OMB No. 1121-0329
Approval Expires 07/31/2016

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Assistance

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) is seeking applications for 1) a technical assistance provider to work with BJA to oversee, coordinate, and assess the initiative, and 2) grants to local Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI) sites. This program furthers the Department's mission by helping state and local governments to analyze criminal justice system data, develop and implement policy options, and allocate scarce resources effectively while improving public safety and enhancing jurisdictions' capacity to make data-driven policy decisions.

Justice Reinvestment Initiative: Assessment Technical Assistance and Maximizing Local Reforms FY 2015 Competitive Grant Announcement

Eligibility

This solicitation has two categories.

Category 1: Eligible applicants are limited to national-scope private and non-profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organizations) and colleges and universities, both public and private (including tribal institutions of higher education). For-profit organizations must agree to forgo any profit or management fee.

For Category 1, BJA welcomes applications that involve two or more entities; however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the others must be proposed as subrecipients. The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for administering the funding and managing the entire project. Only one application per lead applicant will be considered; however, subrecipients may be part of multiple proposals.

Category 2: Eligible applicants are limited to local jurisdictions that participated in the federal Justice Reinvestment Initiative at the Local Level:

1. Alachua County, Florida
2. Allegheny County, Pennsylvania
3. Charlottesville/Albemarle County, Virginia
4. Delaware County, Ohio
5. Denver City and County, Colorado
6. Grant County, Indiana
7. Eau Claire County, Wisconsin
8. Johnson County, Kansas
9. Lane County, Oregon
10. Mecklenburg County, North Carolina
11. Milwaukee County, Wisconsin
12. New York City, New York
13. San Francisco City and County, California
14. Santa Cruz County, California
15. Travis County, Texas
16. Yamhill County, Oregon
17. Yolo County, California

BJA may elect to make awards for applications submitted under this solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

For additional eligibility information, see Section C. Eligibility Information.

Deadline

Applicants must register with Grants.gov prior to submitting an application. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 19, 2015.

All applicants are encouraged to read this **Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov.**

For additional information, see How To Apply in section D. Application and Submission Information.

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035, or via e-mail to support@grants.gov. The Grants.gov Support Hotline hours of operation are 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays.

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must e-mail the BJA contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. Additional information on reporting technical issues is found under "Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues" in the How To Apply section.

For assistance with any other requirement of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 1-800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email responsecenter@ncjrs.gov; fax to 301-240-5830; or web chat at https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp. The NCJRS Response Center hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday and 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. eastern time on the solicitation close date.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: BJA-2015-4152

Release date: March 31, 2015

Contents

A. Program Description 4
Overview 4
Program-Specific Information 5
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables 5
Mandatory Consideration 8
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices 8
B. Federal Award Information 9
Type of Award 9
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls 9
Budget Information 10
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement 10
Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals 11
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver 12
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs 12
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable) 12
C. Eligibility Information 12
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement. 13
Limit on Number of Application Submissions 13
D. Application and Submission Information 13
What an Application Should Include 13
How To Apply 21
E. Application Review Information 24
Selection Criteria 24
Review Process 27
F. Federal Award Administration Information 28
Federal Award Notices 28
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements 28
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements 29
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s) 30
H. Other Information 30
Provide Feedback to OJP 30
Application Checklist 31

Justice Reinvestment Initiative: Assessment Technical Assistance and Maximizing Local Reforms
CFDA #16.827

A. Program Description

Overview

Approximately 2.2 million people were incarcerated in federal, state, and local prisons and jails in 2013, a rate of 1 out of every 110 adults.[1] After three years of declines, the prison population increased slightly in 2013, largely due to growth in state prison populations. These prisons face crowding and resource challenges. Accordingly, state spending on corrections has remained high. Over the last 25 years, state corrections expenditures have increased significantly—from $12 billion in 1988 to more than $55 billion in 2013.[2]

Similar trends are evident on the local level. The local jail population declined by 13,300 from 2012 to 2013, a decrease of 1.8 percent;[3] however, the trend over time indicates an increase in jail use. From 2000 to 2013, the nation's jail population increased by nearly 18 percent. As a result, many jails remain overcrowded yet lack resources dedicated to treatment or programming. Local expenditures on building and operating jails increased nearly 235 percent from 1982 to 2011, a figure that likely underrepresents local investments because it may not include costs such as employee pensions, inmate health care, and other costs outside corrections budgets.[4] The returns on these investments in local jails are disheartening. Pretrial detention, even for short periods, has been found to correlate with reduced public safety and worse case outcomes.[5] Additionally, when a small fraction of people consume a disproportionately large share of jail resources due to mental health problems, substance addiction, and homelessness—as is the case for several local JRI sites and other jail systems studied recently—local justice systems are not achieving the public safety outcomes that their communities expect.

Justice reinvestment emerged as a way to address these issues, both at the state and local level, through a targeted, data-driven policymaking process. BJA, in a public/private partnership with The Pew Charitable Trusts, launched the Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI) in 2010 as a multistaged process in which a jurisdiction increases the cost-effectiveness of its criminal justice system by investing in high-performing public safety strategies.

JRI is a public-private partnership between BJA, the Pew Charitable Trusts, and JRI technical assistance (TA) and assessment providers. Justice Reinvestment at the local level is funded

[1] Bureau of Justice Statistics, Correctional Populations in the United States, 2013 (Dec. 2014), www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cpus13.pdf.
[2] National Association of State Budget Officers, State Expenditure Report: Examining Fiscal 2012-2014 State Spending (2014), www.nasbo.org/sites/default/files/State%20Expenditure%20Report%20%28Fiscal%202012-2014%29S.pdf.
[3] Ibid.; Bureau of Justice Statistics, Correctional Populations in the United States, 2013 (Dec. 2014), www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cpus13.pdf.
[4] Ram Subramanian et al. Incarceration's Front Door: The Misuse of Jail in America. New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice, 2015, www.vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/incarcerations-front-door-report.pdf.
[5] Christopher T. Lowenkamp et al., Investigating the Impact of Pretrial Detention on Sentencing Outcomes (Laura and John Arnold Foundation, 2013).

solely by BJA. Funding from BJA is authorized under the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, Pub. L. 113-235.

Program-Specific Information
Under the JRI model, a multidisciplinary governmental working group analyzes the correctional population and its costs, develops cost-effective policy options, and implements reforms to manage correctional populations while enhancing public safety. JRI jurisdictions reinvest these cost savings into high-performing initiatives that make communities safer. In addition to reducing incarcerated populations, justice reinvestment encourages states to embrace a culture of greater collaboration, data-driven decisionmaking, and increased use of evidence-based practices.

