



Western Washington University
Western CEDAR

WWU Honors Program Senior Projects

WWU Graduate and Undergraduate Scholarship

Spring 2005

The Complicated Art Of Successful Grant-Writing

Kate Seabury

Western Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: https://cedar.wvu.edu/wwu_honors



Part of the [Technical and Professional Writing Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Seabury, Kate, "The Complicated Art Of Successful Grant-Writing" (2005). *WWU Honors Program Senior Projects*. 282.

https://cedar.wvu.edu/wwu_honors/282

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the WWU Graduate and Undergraduate Scholarship at Western CEDAR. It has been accepted for inclusion in WWU Honors Program Senior Projects by an authorized administrator of Western CEDAR. For more information, please contact westerncedar@wwu.edu.

**The Complicated Art
Of Successful Grant-Writing**

A Senior Honors Project

Kate Seabury
Graduate of 2005


Western Washington University
*Advisor **Scott Stevens, Ph.D.***

Project Presented June 2, 2005



HONORS THESIS

In presenting this Honors paper in partial requirements for a bachelor's degree at Western Washington University, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes. It is understood that any publication of this thesis for commercial purposes or for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature 

Date 7/16/05

—TABLE OF CONTENTS—

PREFACE	3
 <i>The Complicated Art of Successful Grant Writing</i>	
Introduction	6
WCFD11: A Case Study	9
The How To	12
Audience	15
Situation	19
Concluding Thoughts	23
Words Cited	24
 APPENDICES	
Appendix I – The Narrative	25
Appendix II –2005 Assistance to Firefighters Grant Application	30

PREFACE

Grant writing is deceptively complex. On the surface it seems to be a purely technical exercise—one that invites dismissal from academia because of its business-like nature. Consequently, most writing on granting takes a very practical, “how to” approach that seeks to guide a new grant writer through the process of making an application. I intend to argue that this approach is insufficient to understanding the complexities of grant writing as a field. The fact that granting has not gained footing in the fields of academic research is problematic and unreflective of the deep complexities functioning within the genre.

Grant writing is kept out of the radar of critical theorists because of its strange location as a genre without a specific field. One could consider grant writing and grant funding as a field of its own, but it fails to be located in any specific academic department. It certainly holds a relation to Business and Economics as grant writing is a method for obtaining funding. It has a Political context, which I will argue later in this paper, and it holds direct ties to theories of Communication, English, and Rhetoric. Yet, it does not fit distinctly enough into any one of these fields to be studied in any of these schools of thought. English tends to value literary studies over technical writing. Businessmen seem to see granting for its practical applications only, and rhetoricians have failed to recognize the support grant writing offers for their theories.

In order to situate myself in a context to speak about these issues, I feel that it is important to lay out some background to my study. Over the past fall and winter, I

undertook the project of writing an Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG)¹ for Whatcom County Fire District 11 (WCFD11-Lummi Island), a department which had previously applied and been denied funding despite their acute need. This is the main source of my practical knowledge on grant writing and will provide a useful case-study for my discussion.

In addition to working with WCFD11 and the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Foundation, my research included attendance at a workshop put on by the AFG, review of guidance materials for the 2005 Assistance to Fire Fighters Grant Application, and consultation of several grant writing “How To” manuals.² I also interviewed both successful and unsuccessful AFG writers, and reviewed a number of winning and losing AFG applications from previous years.³

To frame the rhetorical aspect of my study, I pulled from the theories of several rhetoricians including Douglas Park, Lloyd Bitzer, and Amy Devitt. Their influence will become obvious in the following pages. The result is a rhetorical inquiry in the field of grant writing based upon experience, research, and theorizing about the larger context within which grant funding, and the applications for that funding, resides. Rhetoric provides the tools to look at grant writing as a whole—to simultaneously account for

¹ Since 2001, the US Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has allocated funds for grants to firefighters under a program called the Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG). This program focuses on providing safety equipment to fire departments that lack the funding to secure gear that is compliant with current state and federal safety standards. The application, guidelines, and goals are all available online at <http://www.firegrantsupport.com/>.

² In addition to examining the materials published by the AFG—guidelines, tutorial, workshop—I consulted Bev Browning’s, Grant Writing for Dummies, (Broning, Bev. Grant Writing for Dummies. Indianapolis: Wiley Publishing, Inc, 2001.).

³ I reviewed WCFD11’s 2004 grant, which was not awarded, in comparison with WCFD2’s 2003 grant and WCFD7’s 2004 grant which were both awarded funds. All three of these applications sought to replace old, obsolete bunker gear—the boots, helmets, coats, pants, suspenders, and gloves firefighters wear on the fire-ground.

things like technical form, audience, situation, and political backdrop. This proves extremely helpful to a bigger picture understanding of grant writing.

The Complicated Art of Successful Granting

A Senior Honors Project

By Kate Seabury

Grant funding is fast becoming a crucial source of income for a growing number of social service agencies. In the current state of our political economy, many of these social service agencies (as well as academic and other institutions) are being called upon to provide services that their existing budgets just can not support. This is the case with many fire departments.

Most citizens realize the importance of their local fire department, but many may not realize the extent of the services provided by these firefighters. A local fire department not only responds to house fires and medical emergencies, but most stations support hazmat and rescue response teams that respond to everything from high angle rescue to vehicle extrication to water rescue. Firefighters are trained at Firefighter 1, Firefighter 2, First Responder and Emergency and Medical Technician levels to provide maximum protection to the public they serve.

This means that there is a high cost to business in a fire department. Whether the station is made up of paid or volunteer firefighters, these men and women require intense, continuous training, which includes not only text and video equipment, but practice equipment as well. Scenarios often utilize complicated and expensive materials and firefighters must travel great distances to attend practice burns or emergency medical classes to practice and refine their skills. There is also the vast amount of technical,

medical, and safety equipment needed for the job. This equipment receives constant use and as such constantly requires cleaning, repair, and replacement.

All of this demands a significant amount of monetary support, something that most fire districts do not have. In Washington State (and elsewhere), fire districts are almost solely supported by taxes. After a decade of tax-restrictive initiatives, coupled with already limited tax bases, many fire districts find themselves unable to purchase the equipment necessary for their jobs. This means that safety equipment suffers. Firemen cannot respond without medical supplies but they can respond with ten-year old bunker gear—and so they do. This puts firefighters in increasing danger as their equipment ages past safety standards, increasing the threat of malfunction.

One solution to this problem has been the creation of organizations like the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Foundation that use grant funding to provide the funds to purchase new safety equipment. Since 2001, the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has allocated funds for grants to firefighters under a program called Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG). The primary focus of this program is to provide assistance directly “to fire departments and non affiliated Emergency Medical Service organizations to enhance their protection of the health and safety of the public, as well as that of their personnel.”⁴ This means funding is allocated for the purchase of equipment that aids “fire prevention and firefighter safety research and development.”

With the institution of such organizations as the AFG, the field of grant writing was created as a means of communication and decision making in the allocation of grant funds. Firefighters had a need for equipment, the Department of Homeland Security

⁴ The application, guidelines, and goals for the AFG are all available online at <http://www.firegrantsupport.com/>.

decided to provide firefighters with the equipment (as a way of supporting an activity, fire protection and medical response, that they believed important to the security of the nation), and so the AFG was formed as a way of doing this. The grant is the means by which DHS decides where and how to allocate their budgeted resources. In creating the grant as a vehicle through which to pass this support—where the grant is understood as the way for a fire department to explain their financial need and DHS to receive and respond to that need—the grant application takes on a very important role. It is the means by which information is transferred from one political body to another. It is related to the economic policy of a government institution and it has all nature of social effects on the community who is or is not funded. Better funded departments can provide a higher level of service to their community. The inequality this can create brings in all kinds of problematic ethical issues as well. Thus, there are a number of social-political, as well as economic, factors to consider in granting and these necessitate attention that is sensitive to the complicated nature of the interaction of these factors. In other words, granting is an entire complex field of technical and rhetorical writing that has consequences in political, economic, and social realms. This, by itself, is an important point that warrants further discussion. For now, though, I set it aside to be taken up in a later section.

