



---

The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Assistance](#) (BJA) is seeking applications for the Smart Pretrial Demonstration Initiative. This program furthers the Department's mission by assisting state and local jurisdictions in reducing crime and improving the fair administration of justice.

## Smart Pretrial Demonstration Initiative FY 2014 Competitive Grant Announcement

### Eligibility

Eligible applicants are limited to local public and private entities (as fiscal agent), including non-profit and for-profit (including tribal non-profit or for-profit organizations), faith-based and community organizations, and units of local government (including federally recognized Indian tribal governments as determined by the Secretary of the Interior). For-profit organizations must agree to forego any profit or management fee.

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.

### Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](#) prior to submitting an application. (See "How to Apply," page 24.) All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 27, 2014. (See "Deadlines: Registration and Application," page 4.)

All applicants are encouraged to read this [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#).

### 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](mailto: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.

For assistance with any other requirement of this solicitation, contact the BJA Justice Information Center at 1-877-927-5657, via e-mail at [JIC@telesishq.com](mailto:JIC@telesishq.com), or via live web chat at [www.justiceinformationcenter.us.com](http://www.justiceinformationcenter.us.com). The BJA Justice Information Center hours of operation are

8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, and 8:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. eastern time on the solicitation close date.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: BJA-2014-3874

Release date: April 9, 2014

# Contents

Overview .....	4
Deadlines: Registration and Application .....	4
Eligibility .....	4
Smart Pretrial Demonstration Initiative—Specific Information.....	4
Performance Measures .....	12
What an Application Should Include .....	15
Information to Complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) .....	15
Project Abstract .....	15
Program Narrative .....	16
Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative .....	16
Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) .....	17
Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) .....	177
Additional Attachments.....	18
Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire .....	19
Selection Criteria.....	19
Review Process .....	22
Other Important Information: Award Special Conditions .....	22
Additional Requirements .....	23
How to Apply .....	24
Provide Feedback to OJP .....	26
Application Checklist .....	28
Appendix.....	30

# Smart Pretrial Demonstration Initiative (CFDA 16.751)

## Overview

The Smart Pretrial Demonstration Initiative (SPDI), administered by BJA, is part of BJA's "Smart Suite" of crime fighting programs—Smart Prosecution, Smart Policing, Smart Supervision, and now Smart Pretrial.

BJA established the first program within this Smart Suite over 4 years ago with the launch of Smart Policing. Smart Policing supports law enforcement agencies in building evidence-based, data-driven law enforcement tactics and strategies that are effective, efficient, and economical. For more information on Smart Policing, see the program's most recent fact sheet: [www.smartpolicinginitiative.com/sites/all/files/SPI\\_One\\_Pager\\_2013.pdf](http://www.smartpolicinginitiative.com/sites/all/files/SPI_One_Pager_2013.pdf). The Smart Suite represents a strategic approach that brings more "science" into criminal justice operations by leveraging innovative applications of analysis, technology, and evidence-based practices with the goal of improving performance and effectiveness while containing costs; an important consideration in today's fiscal environment.

The FY 2014 SPDI grant program seeks to build upon analysis-driven, evidence-based pretrial justice by encouraging local and tribal jurisdictions to effectively implement risk assessment and appropriate supervision and/or diversion strategies targeting pretrial outcomes within their jurisdictions.

This program is funded under the Edward Byrne Memorial Competitive Grant Program (Byrne Competitive Program), Public Law No. 113-76, 128 Stat. 5, 61. The Byrne Competitive Program, in part, helps communities improve the functioning and capacity of state and local criminal justice systems and provides for national support efforts including training and technical assistance programs strategically targeted to address local needs.

## Deadlines: Registration and Application

Applicants must register with Grants.gov in order to submit an application. OJP encourages applicants to register several weeks before the application submission deadline. The deadline to submit concept papers under this announcement is 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 27, 2014. See "How to Apply" on page 24 for details.

## Eligibility

Refer to the title page of eligibility under this program.

## Smart Pretrial Demonstration Initiative—Specific Information

### Background

Fifty years ago, then-Attorney General Robert Kennedy convened a national conference to highlight the problems associated with a bail system that did not use risk as a factor to determine

who is released and who is held in jail pending trial. Fifty years later, many of the same problems remain. Today, 61 percent of the nation's jail populations are pretrial detainees,<sup>1</sup> almost all of whom simply cannot afford their bail.<sup>2</sup> The current pretrial detention system in America has been estimated to cost \$8 billion annually to local county governments.<sup>3</sup>

In May 2011, Attorney General Eric Holder and the Office of Justice Programs hosted the National Symposium on Pretrial Justice in Washington, D.C. to once again focus attention on pretrial justice. In his remarks to the Symposium, Attorney General Holder said, of low-risk defendants sitting in jail pretrial, that:

“[a]most all of these individuals could be released and supervised in their communities – and allowed to pursue and maintain employment and participate in educational opportunities and their normal family lives – without risk of endangering their fellow citizens or fleeing from justice. Studies have clearly shown that almost all of them could reap greater benefits from appropriate pretrial treatment or rehabilitation programs than from time in jail – and might, as a result, be less likely to end up serving long prison sentences.”

