

Federal source. Grants awarded to small, impoverished communities may receive a Federal share of up to 90 percent of the total amount approved under the grant award, to implement eligible approved activities.

All non-Federal contributions, cash and in-kind, are accepted as part of the non-Federal share. Except as allowed by Federal statute, no other Federal funds can be used as a cost share. Requirements for in-kind contributions can be found in 44 CFR 13.24. In-kind contributions must be directly related to eligible program costs. The following documentation is required for third-party cash and in-kind contributions: record of source of donor, dates, rates, amounts, and deposit slips for cash contributions.

Evaluation and Award Processes

National Evaluation. Disaster Resistant University mitigation proposals for PDM DRU grants will be evaluated and selected based on the following considerations (each applies to all proposals, unless specified for "planning activities" or "projects"). The specific factors will carry more weight than the general criteria.

- The extent to which the proposal benefits a university (or universities) that demonstrates the following general criteria:

- (1) Top level commitment to the concept of disaster resistance (Chancellor, President, *etc.*)

- (2) Capability to successfully carry out proposed mitigation activities and initiatives (*i.e.*, expertise to carry out the relevant studies and assessments of hazards and risk, their impacts on its facilities, and project implementation);

- (3) For proposals benefiting former DRU universities, commitment to sustained mitigation demonstrated through past and ongoing DRU efforts, such as the selection of a DRU coordinator, partnering efforts, risk assessment and risk reduction planning activities, outreach and implementation of mitigation activities.

- The extent to which the proposal addresses the following specific factors, listed in order of importance, are:

- (1) For mitigation planning activities, the university's assessment of risks by hazard (see Supplemental Questions);

- (2) For mitigation projects,

- a. Benefit-Cost ratio by hazard based on Applicant's Benefit-Cost Analysis;

- b. Whether the project protects critical facilities;

- c. Consistency with the State mitigation plan and any existing local/Tribal and university mitigation plans;

- d. Consistency with Federal laws and Executive Orders to include National

Environmental Policy Act, National Historic Preservation Act, Clean Water Act, Floodplain Management, and Seismic Safety of Federal Buildings; and Federal programs such as American Heritage Rivers Initiative, SBA Disaster Loan Program and EPA Watershed Initiative;

- (3) The priority given to the sub-application by the Applicant;

- (4) Overall size and proportion of university population that will benefit, such as:

- a. Number of university employees and university-employer's rank (largest, second largest, *etc.* employer) in the community

- b. Value of goods and services purchased by university within the community

- c. University budget

- d. Total economic impact of university on community—indicate the effect university would have on community if a disaster strikes (major job shortage, loss of medical services, *etc.*);

- (5) Feasibility of methodology and outcome;

- (6) Implementation involves reasonable timeline and expectations;

- (7) Leverages State and local community involvement through partnerships;

- (8) Identifies appropriate outreach activities that advance mitigation;

- (9) Serves as a model for other universities;

- (10) Innovation and creativity used as part of the best available options;

- (11) Status of State/Tribal mitigation plans

- (12) For community Sub-Applicants:
 - a. Status of the Sub-Applicant as a small, impoverished community.

- b. Community mitigation factors, such as community incentives (tax credits, waiver of building permit fees, and building codes), Community Rating System class, Cooperating Technical Partner, participation as a Firewise Community, and adoption of codes to include Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule, International Code Series and National Fire Protection Association 5000 Code.

In making its selections, FEMA will also consider the PDM DRU National Priorities for FY 2003 funds. This includes mitigating a representative range of universities based on type of hazard addressed, geography, size, and academic community served, which includes consideration of Historically Black Colleges & Universities (HBCU) and Tribal Colleges & Universities (TCU). It also includes sustaining and building on prior DRU efforts through mitigation projects that reduce the risk of loss for past DRU universities.

Selection/Award. For FY 2003 PDM DRU grants, awards will be governed by Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003, Public Law 108–7, section 203 of the Stafford Act, as amended by section 102 of the DMA, this notice, and PDM DRU program guidance, which will be made available to the public on the FEMA Web site: www.fema.gov/fima/dru.shtm.

The Headquarters Approving Federal Official shall consider the National Evaluation criteria and factors listed above, the National priorities, and other pertinent information to determine which sub-applications to approve. After the sub-applications are selected, FEMA Regional offices will work with Applicants whose sub-applications are selected to implement the grant award.

Environmental/Historic Preservation Review Process

FEMA has determined, in accordance with 44 CFR 10.8 (d)(2)(iii), that mitigation planning activities have no impact on the environment and will require no further environmental or historic preservation review. However, mitigation projects will require environmental/historic preservation review. Construction type activities usually require more extensive review, or even an environmental assessment with alternatives addressed, historic preservation consultation, or both. For selected mitigation projects that require any level of environmental/historic preservation review, FEMA will not award the grant and the Applicant may not initiate construction until FEMA has completed its review. FEMA will complete the environmental and historic preservation review with the assistance of both the Applicant and the Sub-Applicant.

If after review of the responses to the established environmental/historic questions, supporting documentation, and the consultations with regulatory/resource agencies, FEMA determines that certain compliance measures are required to address the environmental/historic impacts of a selected project, FEMA will notify the Applicant. The Applicant or Sub-Applicant may determine whether or not to accept the grant award based on the estimated additional cost of the compliance measures. The amount of the Federal share will not be increased to cover any additional costs. Therefore, it is essential that at the time of the application submission, Applicants and Sub-Applicants include costs associated with any anticipated environmental/historic preservation compliance measures or alternatives identified through the development of the