In order to begin this discussion, however, it is valuable to ground our analysis in a specific case-study—in this case Whatcom County Fire District 11 (WCFD11, Lummi Island, Washington)—as a vehicle for analysis of the larger context of granting.

WCFD11 is a volunteer fire department providing sole first response services for all fire, rescue and medical emergencies to the isolated community of Lummi Island. Its 30 volunteers serve a public of 816 full time residents on a 16 square mile island located on the outer rim of Whatcom County, Washington. The terrain these firefighters face varies from rugged mountain on the south end of the island, to steeply banked plateau on the north end of the island. Many of the islands residences are located at grades as steep as 30-45 degrees. In addition to the residents of the island, WCFD11 firefighters are charged with the protection of Department of Natural Resource land on the island. They also provide mutual aid to adjoining districts WCFD8 and WCFD7 through a county-wide mutual aid agreement. The duties of WCFD11 firefighters include structural fire suppression, wild land fire suppression, medical first response, basic life support, advanced life support, hazmat operational level, and rescue operational level.

Like other fire departments in Washington State, WCFD11 faces severe funding challenges. As a wholly tax-supported fire protection district, WCFD11 has been seriously impacted by its extremely limited property tax base, the multiple, aforementioned tax restrictive initiatives, and the intense budget constraints. WCFD11 also has serious funding needs. WCFD11's station is over forty years old and in dire need of seismic upgrade as well as repairs to address the poor drainage and leaking roof. It not only lacks handicap accessibility but has no room for a decontamination area, a shower facility, bay area for any additional apparatus, or a usable office or storage space. Much of the station's equipment is seriously outdated. Their Self Contained Breathing

Apparatus (SCBA's) are in critical need of replacement. Without integrated Personal Alert Safety System (PASS) devices—the gauge that measures the amount of air in the air bottle—firefighters may not get an accurate reading of their air tanks. This can put them in serious danger on the fire ground. Additionally, WCFD11's bunker gear—the coats, pants, boots, helmet, hoods, gloves, and suspenders worn by their firefighters—are over a decade old and consequently obsolete in regards to all state and federal safety standards. In addition to the other items, WCFD11 needs 30 new sets of gear, to outfit all of their volunteer firefighters. With each set costing just over \$1500, the total cost is \$46,000 dollars. Approximately two thirds of WCFD11's \$114,000 budget is taken up in administrative costs, leaving less than \$38,000 to cover all other costs. Even if the department could devote all of this money to replacing all departmental turn out gear, the cost would still outstrip the annual budget by over \$8,000. Without grant funding, WCFD11 would be able to replace 1 to 2 sets a year—a piecemeal approach which barely maintains the dangerous status quo. With a grant, however, WCFD11 could outfit all of their firefighters with complete sets of turnout gear.

The situation of WCFD11 is a common one, and it is the model case for an organization to turn to a granting foundation to try to fill the budget gap. It is the kind of case that the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Foundation was created to respond to. For 2005, WCFD11 decided to submit a request for grant funding to replace thirty sets of old, obsolete turnout gear.

It may be important to note at this point, that in the previous year, 2004, WCFD11 submitted a request for funding to purchase SCBA's with integrated PASS devices to replace their dangerously out of compliant breathing apparatus. With or without funding,

their air bottles will need replacement by the end of 2005. Although, they made it to the final round of scoring, they were not funded in 2004. Examination of this unsuccessful application may be helpful in analysis of the granting field. However, before turning to a discussion of how this happened, it may be useful to give a brief explanation of the scoring process.

AFG applications are completed and judged as two sections. The first is a series of questions regarding contact information, applicant information, departmental characteristics, call volume, budget details, and request information and details. In this section, the applicant is presented with a number of choices and must check the answers that best describe their department and their request. There are also a few fill in the space answers, where the department gets a chance to give a couple sentences of explanation. In the initial scoring of the application, this portion of the grant is scanned by computer, and given scores based upon the specific priorities of the AFG, and then ranked. The highest scoring applications are considered in the competitive range and move on to Phase Two of the scoring process (Application/Workshop/Tutorial).

The second portion of the application is the narrative statement within which the department provides “details regarding (1) your project’s description and budget, (2) your organization’s financial need, (3) the benefit to be derived from the cost of your project, and (4) how the activities requested in your application will help your organization’s daily operations and how this grant will protect life and property” (Application). This is a chance for the department to make a persuasive case for their need. The narrative statements are peer-reviewed and scored in the second phase of judging.

Through a combination of scores, the applications are again ranked and funds are distributed down the list until they run out. Thus, fire departments are notified in groups throughout the rest of the next year. It was in this final group that WCFD11 received their rejection letter.

WCFD11 wrote an extremely good grant. It was well written, to the point, and did the job of explicating their need and lack of resource, and yet money was not awarded. Somewhere there was a break down in communication and their 2004 AFG application failed to do the necessary work to gain the funding. There are a number of factors that could account for this. In essence, WCFD11 failed to locate their audience and provide the appropriate discourse to explicate the problem.

—The How To—

Writing a grant application can be a very daunting task. This is especially true for a writer (or firefighter) who has never written a grant before. Although firemen know their equipment and how to fight fires, most do not know how to write a grant. Although, some fire departments hire grant writers, many times the job falls to the Fire Chief or office secretary, as it did for WCFD11. In response to this, the AFG has tried to make the application process as user-friendly as possible with online tutorials and local workshops. They even provide an on-call answering service to answer questions for AFG grant writers.

Just as the AFG has done, many other organizations and individuals have written on the “how to” of grant writing. In fact, these sorts of texts make up the bulk of the

writing on granting. These approaches treat a grant application in parts and attempt to walk the grant writer through each section. This is precisely what the AFG tutorial does. The Department of Homeland Security has an entire website, a sixty-three slide PowerPoint Presentation, and a forty-four page 2005 Program Guidance document that seeks to give firefighters every opportunity to write a successful grant. It introduces the goals and purposes of each section and then describes what sort of information should be placed in each box of the application. This approach seems practical and it makes the process less daunting for a virgin grant writer. However, following the AFG explanations and guidelines is not in itself equal to a winning grant.

In 2004, when Chief Duncan McClane set out to write WCFD11's grant application he researched the "How to" of grant writing. As I did, he consulted the AFG's online tutorial and guidelines, and attended the AFG workshop on grant writing. He then used these sources as a basis for beginning his application. They guided him to provide a discussion of his department, the nature of the need, as well as the funding limitations of his community. This led him towards a clear and well written piece of writing, but it did not lead him to a winning application.

By segmenting the application, these sorts of guides can lead a writer through writing a grant, without informing them about all the factors involved in the writing of the grant. In some sense, "how to" approaches to grant writing promise something they do not deliver. They say they will teach a grant writer "how to write a grant" but what they offer is a set of formulaic instructions not a comprehensive understanding of the granting process and application.

This creates lack of insight that can put a grant writer at a disadvantage. A grant incorporates political, economic, and social issues, all of which require a comprehensive approach. The “how to” approach runs into problems when it begins simplifying, and segmenting because it loses the ability to involve everything functioning in the grant. When the AFG guidelines instruct the grant writer to provide information on their department, they do not explain what to showcase and how to present it. Essentially, it tells you to follow the guidelines of the specific grant but it doesn’t always help you recognize what those guidelines are. The AFG funds safety equipment. This statement seems simple, but it requires a closer look. In allocating resources for the express purpose of safety, DHS is purchasing safety as if it were a good. Therefore, an AFG grant writer needs to form their text accordingly. WCFD11 is no longer buying bunker gear through DSH. Rather they are selling safety in order to obtain turn-out equipment. This buying/selling transaction introduces larger political, economic, and social issues. Just what these issues are, I will explore later, but hopefully it suffices to say that these are not accounted for within the simple framework of the “how to”

I realize that if I am going to move away from the “how to” approach in the discussion of grant writing, I must fill the void with something else. I have alluded to it above, but here I wish to make explicit that the field of rhetoric and rhetorical analysis has some valuable applications to an understanding of grant writing in terms of what functions behind the guidelines. Rhetoric, as a field of study, seeks to understand and describe the effects and inner workings of language—exactly what we want to do in understanding how to write a grant application.