Conversely, recent research by the Arnold Foundation has shown a disturbing percentage—nearly half—of defendants classified as high risk to reoffend or fail to appear in court are routinely released under traditional bail systems.<sup>4</sup>

Symposium participants developed numerous recommendations for the enhancement of pretrial justice, including expanding the use of citation releases by law enforcement; designating experienced prosecutors to review new arrests before the initial appearance in court for bail-setting; requiring defense representation at that hearing; training bail-setting judicial officers; eliminating pre-set bond schedules and replacing them with evidence-based risk assessment tools; developing and implementing supervision strategies that match supervision levels with the identified risk levels of defendants; and providing detention without bail as a statutory option for defendants posing unmanageable risks.<sup>5</sup>

Over the past several years, BJA has invested significant resources in pretrial training and technical assistance, including the support of the Pretrial Justice Institute (PJI) and the Pretrial Justice Working Group (PJWG), to help monitor the field's ability to implement these recommendations; along with a philanthropic partnership with the Public Welfare Foundation that has helped build the field of criminal justice advocates, technical assistance providers, and stakeholders committed to pretrial reform. And the results have been impressive. Key stakeholder groups, including the Conference of Chief Justices, the Conference of State Court Administrators, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, the National Sheriffs' Association, the American Jail Association, the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, the American Council of Chief Defenders, and the American Probation and Parole Association, have issued policy statements calling for the reform of pretrial justice.<sup>6</sup> A number of states have hosted statewide pretrial justice symposia, and dozens of counties have had pretrial system assessments and trainings. There is widespread agreement among the key stakeholder associations of the need for pretrial reform. Over the last few years, BJA has

---

<sup>1</sup> Todd Minton, *Jail Inmates at Mid-Year 2012: Statistical Tables* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2013).

<sup>2</sup> “Felony Defendants in Large Urban Counties, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Brian A. Reaves, December 2013.

<sup>3</sup> [www.napsa.org/publications/napsafandp1.pdf](http://www.napsa.org/publications/napsafandp1.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> [http://arnoldfoundation.org/sites/default/files/pdf/LJAF-research-summary\\_PSA-Court\\_4\\_1.pdf](http://arnoldfoundation.org/sites/default/files/pdf/LJAF-research-summary_PSA-Court_4_1.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> National Symposium on Pretrial Justice: Summary Report of Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2012), 30.

<sup>6</sup> Visit [www.pretrial.org/get-involved/pretrial-national-coalition/](http://www.pretrial.org/get-involved/pretrial-national-coalition/) to read those Policy Statements.

supported technical assistance on pretrial justice reform, as well as, Justice Reinvestment at the Local Level,<sup>7</sup> and the National Institute of Corrections has supported the Evidence-Based in Decision Making initiative,<sup>8</sup> all of which have tested models of change within local criminal justice systems. From this foundational work, several themes have emerged that are informing this FY 2014 Smart Pretrial Demonstration Initiative:

1. Justice system improvements are most likely to occur when technical knowledge and practical application are coupled together with site capacity building;
2. Justice system improvements are most likely to be successful when the appropriate stakeholders work together, with a clear understanding of their roles in the process, and with structures to hold each accountable to the overall vision. Effective pretrial practices involve the work and consensus of multiple criminal justice system stakeholders, and when technical assistance and training are combined with dedicated investments in site coordination, jurisdictions can move toward evidence-based policies and practices.
3. Justice system stakeholders learn from the successes and failures of their professional peers who have adopted best practices, produced better outcomes, and developed sound public education strategies to build public acceptance of reforms.

There is much work to be done in the pretrial justice field to effectively implement the full set of pretrial justice reengineering called for during the National Symposium—what BJA is now calling “Smart Pretrial.” Hence, this FY 2014 competitive grant announcement.

## Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The goal of SPDI is to test the cost savings and public safety enhancements that can be achieved when jurisdictions move to a pretrial model that uses risk assessment to inform decisionmaking and employs improved risk management strategies (supervision and diversion). SPDI sites selected under this grant announcement will work with a BJA-supported researcher to measure their pretrial outcomes (pretrial rearrests and failure to appear) and associated pretrial justice costs.

BJA seeks proposals from local and tribal jurisdictions interested in collaboratively addressing the viability of the following key elements of SPDI. **At a minimum, sites will be required to implement and utilize a BJA-approved empirically derived pretrial risk assessment instrument, as well as develop, implement, and utilize risk-based supervision strategies.** Applicants should address each of the key elements below, noting any legislative or similar challenges in implementing these key elements.

### Key Elements:

- The immediate or early release of eligible arrestees, after positive identification and assessment of risk of flight and pretrial recidivism.
- The screening of every booked defendant for risk of flight and pretrial recidivism using a BJA-approved risk assessment tool.
- The early review of charges by a seasoned prosecutor.

---

<sup>7</sup> [www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412930-Justice-Reinvestment-at-the-Local-Level-Planning-and-Implementation-Guide-Second-Edition.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412930-Justice-Reinvestment-at-the-Local-Level-Planning-and-Implementation-Guide-Second-Edition.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> <http://nicic.gov/EBDM>

- The presence of defense counsel, prepared to provide effective representation, at the earliest hearing that could result in pretrial detention.
- The release or detention of defendants is informed by the outcome of the risk assessment and adversarial hearing.
  - Where permitted by current legislation, preventive detention hearings should be considered.
- The use of court reminder protocols and risk-based supervision and/or diversion for released defendants.
- If convicted, the transfer of information about the defendant's pretrial supervision outcomes to the sentencing court, prosecutor, defense counsel, as well as any subsequent supervising authority.

