote integrated planning**?

5 A: The primary purpose of this proposal is to make planning reflective as well as strategic. Many
6 states already conduct an integrated planning process which would continue, but the CPS would
7 require a look back to also review efforts already accomplished.
8

9 Q: Will there be a **standardized THIRA model** used by DHS and all states?

10 A: DHS and FEMA are currently working with the National Preparedness Task Force on
11 development of the national THIRA system. THIRA will be the analytical component to
12 understand what can go wrong and to set priorities for objectives to achieve, actions to take, and
13 capabilities to build.
14

15 Q: How does this approach reduce or **streamline current bureaucratic reporting requirements**?

16 A: Bureaucratic reporting requirements are primarily streamlined through the use of the CPS as the
17 measuring stick for current and future efforts. By utilizing essentially a 6-year strategy (one year
18 back, 5 years forward), applicants will be providing a comprehensive and uniform look at
19 capabilities. The CPS's are then provided to DHS for consolidation to provide a comprehensive
20 report to Congress demonstrating past, current, and future efforts and how they all fit into an
21 overall preparedness effort.
22

23 Q: Is the **Hazard Mitigation Grant Program** included in this proposal?

24 A: No. Since HMGP is directly related to the cost of specific disasters, it would not be appropriate
25 for inclusion in this proposal, and is the only mitigation grant not included.
26

27 Q: I currently receive some of the **specific funding through the Port Security Grant Program**;
28 will I still be eligible for that grant?

29 A: The Port Security Grant specifically will no longer exist, but you are still eligible to receive
30 funding! Simply create your "combinations of governments" (or "applicants" in this case),
31 develop a plan approved by the PRC, and begin applying for funding. Just like the urban areas,
32 even if you have never been eligible for port security funding in the past, you may be under this
33 new system.
34