One problem brought up in the “How To” section is the issue that the guidelines fail to clearly state the goals of DHS. They state their goal to provide safety, but many grant writers fail to recognize the consequence of this. DHS is going to fund the departments that best uphold their model of safety. This means the grant application has to prove something. Recognizing this and doing it, essentially depends on an understanding of audience and so I think it would be helpful to examine the idea more closely. Here it is helpful to start with the writings of Douglas Park, a professor of English at Western Washington University, whose theories on audience directly apply.

In his article, “The Meanings of ‘Audience,’” Park asserts that “the very concept of audience applied to written discourse is itself far from straightforward” (233). In practice, the familiar question is “Who or what [is] the audience for this piece?” (233), yet, according to Park, this question is insufficient for an understanding of how audience “[manifests] itself to writers writing” (233). A writer has no way of knowing their real audience. They will never meet them, converse with them, or get to know the actual person who is reading their grant. Yet, Park argues that in answering the “who or what” audience question, a “writer must, in some sense, invent an audience” (234).

This invented audience exists then within the text and both constraints the text and is constrained by it. This means that what the writer articulates and the way he/she articulates it is affected by the perception of who the audience is. In turn, the real audience is invited into the work by way of this imaginary audience member and is then shaped by that invention. In other words, a writer creates a context for his/her reader,

through the invented audience. The writer can then form the audience within the text “as they would like him to be—receptive, open-minded, concerned” (236). If this is to have an affect on the real audience, the writer must hook into the beliefs, biases, and contexts of that audience with the imaginary one. In this way, they can use there language to shape their reader’s response. To do this, Park points out that it is important to exchange the who-is-the-audience-question with a “set of more precise questions as to how the piece in question establishes or possesses the contexts that make it meaningful for readers” (237). Analyzing audience then becomes a “matter of identifying the nature of the contexts that are already given by some aspect of the occasion of publication and of understanding the relationship between those that are given and those that must be more explicitly defined within the discourse itself” (238).

Park’s discussion of audience is important to the discussion of grant writing not only because what he says applies directly to an understanding of the interaction between grant writers and grant reviewers but also because his point highlights the difference between a “how to” approach and a rhetorical approach to the analysis of grant writing. A “how to” book would certainly talk about audience. In fact, it is likely to be entirely about audience. Such instructions take a grant writer systematically through the process constantly reminding them to think about their audience. Yet, just as Park argues, the “how to” approach does not deal with the issue of “audience-as-involved-in-a-rhetorical-situation” sufficiently (235). It does not inform the grant writer that as part of audience, he/she must make assumptions about the beliefs and biases of their grant reviewer so that they can push those beliefs.

This approach to audience gets at the reality of grant writing as a persuasive exercise. Persuasion is nothing but audience centered, but in a unique way. In writing a persuasive argument you have to tap into what your audience already knows and believes and then move their beliefs and assumptions to somewhere else.

The audience for an Assistance for Firefighters Grant Application is a firefighter. As noted before, the narrative portion of the AFG applications is peer reviewed. Thus, it seems that the transfer of meaning—the “we need the money or we will not have bunker gear” persuasion piece—should be very easy to convey firefighter to firefighter. One party tells the other what they need and why they cannot fund it by themselves. That firefighter knows that fire can not be fought without bunker gear, understands the tax burden, budget constraints, etc and allocates the resources accordingly. The problem is that in this particular grant situation, it is not a simple firefighter to firefighter exchange. Rather it is a firefighter—representative of a specific fire department—firefighter—representative of federal institution—interaction. With this, the issue of audience complicates. These AFG representative firefighters are operating not only as firefighters but as reviewers for a specific institution and this organization, DHS, has created a set of guidelines and standards on which grant applications are meant to be judged. Thus, the firefighter/grant reviewer is functioning in a unique double capacity. On one side, he/she understands the issues of firemen and is utilizing personal experience to evaluate applications and on the other side, they are being constrained by the organizations set of standards. This constraint means that the grant writer has to take into account all of the biases and beliefs of DHS/AFG as well as those of the firefighter.

The DHS/AFG part can be gleaned from a deep reading of the application questions, tutorial, and guidelines. The firefighter aspect has to come from a Park-style invented audience. There are certain experiences that firefighters have and certain things that they commonly believe and assume. Part of the job of the narrative section of a grant is to break apart the assumptions that firemen hold, to make a persuasive case for the allocation of money. To explore this notion further it is helpful to turn to our case-study for an example.

In Lummi Island's case it was important to break apart the assumption that adjoining districts will provide backup. One of the greatest challenges facing WCFD11, and the reason why it is so crucial that they have dependable equipment, is the fact that WCFD11 protects an island community. This means that isolation is an inseparable factor in the department's firefighting abilities.

Although, WCFD11 holds mutual aid agreements with neighboring districts, it is virtually impossible for mutual aid to arrive in less than 45 minutes. The only vehicle access to Lummi Island is a 44-year-old 93-foot fatty with a capacity of 18 vehicles and a weight limit of 50,000 pounds. At best the ferry runs from 6:00 AM to midnight, making 1-2 trips per hour. Severe weather and tides drastically affect operation of both the vessel and docks. Additionally, the US Coast Guard requires the vessel to undergo an annual dry dock ranging from 2 to 3 weeks depending on extent of maintenance required. Age related problems may necessitate longer periods of dry dock. Last year when the hull was sandblasted it was blasted through in several spots, requiring significant repairs. A passenger only vessel operates during the dry dock period. Despite age, condition, and increased usage, Whatcom County has no plans to replace the ferry. This means that

WCFD11 is the sole response to any fire or medical emergency on Lummi Island, including Advanced Life Support response. Regardless of the small call load, WCFD11 is held to the same training standards, and must be prepared to handle every kind of emergency, without dependence on other districts.

Part of the problem, for WCFD11 in their 2004 AFG applications, was that they were not successful in reaching their audience on this isolation point. A piece of this was the organization and sentence structure of their 2004 grant application, which tended to bury important information in lengthy paragraphs. This meant that well written, vital material was lost in the quick scanning of a grant reviewer. The narrative was unable to move the grant reviewer from the belief that low call load equals low priority for funding to the conviction that the issue of isolation takes precedent over other factors in making funding decisions.

—Situation—

Attention to audience leads naturally into a discussion of situation. When examining audience, the grant writer is trying to determine the biases and assumptions of their audience. In doing this they must look at situation as a fundamental contribution to the audience's conception of things. In other words, the political climate as well as the social and professional constraints plays an important role in forming the audience's opinions. At this point, I would like to refer us to the work of Lloyd Bitzer, a rhetorical theorist whose work can help in mapping out what I mean by situation.

In his article, “The Rhetorical Situation,” Bitzer argues that rhetoric is inextricably situational. As he puts it, situation is what calls discourse “into existence” (301). In the case of granting, the situation is a need or a void that needs to be filled. Firefighters need new gear. The discourse then that is created is the grant application as a means of communication between the AFG and fire departments like WCFD11. According to Bitzer, this created discourse is so controlling, that “we should consider it the very ground of rhetorical activity” (303)—that is we should consider the occasion of grant writing the “very ground of rhetorical activity” (303). Bitzer goes on to give a useful description of rhetoric:

Rhetoric is pragmatic; it comes into existence for the sake of something beyond itself; it functions ultimately to produce action or change in the world; it performs some task. In short, rhetoric is a mode of altering reality, not by the direct application of energy to object, but by the creation of discourse which changes reality through the mediation of thought and action (302).

This description applies directly to the language used in a grant application. The condition that “invites utterance” is the fact that they are fighting fire in turnout gear, the best of which is over ten years old. The solution is essentially language created as a mediator to change, as a means to exert metaphoric force on a grant reviewer convincing him of the departments need. This puts a lot of power in the language, necessitating exact use.