## **Research Support and Training and Technical Assistance**

In FY 2013, BJA funded PJI through a competitive solicitation to provide training and technical assistance, among other pretrial related activities. As such, PJI will provide training and oversee a collaborative of technical assistance providers to those sites selected under this FY 2014 competitive grant announcement. PJI will also contract with a cross-site researcher, as well as facilitate peer-to-peer exchanges of information, and produce reports on the lessons learned from SPDI. There will be one cross-site researcher for SPDI, who will work with each site. For more information about PJI, visit [www.pretrial.org](http://www.pretrial.org).

## **Smart Pretrial's Three Phases**

**Under this solicitation, BJA will make up to three awards that cover both Phase 1 and 2 at up to \$100,000 per year, for a total budget of \$200,000. Applicants should prepare 2-year budgets. Awards will contain special conditions that will require submission and approval of plans for release of budget conditions for Phase 2. See "Award Special Conditions" on page 22.**

**For Phase 3, BJA anticipates awarding a supplement award for up to \$100,000 based on successful site performance, defined as successful implementation of the site's work plan that will be developed in Phase 1.**

### **Phase 1 – Planning (Starting October 1, 2014, and anticipated to take 1 year)**

- Phase 1 funding will be used to:
  - Support a local SPDI site coordinator who will staff the local policy team (the hiring or reassignment of personnel for the local site coordinator requires BJA approval; see Award Special Conditions, page 22), consisting of:
    - Director of Pretrial Services, Community Corrections/Chief Probation Officer (whichever is applicable to jurisdiction; SPDI does not require a standalone pretrial services program, department, or agency)
    - Chief Judge
    - Chief Public Defender and/or Leadership from the Private Defense Bar
    - Elected Prosecutor
    - Jail Administrator or County Sheriff
    - City Police Chief or other lead Law Enforcement Entity
    - Elected County Official or County Executive

- Support travel of the policy team to a 2-day grant kick-off training in Washington, D.C.
- Reimburse local expenses for data collection
- Support travel for the local site coordinator to one other training or site visit, TBD by BJA and the coordinator.
- Sites will be required to participate in webinars to keep them current with research and best practices in both pretrial and systems reform.
- Sites will be required to work collaboratively with the cross-site researcher, who will be hired by BJA and PJI. During Phase 1, the researcher will advise about data needed for evaluation and coach site coordinators through the baseline data collection process.

As mentioned above, technical assistance will be provided via a consortium of providers managed by PJI, who will work with a local team to:

- Conduct baseline data collection, system mapping, and analysis of existing policies and practices (to include jail population analysis, case processing, lengths of stay in the stages of the system)
- Develop a pretrial system vision and a set of scorecard measures
- Develop a Phase 2, 2-year work plan for implementation of Smart Pretrial, to include signed policy agreements between members of the policy team
- Develop both an internal and external communications strategy and include elements in the 2-year work plan

PJI will undertake an assessment of SPDI sites, whereby the training and technical assistance assets being provided to the sites are documented and assessed (surveys, interviews, observations, etc.). Sites will be required to participate in the Smart Pretrial assessment project.

## **Phase 2 – Implementation**

- Sites will advance to Phase 2 based on the quality of the work plan and the progress made during Phase 1 to codify agreements that allow for implementation. Sites must have BJA approval prior to moving on to Phase 2 (see Award Special conditions on page 22).
- Phase 2 funding will be used to:
  - Support a local Smart Pretrial site coordinator who will staff the local policy team
  - Reimburse local expenses for data collection
  - Support travel of the policy team to a 2-day Smart Pretrial Summit in Washington, D.C. or a like venue
  - Support travel for the local site coordinator to one other training or site visit
- Sites will be required to continue to participate in webinars to keep them current with research and best practices in both pretrial and systems reform.
- Sites will continue to be required to work collaboratively with the cross-site researcher, collect required data, and report quarterly. During Phase 2, the researcher will ensure that sites are collecting data that will be needed to independently assess the impact of the changes to the system outlined in their action plans. Quarterly reports will be generated during Phase 2.

PJI will continue to coordinate technical assistance assets and sites will receive coaching and subject matter assistance from a consortium of providers, based on a site's work plan. PJI will be overseeing publication development and dissemination activities—documenting the process of the sites, the outcomes, and sharing that via the Pretrial Justice Working Group and others (publications, webinars, etc.)

### Phase 3 – Sustainability

- Depending on the availability of funding, BJA anticipates making supplemental awards for Phase 3 based on project performance. As such, sites may be selected to advance to Phase 3 based on successful implementation of the sites' work plan developed in Phase 1 and progress made during Phase 2 to codify agreements that allow for sustainability. It is anticipated that Phase 3 may be funded through supplemental funding.
- Phase 3 grants would be used to:
  - Support a local Smart Pretrial site coordinator who will staff the local policy team
  - Reimburse local expenses for data collection
  - Support travel of the policy team to a 2-day Smart Pretrial Summit in Washington, D.C. or a like venue that will include developing video clips, etc., for use in webinars and trainings for other jurisdictions
  - Support travel for the local site coordinator to one other training or site visit
- Sites would be required to continue to participate in webinars to keep them current with research and best practices in both pretrial and systems reform.
- Sites would continue to be required to work collaboratively with the cross-site researcher and collect required data, and report quarterly. During Phase 3, the research partner will conduct an independent evaluation of the impact of the system change undertaken in Phase 2.

