Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program (AFG)

2016 Assistance to Firefighters Grants

Self-Evaluation Sheet

Vehicle Acquisition

This Self Evaluation Sheet is designed to help you understand the criteria that you must address in your Narrative Statement when applying for the Assistance to Firefighters Grants (AFG) Program. The Panel Reviewers will review all the criteria in the Narrative Statement to assess your agency's financial need, the degree to which your proposal best describes your community risks, the requirements you have listed that will reduce those risks, and how your project(s) align with the AFG Program priorities.

1. Financial Need

Applicants should describe their financial need and how consistent it is with the intent of the AFG Program. This statement should include details describing the applicant's financial distress, including summarizing budget constraints, unsuccessful attempts to obtain vehicle and outside funding, and proving the trouble is out of their control.

- Applicants should provide a comprehensive overview of their organization's budget, including but not limited to describing sources of revenue/funding and expenses
- Does the applicant clearly describe their financial distress?
- Does the applicant explain why they don't have the means to procure vehicles?
- Does the applicant include evidence of sacrifice due to budget constraints?

Below are the same scoring dimensions the Panel Reviewers will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the Peer Reviewers might rate your application.

Excellent: The applicant's financial difficulties are clearly identified, contributing to the inability to purchase new vehicles. The applicant provides strong evidence showing the distress is beyond their control and federal intervention is necessary.

Very Good: The financial need of the applicant is explained, but extent of need is not undoubtedly clear. The applicant describes vehicle deficiencies and their attempts to gain other funding, but in-depth details are lacking.

Good: The applicant identifies a financial need, but lacks details. The applicant demonstrates a need for new vehicles, but does not provide an adequate explanation why they require assistance. It is unclear what the applicant has done to addresses its operational or safety needs.

Fair: The applicant identifies a possible financial need, but little to no detail is provided about other funding attempts, why new vehicle are needed, why funds are lacking, and/or why this problem is out of their control.

Poor: The applicant's financial needs are not identified, nor are they articulated. It is unclear if the lack of vehicle and/or resources are directly related to the financial need of the applicant.

2. Project Description and Budget

This statement should clearly explain the applicant's mission, project goals, budget, and need for requested vehicles. Evidence of the applicant's needs should be provided. The statement should include how the budget expenses are beneficial to the applicant's needs, scope of work, and requested equipment. The applicant should also describe specifics of the vehicle being purchased and its relevance to the applicant's mission, requirements, community served, and call volume.

- Does the applicant demonstrate they understand the stated program priorities?
- Does the applicant produce evidence to support its requested needs?
- Does the applicant describe its budget in detail?
- Does the applicant clearly explain the specifics of the vehicle being purchased?
- Does the applicant show evidence that they have conducted good market research, e.g., bids and specs ready to go?

Below are the same scoring dimensions that the Panel Reviewers will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the Peer Reviewers might rate your application.

Excellent: The applicant clearly identifies the department's mission and the requested vehicle's capacity to complement the mission. The budget is articulated well and not excessive to the needs of the applicant. The project(s) are clearly and coherently aligned with Medium and/or High AFG Program priorities.

Very Good: The applicant's mission and needs are sufficiently explained. Budget items and vehicle requests are described, but lack in-depth details with respect to the relationship with the mission. The project(s) are sufficiently aligned with Medium and/or High AFG Program priorities.

Good: The applicant's intentions are somewhat identified, but there is little detail for the reviewer to fully comprehend the vehicle request and how it relates to the applicant's mission, scope of the procurement, and budget. The project(s) align with some Medium and/or High AFG Program priorities but lack clarity on implementation and/or functionality.

Fair: The applicant includes little detail about their mission and objective. The costs of the requested items or the budget's relationship to the scope of work are lacking or not included. The project(s) alignment to AFG Program priorities is unclear, confusing, or incomplete.

Poor: The applicant does not identify their budget, needs, or mission, or how the requested vehicle will complement the organization. The project(s) do not coherently align to any AFG Program priorities.

3. Operations and Safety/Cost Benefit

Applicants should describe the proposed benefits derived from the vehicle request. This statement should include evidence to support that all costs associated with the vehicle procurement are not superfluous. This statement should also provide data to support that grant funding will be tied directly to the mission and operations of the department (as opposed to administrative-type expenses), and explain what efforts will be made to maximize the funding, such as changes within the department and mutual aid.

- Does the applicant fully explain all aspects of the request?
- Does the applicant give evidence that funds are directly tied to operations of the department?
- Does the applicant include information on sharing the requested vehicle with neighboring jurisdictions?

- Does the cost of the proposed project align with stated needs and the cost benefit(s) of the project?
- Does the applicant show evidence that they have conducted good market research so as not to request more funds than they need?

Below are the same scoring dimensions that the Panel Reviewers will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the Peer Reviewers might rate your application.

Excellent: The applicant clearly identifies and fully articulates proposed benefits from the vehicle acquisition, which support the department's mission and operations. The project's goals benefit the organization and neighboring jurisdictions, and are very advantageous when compared to the costs.

Very Good: The applicant identifies and articulates the vehicle to be purchased, but does not provide details. The applicant has included some initiatives, such as mutual aid. The benefits proposed appear to be reasonable and cost-effective, but more information is needed.

Good: The applicant identifies the request for the vehicle requisition, but includes little detail about what benefits the purchase will give the department and/or community. The purchase price is somewhat unreasonable, and/or a significant portion of the grant funds appear excessive.

Fair: The applicant fails to define the relationship between the vehicle request and the needs of the department and/or community. The benefits of the purchase are vague and costs are excessive or superfluous.

Poor: The applicant does not identify, nor articulate, the benefits of the vehicle request. The applicant does not adequately address the benefits to the organization or community, and costs are inappropriate or non-existent.

4. Statement of Effect/Impact on Daily Operations

This statement should explain how this funding request will add daily benefits to an organization's department. It should address how this request will improve operations and reduce the department's common risk(s). Applicants should include how frequently the requested vehicle will be used and in what capacity. Applicants should also indicate how the requested vehicle will increase their department's ability to save additional lives and property within their community.

- Does the applicant include sufficient details to understand their department's most common risk?
- Does the applicant explain the vehicle requested and how it is tied to protecting life and property on a frequent basis?
- Does the applicant include daily benefits?
- Has the applicant identified the vehicle(s) being replaced as not manufactured for emergency services, and/or that the vehicle being replaced is not compliant with NFPA 1901or NFPA1906?
- Has the applicant explained how the acquisition vehicle(s) will positively impact operations per NFPA 1710 and/or NFPA1720?

Below are the same scoring dimensions that the Panel Reviewers will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the Peer Reviewers might rate your application.

Excellent: The applicant clearly demonstrates the vehicle requested is necessary for daily operations, contributes to protecting lives and property, and supports the department's mission. It is apparent the vehicle will be used frequently and the outcomes of the program are clearly evident.

Very Good: The applicant sufficiently explains how the vehicle will complement the mission and increase the department's efficiency; however, the effects derived from the vehicle acquisition and/or how frequently the vehicle will be used are somewhat vague.

Good: The applicant describes how the vehicle request provides a benefit to the department's operations and will save lives and property, but lacks in-depth information. It is not absolutely clear how effective the items will be, how frequently the items will be used, and/or how the items benefit the department's mission.

Fair: The applicant does not adequately relate their vehicle request to the needs of the department. The applicant excludes specific details as to how the requested items will improve the department's mission, daily operations, and/or ability to save lives and property.

Poor: The applicant does not prove the vehicle requested is necessary for its daily operations and/or that it would contribute to the department's ability to protect life and property.