"Justice reinvestment'' refers to a data-driven approach that: (1) analyzes criminal justice trends to understand what factors are driving the growth in jail and prison populations; (2) develops and implements policy options to manage the growth in corrections expenditures and increase the effectiveness of current spending and investment to increase public safety and improve offender accountability; and (3) measures the impact of the policy changes and reinvestment resources and holds policymakers accountable for projected results.

The JRI Model consists of the following action steps:[6]

1. Engagement of stakeholders across branches of government, political parties, and key groups such as victim advocates, prosecutors, etc.
2. Analysis of data to identify criminal justice population and cost drivers.
3. Development of policy framework that can lead to enacted JRI legislation at the state level, or to strategy implementation at the local level.
4. Implementation of JRI legislation through high-performing programs and strategies to reduce incarceration costs and increase public safety.
5. Support sustainability through measurement of implementation of JRI strategy and reinvestment.

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables
The goals of JRI are as follows:

- Identify drivers of corrections populations and costs.
- Prevent unnecessary confinement and reduce recidivism.
- Improve allocation of resources to yield more cost-beneficial impacts on public safety.

Category 1: Program Oversight, Coordination, and Outcome Assessment (OCOA). Competition ID: BJA-2015-4153
BJA seeks an entity to provide program oversight, coordination, and outcome assessment. The successful OCOA provider will be expected to:

- Assist BJA in overall coordination and assessment of the JRI.
- Provide logistical support for a Justice Reinvestment Steering Committee composed of funding partners and technical assistance (TA) providers.

[6] For a fuller discussion of the model and action steps, see the competitive grant announcement for Justice Reinvestment Initiative: State-Level Technical Assistance.

- Provide technical assistance, in conjunction with BJA, to TA providers to ensure adherence to the fidelity and basic principles of the justice reinvestment model.
- Review recommendations and assessments from TA providers regarding candidate jurisdictions' readiness for JRI.
- Document and assess JRI activities and outcomes, to include: state- and local-level justice reinvestment efforts and technical assistance; JRI subaward grants made by TA providers to seed jurisdictions' implementation of key strategies and programs that advance the JRI goals and priorities; grant activities awarded through Category 2 of this solicitation; JRI Maximizing State Reforms grantees; and juvenile justice system reform funded through JRI appropriations and administered by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Based on these assessment activities, produce the following deliverables:
    - Prepare the second state assessment report,[7] to include information concerning: (1) the number and identity of states who have received JRI assistance; (2) the progress of the states in conducting analyses, developing policies/strategies/programs, and in implementing criminal justice reinvestment strategies; and (3) the reporting of relevant data from states implementing Justice Reinvestment policies/strategies/ programs including relevant criminal justice outcome measures, reductions in population or growth rates; the savings accrued and costs averted; the portion of costs saved or averted that has been or will be invested in high-performing strategies.[8]
    - Draft other publications on topics of relevance for state and local policymakers, including a follow-up brief or report on the experiences of JRI local sites.[9]
    - Develop and update content for the BJA JRI website.
    - Interim documentation of assessment activities, for example, site visit assessment memoranda; and synthesis of 1) monthly reports from providers documenting TA activities by site and 2) data tracking implementation performance and outcomes.
    - Develop and maintain up to date statistics and presentations demonstrating progress of JRI.
    - Up to four assessments of policies enacted or implemented as a result of justice reinvestment efforts.[10]
- Make ongoing recommendations to BJA on relevant criminal justice research and ways to continue to improve the effectiveness of JRI, including advice and assistance to BJA in synthesizing site-specific system indicators and implementation performance measures, and identifying standard measures for like strategies.

BJA's role with respect to the OCOA provider includes the following activities:

- Reviewing and approving major work plans, including changes to such plans, and key decisions pertaining to project operations.
- Reviewing and approving major project-generated documents and materials used in the provision of project services.

---

[7] The report envisioned would update and expand on the 2014 Justice Reinvestment Initiative State Assessment Report.

[8] Such strategies include, for example, pretrial programs, pre- and post-plea diversion programs; substance abuse and mental health treatment programs; programs that address criminogenic needs; case management services; swift, certain, and fair sanctions for individuals under community supervision; and other programs that successfully reduce technical violations and recidivism.

[9] The brief would update the 2014 The Justice Reinvestment Initiative: Experiences from the Local Sites.

[10] Examples of such assessments include Mandatory Reentry Supervision: Evaluating the Kentucky Experience, and Reducing Incarceration for Technical Violations in Louisiana.

- Providing guidance in significant project planning meetings and participating in project sponsored training events or conferences.
- Reviewing and approving any proposed publications prior to release or publication.

The role of the Pew Charitable Trusts' Public Safety Performance Project with respect to JRI includes the following activities:

- Providing co-leadership, input, and guidance on the full range of state-level JRI activities and related matters.
- Providing technical assistance to select states to analyze data and develop policies, which, upon enactment of JRI policies, become eligible to apply for and receive implementation and sustainability assistance from a BJA-funded technical assistance provider.
- Educating and engaging state and local government officials and the media in select JRI sites to help support informed decisionmaking around JRI policies.

Category 2: Maximizing Local Reforms. Competition ID: BJA-2015-4154

The FY 2015 Justice Reinvestment Initiative: Maximizing Local Reforms challenges local jurisdictions to cross the finish line with local JRI. Since 2010, BJA has supported implementation of the justice reinvestment model at the local level in 17 jurisdictions. A recent brief by the Urban Institute, *The Justice Reinvestment Initiative: Experiences from the Local Sites*, reported that, across these jurisdictions, systemwide data analyses found similar factors contributing to local corrections populations and costs: large numbers of defendants detained pretrial; delays in case processing; frequent jail users (including individuals with mental illness and who are homeless); low-level drug, alcohol, and traffic offenses; and probation and parole violations and high recidivism rates. The policy response to these issues also overlapped, including improving risk assessment tools; expanding jail diversion and alternative-to-jail programs; streamlining case processing; increasing access to reentry services and treatment; and building data capacity and implementing evidence-based practices, such as intermediate sanctions and problem-solving courts.