The BJA Project Coordinator will continue to coordinate technical assistance assets and sites will receive coaching and subject matter assistance from a consortium of providers, based on a site's work plan.

PJI will continue to oversee publication development and dissemination activities—documenting the process of the sites, the outcomes, and sharing that via the Pretrial Justice Working Group and others (publications, webinars, etc.)

BJA anticipates selecting two sites as “mentor sites” that will be supported to provide training and technical assistance and host teams from other jurisdictions.

### Data Analysis and Evaluation

SPDI will be assessed in three ways (BJA will support items 1 and 2):

1. The collection of baseline data (Phase 1) and comparison to post-initiative data (Phase 3)
2. An impact assessment conducted in Phase 3
3. A cost-benefit analysis. The Crime and Justice Institute is currently working on a cost-benefit analysis that will be available to SPDI sites.

#### 1. Collection of baseline data and comparison to post-initiative data

During Phase 1, the sites will be required to collect and analyze, with technical assistance, the following (not required in the application):

- Jail data
  - The number of jail admissions per year over the past 5 years (if possible, broken down by reason for admission; i.e., new charge, begin sentence, probation violation)
  - The average daily population over the year for each of the past 5 years (if possible, broken down by status; i.e. pretrial, probation violation or other hold, sentenced)
  - The average length of stay, by risk level
  - The average bond amounts per charge

- 1-day snapshot data:
  - The total number of defendants in jail today
  - Number of defendants in jail today on pretrial status
  - Number of defendants in jail today on probation or other holds
  - Number of defendants in jail today serving sentences
- Pretrial justice measures (all by risk level)
  - The number of arrestees screened using a field-based risk assessment tool
  - The number of arrestees eligible for the issuance of citations and the number cited
  - The number of arrestees eligible for release under delegated release authority and the number released
  - The percentage of those never booked who receive a court reminder
  - The percentage of defendants booked into the jail who were screened using a risk assessment instrument
  - The percentage of risk assessment results shared with the court, prosecutor, and defense counsel
  - The percentage of criminal cases reviewed by the prosecutor prior to initial appearance
  - The percentage of defendants with representation at initial appearance
  - The rate of concurrence with the risk score by the court
    - For all non-concurrence, percentage with a reason entered into the record
  - The percentage of defendants released and by type of release
    - The percentage of those released who receive a court reminder
  - The percentage of defendants held via preventive detention
  - The rates of compliance with court conditions of release
    - Court appearance rates
    - Technical violations
    - Rate of rearrest
    - Rate of rearrest for a violent crime
  - Percentage of supervision records that are made available to the sentencing court, prosecutor, defense counsel as well as any subsequent supervising authority
  - Court measures
    - Average length of case data (court processing times)
    - Average number of court hearings

## 2. Smart Pretrial impact assessment

As stated above, SPDI will have one researcher who will work across all three sites to conduct the impact assessment of SPDI systems change. The primary objective of a cross-site systems change evaluation is to test the viability of Smart Pretrial and to document factors that facilitated or inhibited its successful implementation across sites. In doing so, the initiative will seek to expand the knowledge base regarding effective pretrial justice system design.

A participatory action research framework will guide the cross-site implementation and systems change assessments. Assessment activities support measurement of systems change and generate relevant and timely information for the sites that would inform planning and implementation, as well as promote monitoring and sustainability. Assessment-related technical assistance will focus on building site capacity for self-assessment and outcome analysis activities.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> For a comprehensive understanding of this assessment model, see The Urban Institute's "Process and Systems Change Evaluation Findings from the Transition from Jail to the Community Initiative," 2012. Washington, DC.

### **3. Smart Pretrial cost-benefit analysis**

Currently, Community Resources for Justice's Crime and Justice Institute has a grant from the Public Welfare Foundation to develop a cost-benefit model for pretrial which will allow jurisdictions to analyze the impact of policy changes across pretrial decision points. This model will not attempt to monetize all the Key Elements of SPDI listed above, but will allow sites to explore the costs and benefits of moving from a cash-based/charge-based pretrial system to a risk-based pretrial system.

It is anticipated that the model will be completed mid-2014 and refined via site testing. By Phase 3 of this initiative, the model will be available for use by Smart Pretrial sites.

### **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; and
- 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. OJP's [CrimeSolutions.gov](http://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.

### **Amount and Length of Awards**

BJA anticipates that it will make up to 3 awards of up to \$200,000 each for a 24-month project period. The project start date should be on or after October 1, 2014.

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

### **Budget 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. The 2014 salary table for SES employees is available at [www.opm.gov/salary-tables](http://www.opm.gov/salary-tables). 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/funding/confcost.htm](http://www.ojp.gov/funding/confcost.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 of the OJP "Other Requirements for OJP Applications" web page at [www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other\\_requirements.htm](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm).

### **Match Requirement**

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.

