

Assistance to Firefighters Grant 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 Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG). 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) aligns with AFG priorities.

1. Financial Need

Describe your financial need and how consistent it is with the intent of the AFG. Include details describing your organization's financial distress such as summarizing budget constraints and previous unsuccessful attempts to secure other funding and demonstrate that the financial distress is out of your control. The questions below illustrate how reviewers will evaluate your narrative.

- 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 do not have the means to procure vehicles?
- Does the applicant include evidence of sacrifice due to budget constraints?

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

- **Strongly Agree:** 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.
- **Agree:** 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.
- **Neither Agree nor Disagree:** 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 address its operational or safety needs.



FEMA

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

Clearly explain your organization's project objectives and their relationship to your organization's budget (e.g., personnel, equipment, contracts, etc.) and risk analysis by providing statistics to justify the needs. Describe the various activities to be implemented, including program priorities or facility modifications, to include details on how these are consistent with project objectives, your organization's mission and national, state, and/or local requirements. Provide details that link the proposed expenses to operations and safety, as well as to the completion of the project's goals. The questions below illustrate how reviewers will evaluate your narrative.

- 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?

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 Panel Reviewers might rate your application.

- **Strongly Agree:** The applicant clearly identifies the organization'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 is clearly and coherently aligned with Medium and/or High AFG priorities.
- **Agree:** 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 is sufficiently aligned with Medium and/or High AFG priorities.
- **Neither Agree nor Disagree:** 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 aligns with some Medium and/or High AFG priorities but lacks clarity on implementation and/or functionality.
- **Disagree:** 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 alignment to AFG priorities is unclear, confusing, or incomplete.
- **Strongly Disagree:** The applicant does not identify their budget, needs or mission, or how the requested vehicle will complement the organization. The project does not coherently align to any AFG priorities.

3. Cost Benefit

Describe how you plan to address the operations and personal safety needs of your organization, including cost effectiveness and sharing assets. The Operations and Safety Cost Benefit statement should also include details about gaining the maximum benefits from grant funding by citing reasonable or required costs. For example, applicant should state specific overhead and administrative costs. The request should also be consistent with your organization's mission and identify how funding will benefit your organization and affected personnel. The questions below illustrate how reviewers will evaluate your narrative.

- Does the applicant fully explain all aspects of the request?
- Does the applicant give evidence that funds are directly tied to operations of the organization?
- Does the applicant include information on sharing the requested vehicle with neighboring jurisdictions?
- Does the applicant show evidence that they have conducted good market research to ensure that they do not 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 Panel Reviewers might rate your application.

- **Strongly Agree:** The applicant clearly identifies and fully articulates proposed benefits from the vehicle acquisition, which support the organization's mission and operations. The project's goals benefit the organization and neighboring jurisdictions and are very advantageous when compared to the costs.
- **Agree:** The applicant identifies and articulates the vehicle to be purchased but does not provide in-depth 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.
- **Neither Agree nor Disagree:** The applicant identifies the request for the vehicle requisition but includes little detail about what benefits the purchase will give the organization and/or community. The purchase price is somewhat unreasonable, and/or a significant portion of the grant funds appear excessive.
- **Disagree:** The applicant fails to define the relationship between the vehicle request and the needs of the organization and/or community. The benefits of the purchase are vague, and costs are excessive or unnecessary.
- **Strongly Disagree:** 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

Explain how this funding request will enhance your organization's overall effectiveness. Describe how the grant award will improve daily operations and reduce the organization's risk(s) including how frequently the requested item(s) will be used and in what capacity. Indicate how the requested item(s) will help the community and increase the organization's ability to save additional lives and property. Jurisdictions that demonstrate their commitment and proactive posture to reducing fire risk, by explaining their code enforcement (to include Wildland Urban Interface code enforcement) and mitigation strategies (including whether the jurisdiction has a FEMA-approved mitigation strategy) may receive stronger consideration under these criteria. The questions below illustrate how reviewers will evaluate your narrative.

- Does the applicant include sufficient details to understand their organization's most common risk(s)?
- 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 National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1901 or NFPA 1906?
- Has the applicant explained how the vehicle(s) will positively impact operations per NFPA 1710 and/or NFPA 1720?
- Does the applicant include details on mitigation strategies to reduce fire risk?

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 Panel Reviewers might rate your application.

- Strongly Agree: The applicant clearly demonstrates the vehicle requested is necessary for daily operations, contributes to protecting lives and property, and supports the organization's mission. It is apparent the vehicle will be used frequently, and the outcomes of the program are clearly described.
- Agree: The applicant sufficiently explains how the vehicle will complement the mission and increase the organization's efficiency; however, the effects derived from the vehicle acquisition and/or how frequently the vehicle will be used are somewhat vague.
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant describes how the vehicle request provides a benefit to the organization's operations and will save lives and property but lacks in-depth information. It is not clearly defined how effective the items will be, how frequently the items will be used, and/or how the items benefit the organization's mission.
- Disagree: The applicant does not adequately relate their vehicle request to the needs of the organization. The applicant excludes specific details as to how the requested items will improve the organization's mission, daily operations, and/or ability to save lives and property.
- Strongly Disagree: 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.