At present, the JRI local sites are at various stages of implementation. The Urban Institute's publication documents the experiences of the local sites and highlights the significant changes that are underway and the promise of the work that remains to be done. This solicitation aims to support sites that have followed the justice reinvestment model, described above, with fidelity, as well as to build the evidence base for strategies that allow local jurisdictions to reduce their jail populations and increase public safety.

BJA expects that the JRI governmental working group will designate an agency to act as the legal applicant for this grant program. The working group should determine the most appropriate focus for this project and the most suitable applicant and partners. BJA expects that applicants will document support by the local JRI governmental working group through a letter attached to the application (see Additional Attachments on page 18).

Allowable Uses for Award Funding

Funds can be used to support one or more of the justice reinvestment strategies adopted by the local governmental working group. Some examples include:

- **Pre- and post-plea diversion programs to improve outcomes and reduce jail use**. Applicants may use grant funding to continue building or to expand programs that divert individuals from jail and address criminogenic needs. These diversion programs may

target specific subpopulations, offense types, or criminogenic needs as indicated by research on effective interventions and the JRI data analysis.

- **Pretrial program to improve pretrial decisionmaking.** Applicants may use grant funding to strengthen pretrial programs to reduce the jail population held pending trial and increase pretrial release using the least restrictive release conditions necessary to promote public safety and ensure defendants' return to court. Applicants could propose to build a continuum of options to address the range of risk and needs presented by individuals at this stage in the criminal justice process.

- **Jail-based interventions.** Applicants may use grant funds to provide or facilitate effective in-jail treatment or programming and re-entry services to address inmates' needs.

- **Evidence-based supervision practices to reduce recidivism**. Applicants may use grant funds to continue work to improve adherence to evidence-based supervision, including risk-based supervision, implementing more effective responses to supervision violations and compliance (e.g., positive reinforcements and early termination), and quality assurance measures such as fidelity monitoring and coaching.

- **Frequent front-end users.** Applicants may use funds for evidence-based behavioral health and treatment interventions and other supports to address the special needs of persons with mental illness and/or substance use disorders who are frequent users of the criminal justice system.

- **Evaluation.** Funds may also be used to support an evaluation of one or more of the applicant site's justice reinvestment strategies.

For all strategies that incorporate treatment, applicants are encouraged to leverage opportunities to expand health insurance coverage and expand access and utilization of primary and behavioral healthcare treatment.

Mandatory Consideration
Through this program, BJA aims to add to the evidence base on what works to reduce jail populations and improve public safety. Therefore, it is mandatory that applicants demonstrate that they have already engaged in evaluation efforts to assess efficacy of the strategies they have implemented, or that they propose to use grant or matching funds to conduct such an evaluation. See Selection Criteria on page 24.

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices
OJP strongly emphasizes the use of data and evidence in policy making and program development in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services. OJP is committed to:

- Improving the quantity and quality of evidence OJP generates
- integrating evidence into program, practice, and policy decisions within OJP and the field
- Improving the translation of evidence into practice.

OJP considers programs and practices to be evidence-based when their effectiveness has been demonstrated by causal evidence, generally obtained through one or more outcome evaluations. Causal evidence documents a relationship between an activity or intervention

(including technology) and its intended outcome, including measuring the direction and size of a change, and the extent to which a change may be attributed to the activity or intervention. Causal evidence depends on the use of scientific methods to rule out, to the extent possible, alternative explanations for the documented change. The strength of causal evidence, based on the factors described above, will influence the degree to which OJP considers a program or practice to be evidence-based. The OJP CrimeSolutions.gov web site is one resource that applicants may use to find information about evidence-based programs in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services.

B. Federal Award Information

Category 1: BJA expects to make one award of up to $2,560,000 for a 36-month project period, beginning on October 1, 2015.

Category 2: BJA estimates that it will make up to four awards of up to $350,000, for an estimated total of $1.4 million for a 36-month project period, beginning on October 1, 2015.

BJA may, in certain cases, provide supplemental funding in future years to awards under this solicitation. Important considerations in decisions regarding supplemental funding include, among other factors, the availability of funding, strategic priorities, assessment of the quality of the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and assessment of the progress of the work funded under the award.

All awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and to any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law.

Type of Award[11]
BJA expects that it will make any award from Category 1 of this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a particular type of grant used if BJA expects to have ongoing substantial involvement in award activities. Substantial involvement includes direct oversight and involvement with the grantee organization in implementation of the grant, but does not involve day-to-day project management. See Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements, under Section F. Federal Award Administration Information, for details regarding the federal involvement anticipated under an award from this solicitation.

BJA expects that it will make any award from Category 2 of this solicitation in the form of a grant.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls
If selected for funding, the award recipient must:

(a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the federal award that provides reasonable assurance that the non-federal entity is managing the federal award in compliance with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the federal award. These internal controls should be in compliance with guidance in "Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government" issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the "Internal

[11] *See generally* 31 U.S.C. §§ 6301-6305 (defines and describes various forms of federal assistance relationships, including grants and cooperative agreements (a type of grant)).

Control Integrated Framework", issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).

(b) Comply with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal awards.

(c) Evaluate and monitor the non-federal entity's compliance with statute, regulations and the terms and conditions of federal awards.

(d) Take prompt action when instances of noncompliance are identified including noncompliance identified in audit findings.

(e) Take reasonable measures to safeguard protected personally identifiable information and other information the federal awarding agency or pass-through entity designates as sensitive or the non-federal entity considers sensitive consistent with applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

In order to better understand administrative requirements and cost principles, award applicants are encouraged to enroll, at no charge, in the Department of Justice Grants Financial Management Online Training available here.

Budget Information

Unallowable and Unreasonable Uses for Award Funds
In addition to the unallowable costs identified in the Financial Guide, award funds may not be used for the following:

- Prizes/rewards/entertainment/trinkets (or any type of monetary incentive)
- Gift cards
- Stipends
- Vehicles
- Food and beverage
- Costs that do not support approved project activities

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the Financial Guide at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/financialguide/index.htm.

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement
Category 1 of this solicitation does not require a match. However, if a successful application proposes a voluntary match amount, and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit. Category 2 of this solicitation has a conditional match requirement, described below.

Category 2 Match Requirement (based on federal award amount)
If a JRI local jurisdiction has measured and reinvested savings (see Selection Criteria on page 24), then a match is not required. If such a jurisdiction proposes a voluntary match amount, however, and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit.