### **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. Any award recipient will be required, post award, to provide the data requested in the “Data Grantee Provides” column so that OJP can

calculate values for the “Performance Measures” column. Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

**For Grantees in the Planning Stages**

Objectives	Performance Measures	Data Grantee Provides
<p>Establish a collaborative structure to guide the strategic, collaborative planning process and the design of a pretrial model to improve outcomes</p>	<p>Percent of local policy team components addressed</p>	<p>Number of <u>local policy team</u> components completed to include but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Established local policy team that includes members from multiple constituencies and systems</li> <li>B. Established a schedule for policy team and subcommittee meetings</li> <li>C. Defined relationships among local policy team members and their responsibilities through interagency agreements, memoranda of understanding, etc.</li> <li>D. Established long-term and short-term goals</li> <li>E. Secured personnel and other resources needed to achieve stated goals</li> </ul>
	<p>Percent of program design components addressed</p>	<p>Number of <u>program design</u> components completed, to include but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Devolved system-wide pretrial justice vision statement</li> <li>B. Developed a system-wide map of the front-end of their criminal justice system</li> <li>C. Developed agency-level logic model for implementation for each policy team member</li> <li>D. Identified how the initiative will improve pretrial outcomes</li> </ul>
	<p>Percent of eligibility and assessment components addressed</p>	<p>Number of <u>eligibility and assessment</u> components completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Established requirements for the development or selection of risk assessment tool</li> <li>B. Established procedure to be used for implementation of risk assessment, including location used and staff involved</li> <li>C. Established a plan to use risk assessment results to inform decisions</li> </ul>
	<p>Percent of data collection and analysis components addressed</p>	<p>Number of <u>data collection and analysis</u> components completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Identified process and impact data to be collected</li> <li>B. Established data collection plan</li> <li>C. Identified resources needed for data collection, including staff, funding, technology, and academic partnerships</li> </ul>

		D. Evaluation and monitoring plan established to monitor the impact of the initiative on the target population
--	--	--

**For Grantees in the Implementation Stage**

Objective	Measure	Data Grantee Provides
Implement, utilize and test the viability of pretrial risk assessment instruments and risk-based supervision strategies impact on pretrial outcomes and pretrial justice costs	Percentage of project work plan outcomes met	During the current reporting period: A. Number of total project tasks (complete or incomplete) B. Number of project tasks that were completed during the reporting period (Tasks: a grant activity defined in application project plan)
	Percentage increase in the number of defendants screened utilizing evidence-based risk assessment tool	A. Number of defendants (arrestees) screened utilizing research or evidence-based risk assessment tool six months prior to grant funding B. Number of defendants (arrestees) screened utilizing evidence-based risk assessment tool during current reporting period
	Percentage of time court's release or detain decision is informed by the risk score	A. Number of defendants' (arrestees) release informed by the outcome of the risk assessment B. Number of defendants' (arrestees) detention informed by the outcome of the risk assessment

OJP does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their applications. Instead, applicants should discuss in their application their proposed methods for collecting data for performance measures. Refer to the section "What an Application Should Include" on page 15 for additional information.

**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 “Other Requirements for OJP Applications” web page ([www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other\\_requirements.htm](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm)). Applicants whose proposals may involve a research or statistical component also should review the “Confidentiality” section on that web page.

## 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, and Budget Narrative. 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.

OJP strongly recommends that applicants use appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., “Program Narrative,” “Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative,” “Timelines,” “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).

### 2. Project Abstract

Applicants should provide a project abstract identifying the applicant’s name, title of the project, dollar amount requested. The abstract should include goals of the project, a description of the strategies to be used, a numerical listing of key/major deliverables, and coordination plans.

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.

As a separate attachment, the project abstract will **not** count against the page limit for the program narrative.

All project abstracts should follow the detailed template available at [www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/Project\\_Abstract\\_Template.pdf](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/Project_Abstract_Template.pdf).

**Permission to Share Project Abstract with the Public:** It is unlikely that BJA will be able to fund all promising applications submitted under this solicitation, but it may have the opportunity to share information with the public regarding promising but unfunded applications, for example, through a listing on a webpage available to the public. The intent of this public posting would be to allow other possible funders to become aware of such proposals.

In the project abstract template, applicants are asked to indicate whether they give OJP permission to share their project abstract (including contact information) with the public. Granting (or failing to grant) this permission will not affect OJP's funding decisions, and, if the application is not funded, granting permission will not guarantee that abstract information will be shared, nor will it guarantee funding from any other source.

**Note:** OJP may choose not to list a project that otherwise would have been included in a listing of promising but unfunded applications, should the abstract fail to meet the format and content requirements noted above and outlined in the project abstract template.

### 3. Program Narrative

The program narrative should be double-spaced, using standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins, and should not exceed 15 pages. Number pages "1 of 15", "2 of 15" 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. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures and SPDI's Baseline Data  
BJA does not require applicants to submit performance measures or baseline 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.

### 4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

#### a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at [www.ojp.gov/funding/forms/budget\\_detail.pdf](http://www.ojp.gov/funding/forms/budget_detail.pdf). Applicants that submit their budget in a

different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the OJP Financial Guide at [www.ojp.usdoj.gov/financialguide/index.htm](http://www.ojp.usdoj.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 [OJP Financial Guide](#).

**5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)**

Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a 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 assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, please contact the Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at [ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov](mailto: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.usdoj.gov/funding/pdfs/indirect\\_costs.pdf](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/pdfs/indirect_costs.pdf).

**6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)**

Tribes, tribal organizations, or third parties proposing to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in their applications a resolution, a letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that certifies that the applicant has the legal authority from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for a grant on behalf of a tribe or multiple specific tribes, the application should include appropriate legal documentation, as described above,

from all tribes that would receive services or assistance under the grant. A consortium of tribes for which existing consortium bylaws allow action without support from all tribes in the consortium (i.e., without an authorizing resolution or comparable legal documentation from each tribal governing body) may submit, instead, a copy of its consortium bylaws with the application.

