

**ALBION-LITTLE RIVER FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA**

Tuesday June 9, 2009 at 5:00 pm, at Station 811, 32600 Albion Ridge Road, Albion, CA

- 1. Call to order and determination of a quorum.**
- 2. Public communication to the Board.** An opportunity is provided for members of the public to address the Board with respect to matters within the Board's jurisdiction whether on the agenda or not. For action items the public may also address the board at the time the item is presented for action.
- 3.** The Board will meet to review the criteria for an upcoming grant that may provide funds for the acquisition of fire department vehicles, equipment and buildings.
- 4. Adjournment.**

Any individual who requires disability-related accommodations or modifications, including auxiliary aids and services, in order to participate in the Board meeting should contact the Board in writing at P.O. Box 634, Albion, CA 95410-0634, at least two days before the meeting date.

PART V.

APPLICATION REVIEW AND EVALUATION PROCESS INFORMATION

This section summarizes the multi-level review and evaluation process used to select applications for FSC funding.

A. Prescreening Process

As explained earlier, funding priorities and criteria for evaluating FSC applications are established based on recommendations from the criteria development panel. All submitted applications are ranked based on the substance of the application relative to the established funding priorities. Information provided in the application including answers to the application's activity-specific questions provide a basis to determine each application's ranking relative to the stated priorities.

B. Peer Review Process

Applications most consistent with the grant funding priorities (as outlined in Part I, C above) score higher than applications that are inconsistent with the priorities. Applications scoring the highest are determined to be in the "competitive range" and undergo further evaluation through a peer review process. DHS will review a sufficient number of applications in order to assure that the FSC Program's goals and objectives are met. To achieve this, the number of applications reviewed will be the number of applications whose cumulative requests equates to no less than 200 percent (200%) of the appropriated funding for FSC. As such, with \$210 million appropriated for FSC, DHS will consider no less than \$420 million in applications to be in the competitive range and reviewed by a panel of peers.

A panel of at least three peer reviewers evaluates each application scoring in the competitive range from the first phase of evaluation using the project narrative and the specific project details you provide in the application. During the panel review process, panelists provide a subjective but qualitative judgment on the merits of each request.

Panelists evaluate and score the following project elements:

1) Project Description:

- Your narrative should demonstrate the need for the new facility. This would include a description of the existing facility or facilities and their shortcomings.

- Why are you building a new station versus expanding or modifying your existing station (or vice versa)? Provide a basis for site selection for the new construction.
- Describe your construction project(s). What are the characteristics of your project? How many square feet? How many bays/vehicles? What other accommodations will be included such as a kitchen, training, decontamination area, power source, gender specific sleeping quarters, training space, day room or community meeting space?
- What are the budgeted costs associated/estimated for each section?
- What is the current status of the project? Describe where you are in the process. Have you obtained plans, permits, etc.?

2) Financial Need:

- Why can't this project be funded solely through local funding resources?
- What efforts have you employed to generate funds for the construction? Describe the number and types of events.
- How long have the efforts to generate funds for the new station been ongoing?
- Have you applied for or obtained other grants or sources of funding? Have your fund-raising efforts been unsuccessful or declining?
- Have you obtained but lost partial grants due to inability to fund an entire project?
- Describe your local community's economic situation, including unemployment and poverty levels.

3) Cost/Benefit:

- How will your firefighters be safer with the new station (if applicable)?
- How will the new/modified station improve your response capabilities? Do you have the ability to expand service from new structure?
- Describe the possible consequences if the project is not funded.
- Describe the extent of the local contribution that will go toward the project.
- What types of incidents and/or expanded services that will be handled from the new structure?
- What "green" elements do you plan on incorporating into the station?

4) Effect on Daily Operations:

- Describe how this award will affect your department's daily operational effectiveness due to new proximity to population.
- How would this award affect your department's ability to protect lives and property in your community?

- What assurances can you provide that the new station will be staffed/equipped so fire suppression services are not compromised (not stretched too thin to benefit the community)?
- How will the new structure enhance your department's ability to provide mutual aid?

Each of these elements carries equal weight when factored into the panelists' scores (*i.e.*, one-fourth).

Each application is judged on its own merits, not compared to other applications. The panelists consider all expenses budgeted, including administrative and/or indirect costs, as part of the cost-benefit review. Panelists review each application in its entirety and rate the application according to the established evaluation criteria.

DHS will use the answers to the activity-specific questions as well as other information in the application when conducting initial assessments. The answers to these questions are the primary basis for determining whether an application warrants further evaluation through peer review. Applicants whose answers indicate their project is consistent with the established priorities (as outlined in Section 1.C above) have a better chance of scoring within the competitive range and reaching the second level of evaluation, *e.g.*, the peer review, than those applicants whose projects do not reflect the established priorities. Applicants who submit false information with their applications or misrepresent their organizations in any material manner will have their applications deemed ineligible by the AFG Program Office and referred to the DHS' OIG for further action, as appropriate.

C. Technical Review Process

Each application that scores high during the peer review process will be deemed to be in the fundable range. Applications in the fundable range undergo series of Technical Reviews by subject matter specialists as well as a Program Office review prior to being recommended for award. As part of the technical review, subject matter specialists will assess the technical feasibility of the applicants achieving the benefits claimed in their applications. Applications in the fundable range will also be asked to submit more detailed information regarding their construction budget. The instructions regarding the content and format of that information will be transmitted to the applicant during the technical review. We will have a construction specialist perform a detailed review of the proposed budget as well as conformance to accepted engineering practices (codes, standards, modeling, techniques, or best practices). After the Technical Review, the Program Office will conduct an additional review to assess the request with respect to eligibility prior to recommending the application for award.

**ALBION LITTLE RIVER FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**

June 9, 2009 Station 811, 32600 Albion Ridge Rd., Albion, CA

1. **Call to order and determination of a quorum.** Meeting called to order at 5:10pm. Present were Board Members Terry Kemp, Alan Taeger, Rich Riley, Ed Petrykowski, Chief Derek Wilson and firefighters Ted Williams and Stacy Weil-Dye.
2. **Public communication to the Board.** None.
3. Discussion of upcoming Homeland Security grant. Application deadline is July 10, 2009. Focus was on the need for the 811 Firehouse rebuilding and what justifies it.
4. Meeting adjourned at 6:00pm

Minutes approved by unanimous vote of the board at the June 24, 2009 regular business meeting.