If a JRI local jurisdiction has not measured and reinvested savings (see Selection Criteria on page 24), a match is required, and the following requirements apply:

- The amount of the match must equal the amount of federal funds being sought.
- Match funds are subject to the same regulations and restrictions as the federal funds for this program (see Federal Award Information on page 9).
- Applicants must identify the source of the non-federal funds and how they will use the funds. If a successful applicant's proposed match exceeds the required match amount, and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit.
- Applicants may satisfy this match requirement with cash, in-kind services, or a combination of the two.
- Match funds must be used for one or more of the local jurisdiction's reinvestment strategies identified in the justice reinvestment process. For example, match funding can be used to expand or improve community-based treatment only if the JRI local policy team identified community-based treatment as a reinvestment priority. Match funding could also be used for skills-based trainings for probation officers if the jurisdiction's reinvestment strategies included more effective community supervision. Another example is use of match funding to support an evaluation of one of the justice reinvestment strategies.
- Applicants must identify the target(s) of the reinvestment match with specificity, including, if applicable, names of agencies, service providers, or staff positions to be funded; a description of the kind of service to be provided or functions to be performed; what period of time will be covered; and amounts of funding. Applicants must document these commitments by including relevant attachments to the application (see Additional Attachments on page 21).

Example: For a federal award amount of $350,000, the required reinvestment match is $350,000.

For additional cost sharing and match information, see Section C. Eligibility Information.

Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals
OJP does not typically approve pre-agreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. If approved, pre-agreement costs could be paid from grant funds consistent with a grantee's approved budget, and under applicable cost standards. However, all such costs prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of an applicant. Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs. Should there be extenuating circumstances that appear to be appropriate for OJP's consideration as pre-agreement costs, the applicant should contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this announcement for details on the requirements for submitting a written request for approval. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the Financial Guide, for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver
With respect to any award of more than $250,000 made under this solicitation, recipients may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the award recipient at a rate that exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.[12] The 2015 salary table for SES employees is available on the Office of Personnel Management web site. Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.)

The Assistant Attorney General for OJP may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, the limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant requesting a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of the application. Unless the applicant submits a waiver request and justification with the application, the applicant should anticipate that OJP will request the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

The justification should include the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of the service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the program or project being undertaken with award funds, and a statement explaining that the individual's salary is commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work to be done.

Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs
OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully – before submitting an application – the OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at www.ojp.gov/financialguide/PostawardRequirements/chapter15page1.htm. OJP policy and guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most such costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some such costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, including a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)
If an applicant proposes a program or activity that would deliver services or benefits to individuals, the costs of taking reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to those services or benefits for individuals with limited English proficiency may be allowable. Reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to services or benefits may include interpretation or translation services where appropriate.

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under "Solicitation Requirements" in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

C. Eligibility Information

For additional eligibility information, see Title page.

[12] This limitation on use of award funds does not apply to the non-profit organizations specifically named at Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. part 200.

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement
For information on cost sharing and match requirement, see Section B. Federal Award Information.

Limit on Number of Application Submissions
If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, BJA will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. For more information on system-validated versions, see How To Apply.

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include
Applicants should anticipate that if they fail to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may negatively affect the review of their application; and, should a decision be made to make an award, it may result in the inclusion of special conditions that preclude the recipient from accessing or using award funds pending satisfaction of the conditions.

Moreover, applicants should anticipate that applications that are determined to be nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that do not include the application elements that BJA has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, BJA has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and, for Category 1 only, Résumés/Curricula Vitae of Key Personnel. Applicants may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information. Please review the "Note on File Names and File Types" under How To Apply to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

OJP strongly recommends that applicants use appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., "Program Narrative," "Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative," "Project Plan," "Memoranda of Understanding," "Resumes") for all attachments. Also, OJP recommends that applicants include resumes in a single file.

1. **Information to Complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)**
   The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications, applications, and related information. Grants.gov and OJP's Grants Management System (GMS) take information from the applicant's profile to populate the fields on this form. When selecting "type of applicant," if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select "For-Profit Organization" or "Small Business" (as applicable).

   Intergovernmental Review: This funding opportunity **is** subject to Executive Order 12372. Applicants may find the names and addresses of their state's Single Point of Contact (SPOC) at the following website: www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_spoc/. Applicants whose state appears on the SPOC list must contact their state's SPOC to find out about, and comply with, the state's process under Executive Order 12372. In completing the SF-424, applicants whose state appears on the SPOC list are to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 once the applicant has complied with their state's E.O. 12372 process. (Applicants whose state does not appear on the SPOC list are to make the

appropriate selection in response to question 19 to indicate that the "Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.")

2. Project Abstract

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 400 words or less. Project abstracts should be—

- Written for a general public audience.
- Submitted as a separate attachment with "Project Abstract" as part of its file name.
- Single-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins.
- Include the legal name of the applicant and the project's title, goals, design elements, and deliverables.

As a separate attachment, the project abstract will **not** count against the page limit for the program narrative. BJA requests that the abstract be submitted as a text file, such as Word .doc format.

For Category 2 only, abstracts should also include information on how the application addresses the Mandatory Consideration described on page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**.

3. Program Narrative

The program narrative must respond to the solicitation and the Selection Criteria (a-e) in the order given. For more detailed information regarding the Selection Criteria for this solicitation, see page 24. The program narrative must be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with no less than 1-inch margins, and must not exceed 20 pages. Number pages "1 of 20," "2 of 20," etc. If the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, BJA may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions.

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:

a. Statement of the Problem

b. Project Design and Implementation

c. Capabilities and Competencies

d. Impact/Outcomes, Evaluation, and Sustainment

e. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures
To assist the Department with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111–352, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide the data requested in the "Data Grantee Provides" column so that OJP can calculate values for the "Performance Measures" column. Post award, **Category 1** (OCOA) recipients will be required to submit performance metric data quarterly through BJA's online Training and Technical Assistance Reporting Portal located at www.bjatraining.org.