Applicants unable to submit an application that includes a fully-executed (i.e., signed) copy of appropriate legal documentation, as described above, consistent with the applicable tribe's governance structure, should, at a minimum, submit an unsigned, draft version of such legal documentation as part of its application (except for cases in which, with respect to a tribal consortium applicant, consortium bylaws allow action without the support of all consortium member tribes). If selected for funding, BJA will make use of and access to funds contingent on receipt of the fully-executed legal documentation.

**7. Additional Attachments**

**a. Letter of Understanding and Commitment**

Applicants should include the required Letters of Understanding and Commitment from each member of the local policy team to be established or sustained under this grant program. Required members of the local policy team are listed on page 7.

**b. Timeline**

Include a comprehensive timeline that identifies milestones, numerically listed deliverables, and who is responsible for each activity (provide title and agency).

**c. 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; <a href="mailto:jane.doe@usdoj.gov">jane.doe@usdoj.gov</a>

HHS/ Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration	Drug Free Communities Mentoring Program/ North County Youth Mentoring Program	John Doe, 202/000-0000; <a href="mailto:john.doe@hhs.gov">john.doe@hhs.gov</a>
--	---	--

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.”).

### 8. Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire

Any applicant (other than an individual) that is a non-governmental entity and that has not received any award from OJP within the past 3 years must download, complete, and submit this [form](#).

## Selection Criteria

The following five selection criteria will be used to evaluate each application, with the different weight given to each based on the percentage value listed after each individual criteria. For example, the first criteria, “Statement of the Problem,” is worth 20 percent of the entire score in the application review process.

### 1. Statement of the Problem (20 percent of 100)

Describe the existence or absence of the Smart Pretrial Key Elements (see pages 6-7), and which of the key elements the jurisdiction seeks to address, which must include the two required key elements. Provide any known data to support the jurisdiction’s understanding of their existing pretrial justice system and any attempts to implement risk-based pretrial decision making in the past. This could include data pertaining to the current percentage of the jail population that is in a pretrial status, the failure to appear, and re-arrest rates for pretrial defendants.

### 2. Project Design and Implementation (15 percent of 100)

SPDI’s Phase 1 is a Planning Phase. Describe the jurisdiction’s understanding of, and ability to meet, the set of developmental milestones during Phase 1, as outlined below:

1. Establish a Pretrial Policy Team: With the guidance of BJA and the technical assistance providers, participating jurisdictions will form a multidisciplinary policy team where such a team is not already established. This team will serve as the focal point of the project.
2. Identification/Selection of a SPDI Site Coordinator: Each participating jurisdiction will identify an individual to lead the local effort. This individual will work closely with BJA and the technical assistance providers to coordinate all activities throughout the project. A job description is included in the appendix. Sites may choose to hire someone or reassign an existing employee to this role. **The hiring or reassignment of personnel for the SPDI local site coordinator requires BJA approval.** See “Award Special Conditions” on page 22.

3. Convene the Policy Team on a Regular Basis: Once established, policy teams will meet as a full team once a month for at least 2 hours. These meetings will be facilitated by a lead from the technical assistance provider, with support from the SPDI Site Coordinator. The policy team will have a specific set of project goals to accomplish during the course of these meetings (some of which are listed below). An early project activity will be for policy teams to develop a local work plan for the accomplishment of these over the course of the 1-year period.
4. Attend Site-Based and In-Person Trainings: The full policy team will attend a series of site-based (webinar and in person) trainings as well as a 2-day cross-site training event to be held in Washington, D.C. in December 2014.
5. Develop a System-wide Pretrial Justice Vision Statement: The full policy team will collaboratively develop a single vision statement reflecting the outcomes the pretrial justice component of the criminal justice system seeks to achieve.
6. Develop a Local System-wide Map: The policy team will develop a system-wide map of the front-end of their criminal justice system. This map will help all stakeholders understand the multiple points for the use of objective, risk-based decision making, and where diversion and supervision options (to include court reminders) can be introduced or strengthened.
7. Collect and Analyze Baseline Data: With the assistance of technical assistance providers, participating jurisdictions will collect and analyze data across agencies in support of measuring specified pretrial justice performance measures. Baseline data will be collected to both help the policy team diagnose the state of the pretrial system, and identify targets for improvements in key targets such as risk screening, case processing time, public safety, appearances in court, etc.
8. Engage Staff within each Criminal Justice System Agency: Through directed technical assistance, policy team members will engage staff at all levels of their individual organizations (beginning with mid-management and mid-level supervisors and, through successive events, engaging a sub-set of line staff) in activities designed to prepare for full pilot testing. These activities are designed to enhance staff members' knowledge, understanding and support for the core elements of a high-functioning and legally based pretrial justice system. As a part of this process, policy team members and their respective staff will conduct an assessment of their readiness for full implementation of a redesigned system, and develop an agency-level logic model for implementation.