Bitzer goes on to explain that discourse created by a situation is specific to that situation. There is no universal because each situation of discourse must function within the constraints of that particular case. For WCFD11 one of these constraints was the afore-discussed small call load. This constraint called a certain kind of discourse into existence—one that would answer for that problematic point.

This is the point at which firefighters, and others, run into trouble when writing a grant. Along with treating the audience as a firefighter to firefighter exchange, they also try to approach the persuasive discourse with logic alone. They try to point out that they need equipment; the AFG has money, so the trade should obviously be made. In some ways, this is the idea that the “how to” supports with its segmentation. However, there is much more to consider.

For one there is the political climate. The AFG was created post September 11th and it was formed with a purpose of protection. Thus, through the AFG the DHS is promoting a value of homeland security, of safety, and even of community. In some ways the exchange in granting is a buying and selling transaction and in light of the political and social conditions, the AFG can be read as buying values when they distribute their funding for fire safety. The value buying, then, requires an appropriate response that matches that of the situation. If the AFG is buying security values, then WCFD11 needs to sell that value.

The idea that WCFD11 must sell values brings up another interesting factor for the grant writer. As much as they need to be attentive to the constraints of audience beliefs, values, and assumptions, they also need to be aware of the situation constrains their discourse. A buying and selling image of granting brings in a new relationship to consider. Suddenly, a fire department is in the business of advertising for funding.

The need to advertise can be another source of difficulty for districts that are not used to the type of competition required to win a grant award. It can be especially problematic among firefighters who seem, by their nature, to be self-effacing and humble about what they do. These firemen have an astoundingly hard time defining the

praiseworthy and invaluable things that they do—reconfirming the benefit of an outside grant writer. However, the political situation and the competition of the grant can be problematic on much deeper grounds, when organizations that are especially needy are unable to showcase this in an effective way; thus linking back to the social.

In examining all that governs a grant, one must begin to recognize granting as a genre all its on. This is where theories of genre function become important. Calling into question some of Bitzer's analysis, writers such as Amy J. Devitt trade the stricter notion of unique discourse for a slightly weaker one. Although, this does not change the particularity of the constraints on any one granting situation, Devitt argues in her article "Generalizing about Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept" that genres develop "because they respond appropriately to situations that writers encounter repeatedly." The idea is that the same situation occurs over and over again, and similarities begin to form between appropriate responses. These similarities gain strength until the responses become conventions. This has surely happened with granting and can be seen with the AFG.

With the Assistance to Firefighters Grant, the language and applications have begun to take on a conventional form. This is especially true in Northwest Washington, where fire districts have found growing success with this particular grant. In beginning years of the Foundation, few departments were awarded, but as those numbers grew so did the swapping of application forms and information. Fire districts in the area began to share application language as well as the grant writers who wrote them. This has led to a vocabulary built around granting that seems to have been adopted by many local fire districts. Encouraged by application sharing as well as the actual work of the AFG

workshops and guidelines, firefighters have now started to talk about their gear as “old and obsolete” the exact quote from the AFG funding decisions. They also talk about compliance in terms of percentages, another form from the granting application.

What is even more interesting, however, is the way in which grant funding has altered the budgetary process of these departments (and I believe this is indicative of other social service organizations). Budgetary decisions are made based on the likelihood of funding. For instance, the AFG funds very few vehicles but very large numbers of bunker gear. Thus, fire departments across the state have allocated resources to vehicle purchase, over turn-out gear, because of AFG funding.

—Concluding Thoughts—

Writing is a tool and this is possibly nowhere more obvious than in relationship to grant funding. Yet, grant writing is so much more than a technical tool. It is an amalgamation of social, political, and economic forces and as such demands deeper analysis in an academic setting. It is an economic transaction, an act of persuasion and a relationship made through discourse. It is a model for audience theory as well as a clear application of the complexity of situation. It is also fast becoming a major budgetary source for many of our social and academic services. Interest is growing in this area and perhaps, because of this, it will soon gain the critical analysis that I believe it requires.

—Works Cited—

Assistance to Firefighters Grant Foundation. Online. <http://www.firegrantsupport.com/>.

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." Philosophy and Rhetoric. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University, 1992.

Devitt, Amy J. "Generalizing about Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept." College Composition and Communication. Vol. 44. No. 4. Dec. 1993.

Park, Douglas B. "The Meanings of 'Audience.'" College English. Vol. 44. Mar 1982.

—Appendix I—

—Narrative Statement—

THE APPLICANT:

Whatcom County Fire District 11 (WCFD11) is a volunteer fire department providing the sole first response services for all fire, rescue and medical emergencies to the isolated community of Lummi Island. The district's 30 volunteers are trained at the Firefighter 1, Firefighter 2, First Responder and Emergency Medical Technician levels.

WCFD11 serves a population of 816 full-time residents on a 16 square mile island located on the outer rim of Whatcom County, Washington about 90 miles north of Seattle and 20 miles south of the Canadian border. The service area is rural and heavily wooded. The terrain varies from rugged mountain and Department of Natural Resources land on the south end of the island, to steeply banked plateau on the north end of the island. As a result of the topography, many of the island's residences are located at grades as steep as 30 to 45 degrees.

In recent years, new residential construction has expanded on the island, with a 41% increase in population over the last 10 years. This expansion has brought with it new construction made primarily of lightweight materials that have a greater probability of early collapse, creating a greater threat to firefighter safety. Limited hydrant service creates an added burden for WCFD11 firefighters. The entire island has only three hydrants all located within 500 feet of each other.

The greatest challenge facing WCFD11 is its isolation. Although, WCFD11 holds mutual aid agreements with neighboring districts, it is virtually impossible for mutual aid to arrive in less than 45 minutes. The only vehicle access to Lummi Island is a 44-year-old, 93-foot ferry with a capacity of 18 vehicles and a weight limit of 50,000 pounds. At best, the ferry runs from 6:00 AM to midnight, making 1-2 round trips per hour. Severe weather and tides drastically affects operation of both the vessel and docks. Additionally, the U.S. Coast Guard requires the vessel to undergo an annual dry dock ranging from 2 to 3 weeks, depending on extent of maintenance required. Age related problems may necessitate longer periods of dry dock. For example, last year when the hull was sandblasted it was blasted through in several spots, requiring significant repairs. A passenger only vessel operates during the dry dock period. Despite age, condition, and increased usage, Whatcom County has no plans to replace the ferry.

WCFD11 is the sole response to any fire or medical emergency on Lummi Island, including Advanced Life Support response. Given the unreliable nature of mutual aid, combined with the prevalence of lightweight construction materials, it is imperative that WCFD11 has equipment that provides the highest level of safety for its firefighters, which in turn will provide the best protection for the public.

THE PROJECT:

Whatcom County Fire District 11 will enhance basic fire suppression capabilities and firefighter safety through the purchase of 30 complete sets of turnout gear compliant with current WAC, RCW, NFPA, and OSHA standards for personal protective equipment.

- The District will replace substandard turnout gear that has grown ragged and dangerous due to more than a decade of hard wear.
- WCFD11 has NO TURNOUT GEAR that meets current (2000) state and national standards.
- We are 100% out of compliance with basic (2004) safety standards.
- Award of this grant will enable WCFD11 to bring 100 % of our firefighters' basic personal protective equipment into compliance with current state and federal standards (WAC 296-305, WAC 296-24, WAC, 296-62, NFPA 1500, NFPA 1971, OSHA, and NIOSH).

THE BUDGET:

\$4,320.00 -- Carins 660C Metro Helmet (\$144.00 each)

\$36,240.00 -- Janesville Commando Coats and Pants (\$1,208.00 each)

\$3,480.00 -- Black Diamond Rubber Bunker Boots (\$116.00 each)

\$810.00 -- Hansen Carbon Shield Hoods (\$27.00 each)

\$1,260.00 -- Gloves (\$42.00 each)

\$46,110.00 Total (30 sets -- \$1537.00 per set)

THE BENEFITS:

On the fire ground, turnout gear is a firefighter's most basic and most vital protection. Personal protective equipment compromised by years of wear and repair puts firefighters, and the public they serve, at unacceptable risk.