Performance measures for **Category 2** (Maximizing Local Reforms) of this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
Increase corrections costs saved or avoided by reducing unnecessary confinement	Percent increase in costs saved since the previous fiscal year Percent increase in costs avoided since the previous fiscal year Percent increase in funds reinvested since the previous fiscal year Percent decrease in the confined (jail) population Number of strategies implemented to reduce unnecessary confinement	During the current fiscal year: Corrections costs attributable to confined population prior to project implementation Corrections population forecast for the current fiscal year A. Corrections costs saved due to a decrease in the confined population B. Corrections costs avoided due to a confined population that is smaller than forecast by population projections C. Amount reinvested in strategies or programs that were identified as targets as part of the state's justice reinvestment efforts During the reporting period: A. Number of new admissions to prison B. Number of offenders released from prison C. As of the last day of the reporting period, number of individuals confined in prison Number of strategies implemented to reduce unnecessary confinement by type, to include but not limited to, a) Prosecutorial charging decisions b) Arrest decisions c) Pretrial detention d) Sentencing and diversion e) Probation or parole f) Risk and needs assessment g) Other drivers of the corrections population
Increase reinvestment in evidence-based practices that reduce recidivism	Number of new or updated policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions implemented in accordance with the governing evidence-based principles Number of programs assessed as successfully implementing an evidence-based model	Number of new or updated policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions implemented in accordance with the governing evidence-based principles Number of programs assessed as successfully implementing an evidence-based model
Support justice reinvestment reform efforts by promoting and increasing	Percentage of project plan outcomes met	During the reporting period: A. Number of project tasks B. Number of project tasks completed

collaboration among agencies and officials who work in criminal justice	Percentage of participating agencies/organizations with established Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with each of the identified groups Number of deliverables that meet expectations as determined by BJA	Number of participating jurisdictions with MOUs established with following groups: a) County executive or manager b) County board of supervisors or commissioners c) Judicial branch d) Law enforcement e) Prosecutors f) Other key stakeholders Number of deliverables that meet expectations as determined by BJA
Enhance the translation of evidence into practice by supporting the use of data analysis results to inform policy decisions	Number of analytic reports produced Number of analytic reports submitted Number of meetings with stakeholder groups	A. Number of analysis reports produced B. Number of analysis reports delivered to policymakers C. Number of different stakeholder groups consulted D. Number of meetings with stakeholder groups held E. Number of meetings at which steering committee or task force members received implementation progress updates supported by data

BJA does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their application. Performance measures are included as an alert that BJA will require successful applicants to submit specific data as part of their reporting requirements. For the application, applicants should indicate an understanding of these requirements and discuss how they will gather the required data, should they receive funding.

Note on Project Evaluations

Applicants that propose to use funds awarded through this solicitation to conduct project evaluations should be aware that certain project evaluations (such as systematic investigations designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge) may constitute "research" for purposes of applicable DOJ human subjects protection regulations. However, project evaluations that are intended only to generate internal improvements to a program or service, or are conducted only to meet OJP's performance measure data reporting requirements likely do not constitute "research." Applicants should provide sufficient information for OJP to determine whether the particular project they propose would either intentionally or unintentionally collect and/or use information in such a way that it meets the DOJ regulatory definition of research.

Research, for the purposes of human subjects protections for OJP-funded programs, is defined as, "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge" 28 C.F.R. § 46.102(d). For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research, see the decision tree to assist applicants on the "Research and the Protection of Human Subjects" section of the OJP Funding Resource Center web page (ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/EvidenceResearchEvaluationRequirements.htm). Applicants whose proposals may involve a research or statistical component also should review the "Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements" section on that web page.

4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet (i.e. A. Personnel, B. Fringe Benefits, C. Travel, etc.).

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the Financial Guide at www.ojp.gov/financialguide/index.htm.

b. Budget Narrative

The budget narrative should thoroughly and clearly describe every category of expense listed in the Budget Detail Worksheet. OJP expects proposed budgets to be complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities).

Applicants should demonstrate in their budget narratives how they will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should generally describe cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project. For example, a budget narrative should detail why planned in-person meetings are necessary, or how technology and collaboration with outside organizations could be used to reduce costs, without compromising quality.

The narrative should be mathematically sound and correspond with the information and figures provided in the Budget Detail Worksheet. The narrative should explain how the applicant estimated and calculated all costs, and how they are relevant to the completion of the proposed project. The narrative may include tables for clarification purposes but need not be in a spreadsheet format. As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the Budget Narrative should be broken down by year.

c. Non-Competitive Procurement Contracts In Excess of Simplified Acquisition Threshold

If an applicant proposes to make one or more non-competitive procurements of products or services, where the non-competitive procurement will exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (also known as the small purchase threshold), which is currently set at $150,000, the application should address the considerations outlined in the Financial Guide.

d. Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals

For information on pre-agreement costs, see Section B. Federal Award Information.

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a current federally approved indirect cost rate. (This requirement does not apply to units of local government.) Attach a copy of the federally approved indirect cost rate agreement to the application. Applicants that do not have an approved rate may request one through their cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or, if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct cost categories. For the definition of Cognizant Federal Agency, see the "Glossary of Terms" in the Financial

Guide. For assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, please contact the Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf.

6. Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status

Applicants are to disclose whether they are currently designated high risk by another federal grant making agency. This includes any status requiring additional oversight by the federal agency due to past programmatic or financial concerns. If an applicant is designated high risk by another federal grant making agency, you must email the following information to OJPComplianceReporting@usdoj.gov at the time of application submission:

- The federal agency that currently designated the applicant as high risk
- Date the applicant was designated high risk
- The high risk point of contact name, phone number, and email address, from that federal agency
- Reasons for the high risk status

OJP seeks this information to ensure appropriate federal oversight of any grant award. Unlike the Excluded Parties List, this high risk information does not disqualify any organization from receiving an OJP award. However, additional grant oversight may be included, if necessary, in award documentation.

7. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

Applicants are to disclose whether they have pending applications for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation. The disclosure should include both direct applications for federal funding (e.g., applications to federal agencies) and indirect applications for such funding (e.g., applications to State agencies that will subaward federal funds).

OJP seeks this information to help avoid any inappropriate duplication of funding. Leveraging multiple funding sources in a complementary manner to implement comprehensive programs or projects is encouraged and is not seen as inappropriate duplication.

Applicants that have pending applications as described above are to provide the following information about pending applications submitted within the last 12 months:

- The federal or state funding agency
- The solicitation name/project name
- The point of contact information at the applicable funding agency.

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/E-mail for Point of Contact at Funding Agency
DOJ/COPS	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov

HHS/ Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration	Drug Free Communities Mentoring Program/ North County Youth Mentoring Program	John Doe, 202/000-0000; john.doe@hhs.gov

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment, with the file name "Disclosure of Pending Applications," to their application. Applicants that do not have pending applications as described above are to include a statement to this effect in the separate attachment page (e.g., "[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation.").

