



**To: Bay Area UASI Approval Authority**  
**From: Catherine Spaulding, Assistant General Manager**  
**Date: March 13, 2014**  
**Re: Item 10: Equipment Performance Review**

---

**Staff Recommendation:**

Approve the proposed equipment performance review

**Action or Discussion Item:**

Action

**Discussion:**

The federal homeland security grant program remains under scrutiny at the federal level and grant funds are declining. It is important that the Bay Area continue to demonstrate that we are making optimal usage of investments and are meeting FEMA and OMB standards for effectiveness. In recent meetings, both FEMA Region IX as well as Cal OES leadership stressed the importance of robust evaluation of grant spending at the local level. Regular review of operations is a best practice within government and the private sector, and is a standard to which the Bay Area UASI should continue to hold itself.

At the direction of the Approval Authority, the Bay Area UASI Management Team has regularly examined grant investments to evaluate efficiency and effectiveness. A comprehensive Effectiveness Report was issued in both 2010 and 2012. For future efforts, the Management Team recommends taking a more focused look at particular investments along the POETE continuum (planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercises).

The Management Team proposes to undertake an equipment performance review given that most grant money is spent in this area. (The region spent \$19 million on equipment from the UASI FY11 grant year and \$13 million from UASI FY12). The purpose of the review will be to evaluate the region as a whole (not specific jurisdictions or agencies) and to develop policy-level recommendations for the region to consider so that we may improve the effectiveness of our grant spending in the future.

## *Key Questions*

The equipment performance review will address the following questions:

- **Need:** Is there a clear need for grant-funded equipment purchases that are not otherwise met? How are purchases identified as the most critical?
- **Utilization:** How frequently are equipment purchases actually used and for what?
- **Nexus to Terrorism:** To what extent are purchases building a terrorism preparedness/response capability?
- **Maintenance:** Have grant-funded equipment purchases been properly maintained? Are adequate and realistic plans for maintenance documented and followed?
- **Training:** Are there adequate training/training plans for maintaining and utilizing equipment?
- **Mutual Aid:** Has equipment been requested for mutual aid? How and when?
- **Types:** How do the above questions vary across equipment types?
- **Opportunity Costs:** What is the opportunity cost for spending funds on equipment purchases? What other capabilities could we/should we be building? Or, are we not spending enough on equipment?
- **Best Practices:** What do other comparable UASI regions do to ensure effectiveness in equipment investments and can best practices be applied to the Bay Area?
- **Recommendations:** What steps should the Bay Area UASI Management Team, Bay Area UASI Approval Authority, and/or participating Bay Area UASI jurisdictions take to ensure more effective equipment purchases? In particular: 1) what changes should be made to the Bay Area UASI's strategic planning and grant allocation processes; 2) what effort (if any) should the region make to maintain a centralized, online inventory of equipment for planning and mutual aid purposes?

## *Next Steps*

The Advisory Group approved the performance review concept paper (Appendix A) on February 20<sup>th</sup>. Pending Approval Authority approval, the Management Team will approach Core City auditor groups (or other Bay Area UASI jurisdictions interested to assist) to seek outside evaluator expertise to implement the review. An evaluation plan will be presented to the Advisory Group in July 2014 to demonstrate that there will not be an undue administrative burden placed on jurisdictions in data gathering for the review. We will utilize the expertise and feedback of both the Advisory Group and the CBRNE Working Group during implementation of the review, and we will seek their feedback on preliminary recommendations and drafts of the final report. The performance review will be completed by the end of the calendar year.

Please see Appendix A for a detailed concept paper on the proposed equipment performance review. The paper lays out in detail key questions, an articulation of risk, issues to consider in scoping, and proposed next steps.