None of WCFD11's turnout gear meets current (2000) state and federal standards (WAC 296-305, WAC 296-24, WAC, 296-62, NFPA 1500, NFPA 1971, OSHA, and NIOSH).

Our gear needs continual repair as it is over ten years old. Furthermore, the repeated washing, required to meet safety standard for removal of contaminants, degrades the integrity of the gear's aging fabric (NFPA 1500). Repairs are more and more difficult—and the resulting patches less and less acceptable.

WCFD11's turnout gear must be replaced for the safety of our firefighters and the public they protect. Without this grant, we will be able to replace 1 or 2 sets a year—a piecemeal approach which barely maintains the dangerous status quo. With this grant, we can outfit all of our firefighters with complete turnout sets. When volunteers selflessly contribute countless hours to train for and respond to every kind of public and private emergency, the least we can do is provide personal protective equipment that meets current state and federal safety standards.

WCFD11 volunteers are held to the same training and safety standards as larger departments and they deserve the same reliability in their equipment. WCFD11 volunteers may not be called upon to serve the public as often as firefighters in larger districts but their role is even more vital because of the isolation of the island. Ferry access is undependable and with little to no mutual aid, WCFD11 volunteers are called upon to provide the sole response to any kind of emergency within the community of Lummi Island. It is unacceptable to place WCFD11 volunteers in the line of duty with old, obsolete turnout gear.

To ensure firefighter safety, as well as to comply with Washington State statute and federal standards (WAC 296-305, WAC 296-24, WAC, 296-62, NFPA 1500, NFPA 1971, OSHA, and NIOSH) Whatcom County Fire District 11 must replace all out-dated, sub-standard turnout gear. WCFD11 firefighters will be safer and the public they serve will be better protected by responders secure in their personal safety and confident in the equipment that insures that safety.

THE FUNDING ISSUES:

Whatcom County Fire District 11 faces several severe funding challenges. As a wholly tax-supported fire protection district, WCFD11 has been seriously impacted by each of the following:

- Extremely Limited Property Tax Base
- Budget Demands
- Multiple Tax-restrictive Initiatives

WCFD11 draws funding from an extremely limited property tax base. With only 816 full-time residents, WCFD11 is unable to net enough income to fund even their basic firefighter safety needs.

Adding to the problem is the fact that WCFD11's station is over 40 years old and seriously outdated. It is in dire need of seismic upgrade as well as repairs to address the

poor drainage, and leaking roof. The current facility not only lacks handicap accessibility, but has no room for a decontamination area, a shower facility, bay area for any additional apparatus, or a usable office or storage space. In the last few years, WCFD11's very limited available capital budget has been earmarked for repairs required to update the safety of this substandard facility. This leaves little or nothing to address personal protective concerns.

As an entirely tax supported agency, WCFD11 has been impacted by more than a decade of tax-restrictive initiatives placing severe limits on the generation of revenue. Washington State law limits annual budget increases to one percent. Moreover, other initiatives to roll back property taxes are looming. Specific effects of these tax limiting measures are not fully understood, however, budget cuts of up to 25% could soon be a reality. It is generally acknowledged that these extreme tax restrictions will significantly reduce our capacity to provide adequate fire protection service to our community.

AND FINALLY...

Whatcom County Fire District 11 has a long history of progressive administration and operations, with firefighter safety paramount in any decision-making. As a result, WCFD11 firefighters have faithfully served for over forty years without a line of duty firefighter fatality or serious fire ground injury. Yet, the increasing restriction in funding options forces us to find alternatives to property tax revenue in order to equip our firefighters.

WCFD11 is not such a large fire district that our request can overwhelm a funding agency. Yet, the one-time cost of updating our old, obsolete personal protective equipment far exceeds our limited budget. In a small, isolated community with such a diverse and difficult terrain, residents depend on us as their sole emergency response. Week in and week out, WCFD11 volunteers give their time and talent. Grant funding will enable us to provide the level of safety equipment these dedicated firefighters deserve. After all, in a small community, one life is a very large number.

—Appendix II—

Entire Application

Overview

Are you a member, or are you currently involved in the management, of the fire department or non-affiliated EMS organization applying for this grant with this application?

Yes, I am a member/officer of this applicant

If you answered **No**, please **complete** the information below and press the *Save and Continue* button. If you answered **Yes**, please do **not** complete the information requested below and press the *Save and Continue* button.

Note: If you answered **No** to the above question, the fields marked with an * are required.

Preparer Information

* Preparer's Name

* Address 1

Address 2

* City

* State

* Zip

* Is there a grant-writing fee associated with the preparation of this request?

If you answered yes above, what is the fee? \$

Contact Information

Alternate Contact Information Number 1

· Title	Chief
Prefix	N/A
· First Name	Duncan
Middle Initial	C
· Last Name	McLane
· Business Phone	360-758-2411 Ext.
· Home Phone	360-758-2354 Ext.
Mobile Phone/Pager	360-739-5775
Fax	360-758-2041
· Email	chief1fd@msn.com

Alternate Contact Information Number 2

· Title	Financial Officer
Prefix	N/A
· First Name	Barbara
Middle Initial	
· Last Name	Wallace
· Business Phone	360-758-2411 Ext.
· Home Phone	360-380-1243 Ext.
Mobile Phone/Pager	360-820-1428
Fax	360-380-1243
· Email	bwallace@lummiislandfire.com

Applicant Information

EMW-2005-FG-02714

Originally submitted on 03/30/2005 by Duncan McLane (Userid: whatcom11)

Contact Information:

Address: 3809 Legoe Bay Rd
 City: Lummi Island
 State: Washington
 Zip: 98262
 Day Phone: 360-758-2411
 Evening Phone: 360-758-2354
 Cell Phone: 360-739-5775
 Email: chiefifid@msn.com

Application number is EMW-2005-FG-02714

• Organization Name	Whatcom County Fire District No. 11
• Type of Applicant	Fire District
• Type of Jurisdiction Served	County
If other, please enter the type of Jurisdiction	
• Employer Identification Number	91-6001383
• Does your organization have a DUNS Number?	Yes
If yes, please enter the DUNS Number	184983537
Headquarters Physical Address	
• Physical Address 1	3809 Legoe Bay Rd
Physical Address 2	
• City	Lummi Island
• State	Washington
• Zip	98262 - 0130
	Need help for ZIP+4?
Mailing Address	
• Mailing Address 1	P.O. Box 130
Mailing Address 2	
• City	Lummi Island
• State	Washington
• Zip	98262 - 0130
	Need help for ZIP+4?
Account Information	
• Type of bank account	Checking
• Bank routing number - 9 digit number on the bottom left hand corner of your check	125000574
• Your account number	3515003542
Additional Information	
• For this fiscal year (Federal) is your jurisdiction	

receiving Federal funding from any other grant program that may duplicate the purpose and/or scope of this grant request? No

• If awarded this grant, will your jurisdiction expend greater than \$300,000 in Federal share funds during the Federal fiscal year in which the grant was awarded? No

• Is the applicant delinquent on any federal debt? No

If you answered yes to any of the additional questions above, please provide an explanation in the space provided below:

Department Characteristics (Part I)

· Are you a member of a Federal Fire Department or contracted by the Federal government and solely responsible for suppression of fires on Federal property?	No		
· What kind of organization do you represent?	All volunteer		
If you answered combination, above, what is the percentage of career members in your organization?	%		
· What type of community does your organization serve?	Rural		
· What is the square mileage of your primary response area?	16		
· What percentage of your response area is protected by hydrants?	1 %		
· In what county/parish is your organization physically located? If you have more than one station, in what county/parish is your main station located?	Whatcom		
· Does your organization protect critical infrastructure of the state?	Yes		
· How much of your jurisdiction's land use is for agriculture, wild land, open space, or undeveloped properties?	1 %		
· What percentage of your jurisdiction's land use is for commercial, industrial, or institutional purposes?	1 %		
· What percentage of your jurisdiction's land is used for residential purposes?	98 %		
· How many commercial, industrial, residential, or institutional structures in your jurisdiction are more than four stories tall?	0		
· What is the permanent resident population of your <u>Primary/First Due Response Area or jurisdiction served?</u>	816		
· How many active firefighters does the department have who perform firefighting duties?	30		
· How many personnel provide only EMS service delivery?	2		
· How many stations are in your organization?	1		
· Do you currently report to the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS)?	Yes		
If you answered yes above, please enter your <u>FDIN/FDID</u>	37D11		
· What services does your organization provide?			
Structural Fire Suppression	Medical First Response		Hazmat Operational Level
Wildland Fire Suppression	Basic Life Support		Rescue Operational Level
	Advanced Life Support		