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

If a proposal involves research and/or evaluation, regardless of the proposal's other merits, in order to receive funds, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence, including appropriate safeguards to ensure research/evaluation objectivity and integrity, both in this proposal and as it may relate to the applicant's other current or prior related projects. This documentation may be included as an attachment to the application which addresses BOTH i. and ii. below.

i. For purposes of this solicitation, applicants must document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:

   a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its proposal to identify any research integrity issues (including all principal investigators and sub-recipients) and it has concluded that the design, conduct, or reporting of research and evaluation funded by BJA grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts will not be biased by any personal or financial conflict of interest on the part of part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients responsible for the research and evaluation or on the part of the applicant organization;

   OR

   b. A specific listing of actual or perceived conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified in relation to this proposal. These conflicts could be either personal (related to specific staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients) or organizational (related to the applicant or any subgrantee organization). Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include, but are not limited to, those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse's work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization could not be given a grant to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), as the organization in such an instance would appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a

reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.

ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation applicants must address the issue of possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:

a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. Applicants MUST also include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest.

OR

b. If the applicant has identified specific personal or organizational conflicts of interest in its proposal during this review, the applicant must propose a specific and robust mitigation plan to address conflicts noted above. At a minimum, the plan must include specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

Considerations in assessing research and evaluation independence and integrity will include, but are not be limited to, the adequacy of the applicant's efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the organization in carrying out the research, development, or evaluation activity; and the adequacy of the applicant's existing or proposed remedies to control any such factors.

c. Project Plan with each project goal, related objective(s), activities, benchmarks or milestones, expected completion dates, and responsible person(s) or organization.

d. Position Descriptions for key positions.

e. Résumés for key personnel (applies to Category 1 only). Applicants may combine position descriptions and résumés into a single document; however, please note that résumés are one of the critical elements for an application, along with the program

narrative and budget/budget narrative. Applications that do not include these elements shall neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration by BJA.

f. **Letters of Support** from all key partners, detailing the commitment to work with the applicant to promote the mission of the project.

g. **Documentation of Reinvestment Match** (only applies to Category 2 applicants in certain circumstances—see Match Requirement on page 10).

8. **Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire**
In accordance with 2 CFR 200.205, Federal agencies must have in place a framework for evaluating the risks posed by applicants before they receive a Federal award. To facilitate part of this risk evaluation, **all** applicants (other than an individual) are to download, complete, and submit this form.

9. **Disclosure of Lobbying Activities**
All applicants must complete this information. Applicants that expend any funds for lobbying activities are to provide the detailed information requested on the form Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL). Applicants that do not expend any funds for lobbying activities are to enter "N/A" in the text boxes for item 10 ("a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant" and "b. Individuals Performing Services").

How To Apply
Applicants must register in, and submit applications through Grants.gov, a "one-stop storefront" to find federal funding opportunities and apply for funding. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application at www.Grants.gov. Applicants that experience technical difficulties during this process should call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at **800-518-4726** or **606–545–5035**, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays. Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, **processing delays may occur, and it can take several weeks** for first-time registrants to receive confirmation and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications 72 hours prior to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

BJA strongly encourages all prospective applicants to sign up for Grants.gov email notifications regarding this solicitation. If this solicitation is cancelled or modified, individuals who sign up with Grants.gov for updates will be automatically notified.

Note on File Names and File Types: Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in names of attachment files. Valid file names may include only the characters shown in the table below. Grants.gov is designed to reject any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains any characters not shown in the table below.

Characters	Special Characters		
Upper case (A – Z)	Parenthesis ( )	Curly braces { }	Square brackets [ ]
Lower case (a – z)	Ampersand (&)	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Underscore (__)	Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (')
Hyphen (-)	At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign ($)
Space	Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)

Period (.)	**When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the "&" format.**

Grants.gov is designed to forward successfully submitted applications to OJP's Grants Management System (GMS).

GMS does not accept executable file types as application attachments. These disallowed file types include, but are not limited to, the following extensions: ".com," ".bat," ".exe," ".vbs," ".cfg," ".dat," ".db," ".dbf," ".dll," ".ini," ".log," ".ora," ".sys," and ".zip." GMS may reject applications with files that use these extensions. It is important to allow time to change the type of file(s) if the application is rejected.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

OJP may not make a federal award to an applicant until the applicant has complied with all applicable DUNS and SAM requirements. If an applicant has not fully complied with the requirements by the time the federal awarding agency is ready to make a federal award, the federal awarding agency may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive a federal award and use that determination as a basis for making a federal award to another applicant.

1. **Acquire a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.** In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires that all applicants (other than individuals) for federal funds include a DUNS number in their applications for a new award or a supplement to an existing award. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and differentiating entities receiving federal funds. The identifier is used for tracking purposes and to validate address and point of contact information for federal assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. The DUNS number will be used throughout the grant life cycle. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866–705–5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 1-2 business days.

2. **Acquire registration with the System for Award Management (SAM).** SAM is the repository for standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. OJP requires all applicants (other than individuals) for federal financial assistance to maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Applicants must **update or renew their SAM registration annually** to maintain an active status.

   Applications cannot be successfully submitted in Grants.gov until Grants.gov receives the SAM registration information. **The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours.** OJP recommends that the applicant register or renew registration with SAM as early as possible.

   Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at www.sam.gov.

3. **Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password**. Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process, go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html.

4. **Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.

5. **Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for both categories of this solicitation is 16.827, titled "Justice Reinvestment Initiative" and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2015-4152.

6. **Select the correct Competition ID.** Some OJP solicitations posted to Grants.gov contain multiple purpose areas, denoted by the individual Competition ID. If applying to a solicitation with multiple Competition IDs, select the appropriate Competition ID for the intended purpose area of the application.

7. **Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application and the second will state whether the application has been successfully validated, or rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges applicants to submit applications **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

   Click here for further details on DUNS, SAM, and Grants.gov registration steps and timeframes.

Note: Duplicate Applications
If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, BJA will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. See Note on File Names and File Types under How To Apply.

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues
Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline or the SAM Help Desk to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. Then applicant must e-mail the BJA contact identified in the Contact Information section on page 2 **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. The e-mail must describe the technical difficulties, and include a timeline of the applicant's submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s). **Note: BJA *does not* automatically approve requests.** After the program office reviews the submission, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to validate the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the applicant failed to follow all required procedures, which resulted in an untimely application submission, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit their application.