### 3. Capabilities and Competencies (35 percent of 100)

Fully describe the applicant's capabilities to implement the project and the competencies of the staff assigned to the project by detailing the following:

- Commitment to work as a collaborative team and evidence of a pre-existing collaborative climate.
  - Requirements for Policy Team Membership: Commitment to participate must be demonstrated by, at a minimum, the following policymakers:
    - Director of Pretrial Services, Community Corrections/Chief Probation Officer (whichever is applicable to jurisdiction; SPDI does not require a standalone pretrial services program, department or agency)
    - Chief Judge
    - Chief Public Defender and/or Leadership from the Private Defense Bar

- Elected Prosecutor
- Jail Administrator or County Sheriff
- City Police Chief or other lead Law Enforcement Entity
- Elected County Official or County Executive
- Applications should describe a local process for orientating new members to the team, should elections or other staffing changes mean changes to the participants during Phase 1
- **Applications should include a letter of understanding and commitment signed by each of the stakeholders listed above. See page 18.**
- Commitment to develop and put into policy and practice a shared vision of the pretrial justice component of the criminal justice system.
- Commitment to put into practice research-supported evidence-based practices (e.g., use of empirically-based risk/needs assessment instruments, interventions matched to defendant's assessed level of risk to flee or be rearrested during their pretrial phase, best practices in terms of data collection, analysis and use).
- Individual with the role, credibility, and expertise to serve as the local SPDI site coordinator throughout the duration of the project or commitment to hire a SPDI site coordinator (i.e., working collaborating with BJA and its technical assistance providers, organizing and convening the policy team, facilitating timely and accurate communications between all parties, collecting data and information, preparing reports and presentations, facilitating meetings, etc.). **Hiring or reassignment of personnel for this position requires BJA approval. See Award Special Conditions on page 22.**

Describe previous attempts, successful or not, to undertake significant criminal justice reforms that worked to reduce jail populations and offer alternatives to traditional case processing (diversion, problem solving courts, crisis intervention teams). Provide sample agendas from those meetings, reports issues, outcomes measured.

**4. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures and SPDI's Baseline Data (20 percent of 100)**

Applicants must state their commitment to collaboratively work with the SPDI Researcher, sharing all required data.

Describe and provide evidence of the types and quality of data sources available to the agency to conduct appropriate analysis. Does the agency have access to multiple sources of data (both internal and external to the agency) specific to the identified problem? Does the agency have the ability to integrate data from different sources?

For the list of data required for this project see pages 9-10 in the Smart Pretrial Specific Information section.

**5. Budget (10 percent of 100)**

Provide a proposed budget and budget narrative that are complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should 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.<sup>10</sup> Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that if, in its

---

<sup>10</sup> Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that if, 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.

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.

Applicants should budget up to \$200,000 for 24 months (approximately \$100,000 a year) for the following during Phases 1 and 2:

- Costs for the hiring of a local SPDI site coordinator.
- Cost for local data collection.
- Travel/lodging expenses for seven-person policy team to attend two 2-day meetings during the 24-month project period. The meetings will be held in the Washington, D.C. or like venue.
- Travel/lodging expenses for the site coordinator to attend two other training events or model site visits during the 24 month period, TBD.

## **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. BJA may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to review the applications under this solicitation. 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. Applications that meet basic minimum requirements will be evaluated, scored, and rated by a peer review panel. Peer reviewers' ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only. 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, site visits, and available funding.

BJA may elect to conduct site feasibility visits prior to selecting any site for award.

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer, in consultation with BJA, reviews applications for potential discretionary awards to evaluate the fiscal integrity and financial capability of applicants, examines proposed costs to determine if the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs, and determines whether 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, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance, and available funding when making awards.

## **Other Important Information: Award Special Conditions**

Once awarded, each grant award will have in place a special condition withholding on all but \$50,000, which will allow grantees to engage in needed start-up meetings. Within 45 days of award acceptance date, sites must submit for approval the resume and supporting documentation of the proposed SPDI local site coordinator. BJA retains the right to reject any proposed site personnel.

Once approved, Phase 1 funding will be released (up to \$100,000 total).

Phase 2 funding (up to \$100,000, for a total grant amount not to exceed \$200,000) will be held until BJA approves of the Phase 2 work plan for implementation. BJA anticipates grantees will submit their plans no later than September 1, 2015, for an anticipated Phase 2 start date of no later than October 1, 2015.

## **Additional Requirements**

Applicants selected for awards must agree to comply with additional legal requirements upon acceptance of an award. OJP encourages applicants to review the information pertaining to these additional requirements prior to submitting an application. Additional information for each requirement can be found at [www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other\\_requirements.htm](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm).

- Civil Rights Compliance
- Civil Rights Compliance Specific to State Administering Agencies
- Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations
- Confidentiality
- Research and the Protection of Human Subjects
- Anti-Lobbying Act
- Financial and Government Audit Requirements
- Reporting of Potential Fraud, Waste, and Abuse and Similar Misconduct
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- DOJ Information Technology Standards (if applicable)
- Single Point of Contact Review
- Non-Supplanting of State or Local Funds
- Criminal Penalty for False Statements
- Compliance with [Office of Justice Programs Financial Guide](#)
- Suspension or Termination of Funding
- Non-profit Organizations
- For-profit Organizations
- Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)

- Rights in Intellectual Property
- Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) of 2006
- Awards in Excess of \$5,000,000 – Federal Taxes Certification Requirement
- SAM
- Policy and Guidance for Conference Approval, Planning, and Reporting
- OJP Training Guiding Principles for Grantees and Subgrantees

## 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](http://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 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. Grants.gov is designed to forward successfully submitted applications to OJP’s Grants Management System (GMS).**

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 ( . )	<b>When using the ampersand (&amp;) in XML, applicants must use the “&amp;amp;” format.</b>		

**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:

- 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](http://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](http://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/applicants/get\\_registered.jsp](http://www.grants.gov/applicants/get_registered.jsp).
- 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 this solicitation is 16.751, titled "Edward Byrne Memorial Competitive Grant Program," and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2014-3874.
- 6. Complete the Disclosure of Lobbying Activities.** All applicants must complete this information. Applicants that expend any funds for lobbying activities must provide the detailed information requested on the form *Disclosure of Lobbying Activities* (SF-LLL). Applicants that do not expend any funds for lobbying activities should enter "N/A" in the required highlighted fields.