Department Characteristics (Part II)

• What is the total number of fire-related civilian fatalities in your jurisdiction over the last three years?	0
• What is the total number of fire-related civilian injuries in your jurisdiction over the last three years?	0
• What is the total number of line of duty member fatalities in your jurisdiction over the last three years?	0
• What is the total number of line of duty member injuries in your jurisdiction over the last three years?	0
• In an average year, how many times does your organization receive mutual/automatic aid?	1
• In an average year, how many times does your organization provide mutual/automatic aid?	0
• What was your organization's estimated average annual operating budget over the last three years?	113305
• What percentage of your annual operating budget is dedicated to personnel costs (salary, overtime and fringe benefits)?	66 %
• What percentage of your annual operating budget is derived from: Enter numbers only, percentages must sum up to 100%	
Taxes?	96 %
Grants?	2 %
Donations?	1 %
Fund drives?	1 %
Other?	0 %

If you entered a value into Other field (other than 0), please explain

•How many vehicles does your organization have in each of the categories below? Enter numbers only and enter 0 if you do not have any of the vehicles below

Total Number

Engines (or pumpers): Pumper, Pumper/Tanker, Rescue/Pumper, Foam Pumper, CAFS Pumper, Quint (Aerial device of less than 76 feet), Fire Boats (more than 13 feet long), Type I, Type II, Type III Engine, Tanker, Tender, Foam Tanker/Tender (greater than 1,200 gallon tank capacity)	2
Aerial Apparatus: Aerial Ladder Truck, Telescoping, Articulating, Ladder Towers, Platform, Tiller Ladder Truck, Quint (Aerial device of 76 feet or greater)	0
Brush/Quick attack : Brush Truck, Patrol Unit (Pick up w/ Skid Unit), Quick Attack Unit, Mini-Pumper, Type IV Engine	1
Rescue Vehicles: Rescue Squad, Rescue (Light, Medium, Heavy), Technical Rescue Vehicle, Hazardous Materials Unit	0
Other: EMS Chase Vehicle, Air/Light Unit, Rehab Units, Bomb Unit, Technical Support (Command, Operational Support/Supply), Hose Tender, Salvage Truck, ARFF (Aircraft Rescue Firefighting), Command/Mobile Communications Vehicle, Other Vehicle	1

Provide in the space below the following information only if you are applying for a vehicle:

If you have 15 emergency response vehicles or less, list all vehicles providing the type, the age, the pump capacity (GPM) if applicable, and the carrying capacity (gallons) if applicable.

If you have more than 15 emergency response vehicles, provide us with the oldest, newest, and the average age of the vehicles per type or class of vehicle.

Department Call Volume

• How many responses per year by category? (Enter whole numbers only: If you have no calls for any of the categories, enter 0)

Structural Fires	1
Vehicle Fires	0
Vegetation Fires	8
EMS Response Call	47
Rescue	1
Hazardous Condition/Materials Calls	1
Service Calls	1
Good Intent Calls/False Alarms	1
Other Calls and Incidents	0

Request Information

* 1. Select a program for which you are applying. Remember, you can only apply for one program this year. You can apply for as many activities within a program as you need.
 (If you modify your selection, you will lose data entered under the original activity.)

Program Name

Operations and Safety

* 2. Will this grant benefit more than one organization?

Yes

If you answered Yes to Question 2 above, please explain.

Award of this grant will potentially benefit seventeen fire districts and departments. Through mutual aid agreements, Whatcom County Fire District 11 firefighters are available to support all other jurisdictions in Whatcom County. Funding from this grant will enable WCFD11 to bring firefighters' personal protective equipment into 100% compliance with state and federal standards and into 100% compatibility with surrounding jurisdictions, greatly enhancing safety and interoperability on mutual aid responses.

Request Details

The activities for program Operations and Safety are listed in the table below.

Activity	Number of Entries	Total Cost	Additional Funding
Equipment	0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Modify Facilities	0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Personal Protective Equipment	5	\$ 46,110	\$ 0
Training	0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Wellness and Fitness Programs	0	\$ 0	\$ 0

Personal Protective Equipment

Personal Protective Equipment Details

*1. Select the PPE that you propose to acquire

Helmets

Please provide further description of the item selected above or if you selected other above, please specify.

Cairns 660C Metro Helmet. NFPA-Approved, Durable Fiberglass Composite.

*2. Number of units

30 (Whole numbers only)

*3. Cost per unit

\$144 (Whole dollar amounts only)

*4. What percentage of your on-duty active members has PPE that meets current applicable NFPA and OSHA standards in effect at the time of application? If you are asking for specialized equipment (e.g., HazMat), what percentage of applicable members have this specialized PPE that meets the established standards?

0%

*5. What percentage of your on-duty active members will have PPE that meets current applicable NFPA and OSHA standards if this grant is awarded? If you are asking for specialized equipment (e.g., HazMat), what percentage of applicable members will have

100%

specialized PPE that meets established standards if this grant is awarded?

*6. What is the purpose of this request? to replace old/obsolete equipment

If you have indicated you are replacing equipment (for any reason) in question 6 above, please specify the age of the equipment in years. More than 10 years

*7. If purchasing a PASS device, what type of PASS device will you be purchasing? Not applicable [Help](#)

*8. Is this PPE : For protection use against fire

*If you selected Other above, please specify.

Personal Protective Equipment

Personal Protective Equipment Details

*1. Select the PPE that you propose to acquire Coats & Pants

Please provide further description of the item selected above or if you selected other above, please specify. Washington State Bid. Janesville Commando Coat and Pants, Gold PBI Outershell, Nomex/Kevlar Thermal Liner, Glide Facecloth, Gore/Teflon Breathable Moisture Barrier. Freedom Design Underarms, Elbows, Knee & Crouch. Kevlar AraShield reinforced Cuffs and Knees. Foam Padding in Knees and Cuffs. 3" Scotchlite triple trim. Coats have 6" x 10" x 2" Pockets with Kevlar Twill Reinforcement, and Radio Pocket. Pants to have 8" x 8" x 2" Pockets with Kevlar Twill Reinforcement. Wright Heavy Suspenders

*2. Number of units 30 (Whole numbers only)

*3. Cost per unit \$1208 (Whole dollar amounts only)

*4. What percentage of your on-duty active members has PPE that meets current applicable NFPA and OSHA standards in effect at the time of application? If you are asking for specialized equipment (e.g., HazMat), what percentage of applicable members have this specialized PPE that meets the established standards? 0%

*5. What percentage of your on-duty active members will have PPE that meets current applicable NFPA and OSHA standards if this grant is awarded? If you are asking for specialized equipment (e.g., HazMat), what percentage of applicable members will have specialized PPE that meets established standards if this grant is awarded? 100%

*6. What is the purpose of this request? to replace old/obsolete equipment

If you have indicated you are replacing equipment (for any reason) in question 6 above, please specify the age of the equipment in years. More than 10 years

*7. If purchasing a PASS device, what type of PASS device will Not applicable [Help](#)

you be purchasing?

*8 . Is this PPE : For protection use against fire

*If you selected Other above, please specify.