The following conditions are generally insufficient to justify late submissions:

- Failure to register in SAM or Grants.gov in sufficient time
- Failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its web site
- Failure to follow each instruction in the OJP solicitation
- Technical issues with the applicant's computer or information technology environment, including firewalls.

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP funding web page at www.ojp.gov/funding/Explore/CurrentFundingOpportunities.htm.

E. Application Review Information

Selection Criteria
Category 1 and Category 2 applications will be evaluated using distinct sets of criteria, as described below. Different weight is given to each based on the percentage value listed below after each individual criterion. For example, the first criterion, "Statement of the Problem," is worth 20 percent of the entire application in the review process.

Category 1 Criteria

1. Statement of the Problem (20 percent)

- Describe in general terms the current state of corrections spending among state and local jurisdictions in relation to overall budgets.
- Describe in general terms the availability of data at the state and local level to guide decisionmaking with regard to criminal justice system funding and resource allocation.
- Describe challenges in calculating accurate prison, jail, and community supervision population projections and the resultant costs saved or averted based on criminal justice policy recommendations that may result from enactment of JRI policy changes.
- Describe the evidence base for strategies that reduce corrections populations while improving public safety.
- Describe the challenges in calculating actual costs saved or averted over time.
- Describe the challenges in tracking reinvestment of cost savings over time.

2. Project Design and Implementation (40 percent)

- Address in detail how the applicant proposes to undertake and accomplish each of the tasks outlined on pages 5-8. A detailed implementation plan with key benchmarks must be submitted (see page 20).
- Describe how the proposed management structure and staffing of the project will facilitate the delivery of the required services as reflected in the implementation plan. The management and organizational structure described should match the staffing

needs necessary to accomplish the tasks outlined in the implementation plan. Detailed information contained in the project plan (see page 20) will contribute to the assignment of points relative to this criterion.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (20 percent)

- Clearly articulate why the applicant is uniquely positioned to assess implementation of the JRI Model, providing a detailed description of the capacity of the organization to deliver the required services and perform the key tasks described on pages 5-7.
- Clearly articulate the organization's history of involvement with assessing national, state-level, and local-level criminal justice projects.
- Discuss the staffing resources, either permanent full-time staff or proposed consultants, to effectively implement the program. Job descriptions, résumés of key project staff, and appropriate letters of support will contribute to the assignment of points related to this criterion (see Additional Attachments on page 20).

4. Impact/Outcomes, Evaluation, and Sustainment (5 percent)

- Describe a process for assessing the project's effectiveness (see Performance Measures on page 14).

5. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures (5 percent)

- Describe the manner in which the data required for this solicitation's performance measures will be collected, including the system(s) used and the person(s) responsible.

6. Budget (10 percent)

- Applicants should submit a budget that is complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should generally demonstrate how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.[13]

Category 2 Criteria

1. Statement of the Problem (20 percent)

- Describe the local jurisdiction's fidelity to the local-level JRI model.[14] The application must describe the jurisdiction's actions related to the following components with specificity:
  - Convening a multidisciplinary task force or committee;

[13] Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

[14] See Urban Institute, Justice Reinvestment at the Local Level: Planning and Implementation Guide, Second Edition (2013), www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412930-Justice-Reinvestment-at-the-Local-Level-Planning-and-Implementation-Guide-Second-Edition.pdf.

- Analyzing criminal justice system data to determine drivers of the corrections population and costs;
- Adopting policy options to address the drivers;
- Implementing strategies to address the drivers and related evidence-based strategies;
- Adopting robust jurisdiction- and strategy-specific measures (including measuring cost savings/avoidance); and
- Identifying reinvestment priorities and reinvesting costs saved or averted.

- Describe outcomes to date, including corrections population changes, costs saved or avoided, and any other relevant outcomes.
- Describe amounts and targets of reinvestment to date. If the jurisdiction has made no reinvestment to date, describe the matching funds, as detailed on page 10.
- Describe challenges faced in achieving intended outcomes that this project is designed to address.
- Explain the inability to fund the project adequately without federal assistance.

2. Project Design and Implementation (35 percent)

- Describe specifically which areas the proposed project will address (refer to the "Allowable Uses of Funds" section on pages 7-8).
- Clearly articulate the goals established for this project and connect them to the overarching goals of the solicitation set forth on page 5.
- Explain how this project complements, rather than supplants, the jurisdiction's reinvestment strategies.
- Use data to support the project design.
- If applicable, indicate the number of people who would receive services if this proposal is funded.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (25 percent)

- Describe the management structure and staffing of the project, identifying the agency responsible for the project and the grant coordinator.
- Demonstrate the capability of the applicant to ensure proper fiscal and programmatic oversight of the grant, make and administer subgrants as appropriate, and manage the collaborative partnerships involved, if applicable.
- List the partners (governmental and non-governmental, if applicable) and describe their competencies, the relationship of those agencies to the applicant, and the history of collaboration among the partners.

4. Impact/Outcomes, Evaluation, and Sustainment (10 percent)

- Identify goals and objectives for project development, implementation, and outcomes.
- Describe how performance will be documented, monitored, and evaluated, and identify the impact of the strategy once implemented.

- Describe how the applicant plans to meet the mandatory consideration regarding evaluation efforts described on page 8.
- Outline what data and information will be collected and describe how evaluation and collaborative partnerships will be leveraged to build long-term support and resources for the project.
- Discuss how this effort will be integrated into the state and/or local justice system plans or commitments, how the project will be financially sustained after federal funding ends, and the expected long-term results for the program.

5. Plan for Collecting Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures (5 percent)

- Describe the process for assessing the project's effectiveness through the collection and reporting of the required performance metrics data (see Performance Measures on page 14).

6. Budget (5 percent)

- Submit a budget that is complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should generally demonstrate how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.[15]

Review Process
OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for awarding grants. BJA reviews the application to make sure that the information presented is reasonable, understandable, measurable, and achievable, as well as consistent with the solicitation.

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. For purposes of assessing whether applicants have met basic minimum requirements, OJP screens applications for compliance with specified program requirements to help determine which applications should proceed to further consideration for award. Although program requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP grant programs:

- Applications must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant
- Applications must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable)
- Applications must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation
- Applications must include all items designated as "critical elements"
- Applicants will be checked against the General Services Administration's Excluded Parties List

For a list of critical elements, see "What an Application Should Include" under Section D. Application and Submission Information.