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 an e-mail validation message from Grants.gov. The message will state whether the application has been received and 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 an application, BJA will review only the most recent valid version submitted.

### **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 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.usdoj.gov/funding/solicitations.htm](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/solicitations.htm).

### **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](mailto: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](mailto: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 2014 Smart Pretrial Demonstration Initiative**

This application checklist has been created to assist in developing an application.-

#### **What an Applicant Should Do:**

*Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Acquire a DUNs Number (see page 25)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 25)

*To Register with Grants.gov:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 25)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 25)

*To Find Funding Opportunity:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 25)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 25)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 24)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)

#### **General Requirements:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Review "[Other Requirements](#)" web page

#### **Scope Requirement:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$200,000.

#### **Eligibility Requirement:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Local or tribal (federally-recognized Indian tribal governments as determined by the Secretary of the Interior) government agencies.

#### **What an Application Should Include:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 15)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Project Abstract (see page 15)
- \_\_\_\_\_ \*Program Narrative (see page 16)
- \_\_\_\_\_ \*Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 16)
- \_\_\_\_\_ \*Budget Narrative (see page 17)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 11)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Read OJP policy and guidance on "conference" approval, planning, and reporting available at [www.ojp.gov/funding/confcost.htm](http://www.ojp.gov/funding/confcost.htm) (see page 12)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 25)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 17)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 17)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Additional Attachments
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Letter Affirming Assurances and Relevant Legislation (see page 18)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Memorandum of Understanding or Inter-Local Agreement (if applicable) (see page 18)

- \_\_\_\_\_ Timeline (see page 18)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 18)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire (if applicable) (see page 19)

\* NOTE: These elements are the basic minimum requirements for applications. Applications that do not include these elements shall neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration by BJA.

## APPENDIX

### POSITION

Local Smart Pretrial (SP) Site Coordinator

### POSITION PURPOSE

Under limited supervision, the SP site coordinator is responsible for the coordination and management of the local Smart Pretrial Demonstration Initiative. The SP site coordinator is charged with assisting the local policy team, as defined by the BJA Smart Pretrial Demonstration Initiative Request for Proposals, in the effort to reduce the inappropriate use of secure detention pretrial in a rational risk-based manner without compromising public safety through the implementation of the key elements of Smart Pretrial.

This is a grant-funded position for 2 years and is subject to the availability of funds for renewal beyond the initial 2-year period.

### Responsibilities

Become an expert in the purpose and use of secure detention and detention alternatives, as well as in the principles and language of Smart Pretrial reform. Learn to understand and anticipate the barriers to reform.

Work actively and collaboratively with Local Policy Team, PJI, and BJA.

Participate on the Local Policy Team and any Subcommittees, attending and facilitating meetings, providing information and guidance regarding strategies and pretrial justice best practices, and working to develop local policy and practice that achieve the goals of the Smart Pretrial Initiative.

Collect extensive data regarding justice processes and the population in the jail over time, including those released via any method in pretrial. Tasks include, but are not limited to, contributing to the development of appropriate methodologies (both quantitative and qualitative); reviewing court, detention, and program files; interviewing justice personnel; and developing, maintaining, and manipulating databases.

Prepare and present analytical reports and related information regarding the use, efficiency, and effectiveness of the local jail system; draw conclusions and explain results; help Local Policy Team identify where improvement is needed and the appropriate strategies for making those improvements.

Help monitor the progress of the Smart Pretrial Initiative. Document and track policies and practices implemented; contribute to the evaluation whether strategies implemented achieve intended outcomes; prepare related reports; make appropriate recommendations.

Serve as liaison between the Local Policy Team Committee, the Project Coordinator, and BJA, sharing information, addressing questions, and reporting progress.

Train/educate staff and system personnel in the principles of Smart Pretrial via one-on-one discussions, group presentations, and participation at conferences.

## **MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS**

1. Bachelor's degree in law enforcement, criminology, psychology or a related field. Master's degree preferred.
2. 15 years' experience in criminology, psychology, social work, probation/parole, or related experience.
3. Must possess the technical skills required for planning, communicating, implementing, and measuring changes to policies and procedures.
4. Must have knowledge of goals, practices and techniques of corrections.
5. Must have the ability to communicate effectively, in both oral and written English, and to develop and present information to diverse audiences at the community level.
6. Must have the ability to learn and apply the state statutes and other relevant laws and regulations.
7. Must have the ability to maintain effective relationships with funding agencies, councils, and the general public.
8. Must have the ability to assess and communicate project effectiveness utilizing appropriate evaluation methodologies including process and outcome methods.
9. Must have the knowledge of secure detention needs and gaps within the county.
10. Ability to think critically, analytically, and independently, as well as communicate effectively, in order to contribute to and lead discussions regarding strategies for system reform, and to help plan for and implement those strategies.
11. Ability to work productively and proactively without constant, direct supervision, and to manage time effectively.
12. Ability to work cooperatively, collaboratively, and diplomatically with a variety of key actors, and to facilitate challenging discussions and problem-solving.