Personal Protective Equipment

Personal Protective Equipment Details

*1. Select the PPE that you propose to acquire Boots
 Please provide further description of the item selected above or if you selected other above, please specify. NFPA-Approved Black Diamond #690-9301 Rubber Bunker Boots
 *2. Number of units 30 (Whole numbers only)
 *3. Cost per unit \$116 (Whole dollar amounts only)
 *4. What percentage of your on-duty active members has PPE that meets current applicable NFPA and OSHA standards in effect at the time of application? If you are asking for specialized equipment (e.g., HazMat), what percentage of applicable members have this specialized PPE that meets the established standards? 0%
 *5. What percentage of your on-duty active members will have PPE that meets current applicable NFPA and OSHA standards if this grant is awarded? If you are asking for specialized equipment (e.g., HazMat), what percentage of applicable members will have specialized PPE that meets established standards if this grant is awarded? 100%
 *6. What is the purpose of this request? to replace old/obsolete equipment
 If you have indicated you are replacing equipment (for any reason) in question 6 above, please specify the age of the equipment in years. More than 10 years
 *7. If purchasing a PASS device, what type of PASS device will you be purchasing? Not applicable [Help](#)
 *8 . Is this PPE : For protection use against fire
 *If you selected Other above, please specify.

Personal Protective Equipment

Personal Protective Equipment Details

*1. Select the PPE that you propose to acquire Hoods
 Please provide further description of the item selected above or if you selected other above, please specify. Hansen Carbon Shield NFPA Fire Hood
 *2. Number of units 30 (Whole numbers only)
 *3. Cost per unit \$27 (Whole dollar amounts only)

- *4. What percentage of your on-duty active members has PPE that meets current applicable NFPA and OSHA standards in effect at the time of application? If you are asking for specialized equipment (e.g., HazMat), what percentage of applicable members have this specialized PPE that meets the established standards? 0%
- *5. What percentage of your on-duty active members will have PPE that meets current applicable NFPA and OSHA standards if this grant is awarded? If you are asking for specialized equipment (e.g., HazMat), what percentage of applicable members will have specialized PPE that meets established standards if this grant is awarded? 100%
- *6. What is the purpose of this request? to replace old/obsolete equipment
- If you have indicated you are replacing equipment (for any reason) in question 6 above, please specify the age of the equipment in years. More than 10 years
- *7. If purchasing a PASS device, what type of PASS device will you be purchasing? Not applicable [Help](#)
- *8. Is this PPE : For protection use against fire
- *If you selected Other above, please specify.

Personal Protective Equipment

Personal Protective Equipment Details

- *1. Select the PPE that you propose to acquire Gloves
- Please provide further description of the item selected above or if you selected other above, please specify.
- *2. Number of units 30 (Whole numbers only)
- *3. Cost per unit \$42 (Whole dollar amounts only)
- *4. What percentage of your on-duty active members has PPE that meets current applicable NFPA and OSHA standards in effect at the time of application? If you are asking for specialized equipment (e.g., HazMat), what percentage of applicable members have this specialized PPE that meets the established standards? 0%
- *5. What percentage of your on-duty active members will have PPE that meets current applicable NFPA and OSHA standards if this grant is awarded? If you are asking for specialized equipment (e.g., HazMat), what percentage of applicable members will have specialized PPE that meets established standards if this grant is awarded? 100%
- *6. What is the purpose of this request? to replace old/obsolete equipment
- If you have indicated you are replacing equipment (for any reason) in question 6 above, please specify the age of the equipment in years. More than 10 years
- *7. If purchasing a PASS device, what type of PASS device will you be purchasing? Not applicable [Help](#)

*8 . Is this PPE :

For protection use against fire

*If you selected Other above, please specify.

Budget

Budget Object Class

a. Personnel	\$ 0
b. Fringe Benefits	\$ 0
c. Travel	\$ 0
d. Equipment	\$ 46,110
e. Supplies	\$ 0
f. Contractual	\$ 0
g. Construction	\$ 0
h. Other	\$ 0
i. Indirect Charges	\$ 0
Federal and Applicant Share	
Federal Share	\$ 43,805
Applicant Share	\$ 2,305
Federal Rate Sharing (%)	95/5
* <u>Non-Federal Resources</u> <i>(The combined Non-Federal Resources must equal the Applicant Share of \$ 2,305)</i>	
a. Applicant	\$ 2,305
b. State	\$ 0
c. Local	\$ 0
d. Other Sources	\$ 0

If you entered a value in Other Sources, include your explanation below. You can use this space to provide information on the project, cost share match, or if you have a indirect cost agreement with a federal agency.

Total Budget **\$ 46,110**

Narrative Statement

Project Description

* Please provide your narrative statement in the space provided below. Include in your narrative, details regarding (1) your project's description and budget, (2) your organization's financial need, (3) the benefit to be derived from the cost of your project, and (4) how the activities requested in your application will help your organization's daily operations and how this grant will protect life and property.

THE APPLICANT:

Whatcom County Fire District 11 (WCFD11) is a volunteer fire department providing the sole first response services for all fire, rescue and medical emergencies to the isolated community of Lummi Island. The district's 30 volunteers are trained at the Firefighter 1, Firefighter 2, First Responder and Emergency Medical Technician levels.

WCFD11 serves a population of 816 full-time residents on a 16 square mile island located on the outer rim of Whatcom County, Washington about 90 miles north of Seattle and 20 miles south of the Canadian border. The service area is rural and heavily wooded. The terrain varies from rugged mountain and Department of Natural Resources land on the south end of the island, to steeply banked plateau on the north end of the island. As a result of the topography, many of the island's residences are located at grades as steep as 30 to 45 degrees.

In recent years, new residential construction has expanded on the island, with a 41% increase in population over the last 10 years. This expansion has brought with it new construction made primarily of lightweight materials that have a greater probability of early collapse, creating a greater threat to firefighter safety. Limited hydrant service creates an added burden for WCFD11 firefighters. The entire island has only three hydrants all located within 500 feet of each other.

The greatest challenge facing WCFD11 is its isolation. Although, WCFD11 holds mutual aid agreements with neighboring districts, it is virtually impossible for mutual aid to arrive in less than 45 minutes. The only vehicle access to Lummi Island is a 44-year-old, 93-foot ferry with a capacity of 18 vehicles and a weight limit of 50,000 pounds. At best, the ferry runs from 6:00 AM to midnight, making 1-2 round trips per hour. Severe weather and tides drastically affects operation of both the vessel and docks. Additionally, the U.S. Coast Guard requires the vessel to undergo an annual dry dock ranging from 2 to 3 weeks, depending on extent of maintenance required. Age related problems may necessitate longer periods of dry dock. For example, last year when the hull was sandblasted it was blasted through in several spots, requiring significant repairs. A passenger only vessel operates during the dry dock period. Despite age, condition, and increased usage, Whatcom County has no plans to replace the ferry.

WCFD11 is the sole response to any fire or medical emergency on Lummi Island, including Advanced Life Support response. Given the unreliable nature of mutual aid, combined with the prevalence of lightweight construction materials, it is imperative that WCFD11 has equipment that provides the highest level of safety for its firefighters, which in turn will provide the best protection for the public.

THE PROJECT:

Whatcom County Fire District 11 will enhance basic fire suppression capabilities and firefighter safety through the purchase of 30 complete sets of turnout gear compliant with current WAC, RCW, NFPA, and OSHA standards for personal protective equipment.

- The District will replace substandard turnout gear that has grown ragged and dangerous due to more than a decade of hard wear.
- WCFD11 has NO TURNOUT GEAR that meets current (2000) state and national standards.
- We are 100% out of compliance with basic (2004) safety standards.
- Award of this grant will enable WCFD11 to bring 100 % of our firefighters' basic personal protective equipment into compliance with current state and federal standards (WAC 296-305, WAC 296-24, WAC, 296-62, NFPA

1500, NFPA 1971, OSHA, and NIOSH).

THE BUDGET:

\$4,320.00 -- Carins 660C Metro Helmet (\$144.00 each)

\$36,240.00 -- Janesville Commando Coats and Pants (\$1,208.00 each)

\$3,480.00 -- Black Diamond Rubber Bunker Boots (\$116.00 each)

\$810.00 -- Hansen Carbon Shield Hoods (\$27.00 each)

\$1,260.00 -- Gloves (\$42.00 each)

\$46,110.00 Total (30 sets -- \$1537.00 per set)

THE BENEFITS:

On the fire ground, turnout gear is a firefighter's most basic and most vital protection. Personal protective equipment compromised by years of wear and repair puts firefighters, and the public they serve, at unacceptable risk.