[15] Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

BJA may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to review the applications. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is NOT a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. A peer review panel will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. Peer reviewers' ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although their views are considered carefully. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior BJA and OJP awards, available funding, and—as JRI is a public/private partnership—BJA will consider Pew's input.

OJP reviews applications for potential discretionary awards to evaluate the risks posed by applicants before they receive an award. This review may include but is not limited to the following:

1. Financial stability and fiscal integrity
2. Quality of management systems and ability to meet the management standards prescribed in the Financial Guide
3. History of performance
4. Reports and findings from audits
5. The applicant's ability to effectively implement statutory, regulatory, or other requirements imposed on non-Federal entities
6. Proposed costs to determine if the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs, and whether those costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable federal cost principles and agency regulations

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General, who may consider factors including, but not limited to, peer review ratings, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior BJA and OJP awards, and available funding when making awards.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices
OJP award notification will be sent from GMS. Recipients will be required to log in; accept any outstanding assurances and certifications on the award; designate a financial point of contact; and review, sign, and accept the award. The award acceptance process involves physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements
If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the agency-approved project proposal and budget, the recipient must comply with award terms and conditions, and other legal requirements, including but not limited to OMB, DOJ or other federal regulations which will be included in the award, incorporated into the award by reference, or are otherwise applicable to the award. OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review the information pertaining to these requirements **prior** to submitting an application. To assist

applicants and recipients in accessing and reviewing this information, OJP has placed pertinent information on its Solicitation Requirements page of the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Please note in particular the following two forms, which applicants must accept in GMS prior to the receipt of any award funds, as each details legal requirements with which applicants must provide specific assurances and certifications of compliance. Applicants may view these forms in the Apply section of the OJP Funding Resource Center and are strongly encouraged to review and consider them carefully prior to making an application for OJP grant funds.

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

- Standard Assurances

Upon grant approval, OJP electronically transmits (via GMS) the award document to the prospective award recipient. In addition to other award information, the award document contains award terms and conditions that specify national policy requirements[16] with which recipients of federal funding must comply; uniform administrative requirements, cost principles, and audit requirements; and program-specific terms and conditions required based on applicable program (statutory) authority or requirements set forth in OJP solicitations and program announcements, and other requirements which may be attached to appropriated funding. For example, certain efforts may call for special requirements, terms, or conditions relating to intellectual property, data/information-sharing or -access, or information security; or audit requirements, expenditures and milestones, or publications and/or press releases. OJP also may place additional terms and conditions on an award based on its risk assessment of the applicant, or for other reasons it determines necessary to fulfill the goals and objectives of the program.

Prospective applicants may access and review the text of mandatory conditions OJP includes in all OJP awards, as well as the text of certain other conditions, such as administrative conditions, via Mandatory Award Terms and Conditions page of the OJP Funding Resource Center.

As stated above, BJA anticipates that it will make any award from Category 1 of this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement. Cooperative agreement awards include standard "federal involvement" conditions that describe the general allocation of responsibility for execution of the funded program. Generally-stated, under cooperative agreement awards, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient in implementing the funded and approved proposal and budget, and the award terms and conditions. Responsibility for oversight and redirection of the project, if necessary, rests with BJA.

In addition to any "federal involvement" condition(s), OJP cooperative agreement awards include a special condition specifying certain reporting requirements required in connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposium, training activities, or similar events funded under the award, consistent with OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting.

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

[16] *See generally* 2 C.F.R. 200.300 (provides a general description of national policy requirements typically applicable to recipients of federal awards, including the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA)).

Recipients must submit quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with 2 CFR Part 200. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent.

Special Reporting requirements may be required by OJP depending on the statutory, legislative or administrative obligations of the recipient or the program.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For additional Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s), see the Title page.

For additional contact information for Grants.gov, see the Title page.

H. Other Information

Provide Feedback to OJP
To assist OJP in improving its application and award processes, we encourage applicants to provide feedback on this solicitation, the application submission process, and/or the application review/peer review process. Provide feedback to OJPSolicitationFeedback@usdoj.gov.

IMPORTANT: This e-mail is for feedback and suggestions only. Replies are **not** sent from this mailbox. If you have specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation, **you must** directly contact the appropriate number or e-mail listed on the front of this solicitation document. These contacts are provided to help ensure that you can directly reach an individual who can address your specific questions in a timely manner.

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please e-mail your resume to ojppeerreview@lmbps.com. The OJP Solicitation Feedback email account will not forward your resume. **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization have submitted an application.

Application Checklist
FY 2015 Justice Reinvestment Initiative:
Maximizing Local Reforms and Assessment Technical Assistance

This application checklist has been created to assist in developing an application. Please note that the items indicated with an asterisk (*) below have been designated as the basic minimum requirements for both categories of applications. Applications that do not include these elements shall neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration by BJA.

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:
_____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 22)
_____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 22)
To Register with Grants.gov:
_____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 22)
_____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 23)
To Find Funding Opportunity:
_____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 23)
_____ Select the correct Competition ID (see page 23)
_____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package
_____ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 21)
_____ Read Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov
After application submission, *receive Grants.gov email notifications that:*
_____ (1) application has been received (see page 23)
_____ (2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 23)
If no Grants.gov receipt, and validation or error notifications are received:
_____ contact the NCJRS Response Center regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see pages 2 and 23)

General Requirements:

_____ Review the Solicitation Requirements in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Scope Requirement:

_____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of $2,560,000 for Category 1 applications and $350,000 for Category 2 applications.

Eligibility Requirement:

_____ For Category 1, the applicant is a national-scope private non-profit organization (including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organizations), college, or university (public or private) (including tribal institutions of higher education).
_____ For Category 2, the applicant is one of the seventeen local jurisdictions listed on the Title page.

What an Application Should Include:

_____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 13)

_____ Project Abstract (see page 14)
_____ *Program Narrative (see page 14)
_____ *Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 17)
_____ *Budget Narrative (see page 17)
    _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 12)
    _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at ojp.gov/financialguide/PostawardRequirements/chapter15page1.htm (see page 12)
_____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 21)
_____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 17)
_____ Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status (see page 18)
_____ Additional Attachments
    _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 18)
    _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 18)
    _____ Project Plan (see page 20)
    _____ Position Descriptions of Key Project Staff (see page 20)
    _____ *Résumés of Key Project Personnel (required for Category 1 only, see page 20)
    _____ Letters of Support from Key Partners (see page 21)
    _____ Documentation of Reinvestment Match (applies to Category 2 only, see page 21)
_____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 21)