None of WCFD11's turnout gear meets current (2000) state and federal standards (WAC 296-305, WAC 296-24, WAC, 296-62, NFPA 1500, NFPA 1971, OSHA, and NIOSH). Our gear needs continual repair as it is over ten years old. Furthermore, the repeated washing, required to meet safety standard for removal of contaminants, degrades the integrity of the gear's aging fabric (NFPA 1500). Repairs are more and more difficult—and the resulting patches less and less acceptable.

WCFD11's turnout gear must be replaced for the safety of our firefighters and the public they protect. Without this grant, we will be able to replace 1 or 2 sets a year—a piecemeal approach which barely maintains the dangerous status quo. With this grant, we can outfit all of our firefighters with complete turnout sets. When volunteers selflessly contribute countless hours to train for and respond to every kind of public and private emergency, the least we can do is provide personal protective equipment that meets current state and federal safety standards.

WCFD11 volunteers are held to the same training and safety standards as larger departments and they deserve the same reliability in their equipment. WCFD11 volunteers may not be called upon to serve the public as often as firefighters in larger districts but their role is even more vital because of the isolation of the island. Ferry access is undependable and with little to no mutual aid, WCFD11 volunteers are called upon to provide the sole response to any kind of emergency within the community of Lummi Island. It is unacceptable to place WCFD11 volunteers in the line of duty with old, obsolete turnout gear.

To ensure firefighter safety, as well as to comply with Washington State statute and federal standards (WAC 296-305, WAC 296-24, WAC, 296-62, NFPA 1500, NFPA 1971, OSHA, and NIOSH) Whatcom County Fire District 11 must replace all out-dated, sub-standard turnout gear. WCFD11 firefighters will be safer and the public they serve will be better protected by responders secure in their personal safety and confident in the equipment that insures that safety.

THE FUNDING ISSUES:

Whatcom County Fire District 11 faces several severe funding challenges. As a wholly tax-supported fire protection district, WCFD11 has been seriously impacted by each of the following:

- Extremely Limited Property Tax Base
- Budget Demands
- Multiple Tax-restrictive Initiatives

WCFD11 draws funding from an extremely limited property tax base. With only 816 full-time residents, WCFD11 is unable to net enough income to fund even their basic firefighter safety needs.

Adding to the problem is the fact that WCFD11's station is over 40 years old and seriously outdated. It is in dire need of seismic upgrade as well as repairs to address the poor drainage, and leaking roof. The current facility not only lacks handicap accessibility, but has no room for a decontamination area, a shower facility, bay area for any additional apparatus, or a usable office or storage space. In the last few years, WCFD11's very limited available capital budget has been earmarked for repairs required to update the safety of this substandard facility. This leaves little or nothing to address personal protective concerns.

As an entirely tax supported agency, WCFD11 has been impacted by more than a decade of tax-restrictive initiatives placing severe limits on the generation of revenue. Washington State law limits annual budget increases to one percent. Moreover, other initiatives to roll back property taxes are looming. Specific effects of these tax limiting measures are not fully understood, however, budget cuts of up to 25% could soon be a reality. It is generally acknowledged that these extreme tax restrictions will significantly reduce our capacity to provide adequate fire protection service to our community.

AND FINALLY...

Whatcom County Fire District 11 has a long history of progressive administration and operations, with firefighter safety paramount in any decision-making. As a result, WCFD11 firefighters have faithfully served for over forty years without a line of duty firefighter fatality or serious fire ground injury. Yet, the increasing restriction in funding options forces us to find alternatives to property tax revenue in order to equip our firefighters.

WCFD11 is not such a large fire district that our request can overwhelm a funding agency. Yet, the one-time cost of updating our old, obsolete personal protective equipment far exceeds our limited budget. In a small, isolated community with such a diverse and difficult terrain, residents depend on us as their sole emergency response. Week in and week out, WCFD11 volunteers give their time and talent. Grant funding will enable us to provide the level of safety equipment these dedicated firefighters deserve. After all, in a small community, one life is a very large number.

* Please describe any grants that you currently have with DHS including the AFG, for example, 2002 AFG grant for vehicle or 2003 ODP grant for exercises. (Enter "N/A" if Not Applicable)

N/A

Assurances and Certifications

Form 20-16A

You must read and sign these assurances by providing your password and checking the box at the bottom of this page.

Note: Fields marked with an * are required.

Assurances Non-Construction Programs

Note: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have any questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States, and if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal gain.
4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. Section 4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the nineteen statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. Sections 1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. Section 794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. Sections 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) Sections 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. 290-dd-3 and 290-ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Acts of 1968 (42 U.S.C. Section 3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Title II and III of the Uniform

Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or Federally assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interest in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.

8. Will comply with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. Sections 1501-1508 and 7324-7328), which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. Sections 276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. Section 276c and 18 U.S.C. Sections 874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. Sections 327-333), regarding labor standards for Federally assisted construction sub agreements.
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in flood plains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. Section 1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. Section 7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, (P.L. 93-523); and (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (P.L. 93-205).
12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. Section 1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 469a-1 et seq.).
14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.
15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.
16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. Section 4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act of 1984.
18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations and policies governing this program.
19. It will comply with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. 201), as they apply to employees of institutions of higher education, hospitals, and other non-profit organizations.

Signed by **Duncan McLane** on 03/16/2005

Form 20-16C

You must read and sign these assurances by providing your password and checking the box at the bottom of this page.

Note: Fields marked with an * are required.

Certifications Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements.

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature on this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 44 CFR Part 18, "New Restrictions on Lobbying; and 28 CFR Part 17, "Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Non-procurement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)." The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. Lobbying

A. As required by the section 1352, Title 31 of the US Code, and implemented at 44 CFR Part 18 for persons (entering) into a grant or cooperative agreement over \$100,000, as defined at 44CFR Part 18, the applicant certifies that:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid by or on behalf of the undersigned to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement and extension, continuation, renewal amendment or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement.

(b) If any other funds than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities", in accordance with its instructions.

(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all the sub awards at all tiers (including sub grants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements and sub contract(s)) and that all sub recipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

2. Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters (Direct Recipient)

A. As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 44CFR Part 67, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 44 CFR Part 17, Section 17.510-A, the applicant certifies that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, sentenced to a denial of Federal benefits by a State or Federal court, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency.

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civilian judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain or perform a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property.

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a government entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of

this certification: and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

3. Drug-Free Workplace (Grantees other than individuals)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 44CFR Part 17, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 44 CFR part 17, Sections 17.615 and 17.620:

(A) The applicant certifies that it will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug free awareness program to inform employees about:

- (1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;
- (2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;
- (3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation and employee assistance programs; and
- (4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant to be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:

- (1) Abide by the terms of the statement and
- (2) Notify the employee in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction.

(e) Notifying the agency, in writing within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to the applicable DHS awarding office, i.e. regional office or DHS office.

(f) Taking one of the following actions, against such an employee, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:

- (1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or
- (2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement or other appropriate agency.

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

(8) The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance

Street	City	State	Zip	Action
--------	------	-------	-----	--------

If your place of performance is different from the physical address provided by you in the Applicant Information, press *Add Place of Performance* button above to ensure that the correct place of performance has been specified. You can add multiple addresses by repeating this process multiple times.

Section 17.630 of the regulations provide that a grantee that is a State may elect to make one certification in each Federal fiscal year. A copy of which should be included with each application for DHS funding. States and State agencies may elect to use a Statewide certification.

Signed by **Duncan McLane** on 03/16/2005

FEMA Standard Form LLL

Only complete if applying for a grant for more than \$100,000 and have lobbying activities. See Form 20-16C for lobbying activities definition.

This form is not applicable