

**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 funding under the Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction Program, also known as Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN). This program furthers the Department's mission and violent crime reduction strategy by providing support to state, local, and tribal efforts to reduce gun crime and gang-related violence.

# **Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction Program: (Project Safe Neighborhoods) FY 2017 Competitive Grant Announcement**

**Applications Due: March 28, 2017**

## **Eligibility**

Eligible applicants are PSN team fiscal agents for the United States Attorney Office districts and federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior). **All fiscal agents must be certified by the relevant U.S. Attorney's Office (USAO).** Eligible USAO-certified fiscal agents include states, units of local government, educational institutions, faith-based and other community organizations, private nonprofit organizations, and federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior). For details on the fiscal agent certification process, please visit [www.bja.gov/programs/psn/cert\\_process.html](http://www.bja.gov/programs/psn/cert_process.html).

**NOTE: If an applicant is not a fiscal agent that has received the required certification by its local USAO, its application will be summarily rejected.**

There are categories for small, medium, and large districts as well as for federally recognized American Indian and Alaska Native tribes and/or tribal organizations. Applicants may only apply to one category. The categories are:

Category 1: USAO district populations of 5 million or more.

Category 2: USAO district populations of 2 million–4,999,999.

Category 3: USAO district populations under 2 million.

Category 4: Federally recognized American Indian tribes and Alaska Native tribes and/or tribal organizations. Tribes and tribal organizations must coordinate their application with the local USAO as well as provide a letter of certification from the local USAO for their application.

BJA may elect to fund applications submitted under this FY 2017 solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other considerations, the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

For information on eligibility, 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 March 28, 2017.

To be considered timely, an application must be submitted by the application deadline using Grants.gov, and the applicant must have received a validation message from Grants.gov that indicates successful and timely submission. OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date, in order to allow time for the applicant 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.

OJP encourages all applicants 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 email to [support@grants.gov](mailto:support@grants.gov). The [Grants.gov](#) Support Hotline operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must email the contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** in order to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears 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 800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email [grants@ncjrs.gov](mailto:grants@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 solicitation: BJA-2017-11482

Release date: January 11, 2017

## Contents

A. Program Description .....	4
Overview .....	4
Program-Specific Information .....	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables .....	8
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices .....	9
B. Federal Award Information.....	9
Type of Award.....	10
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls.....	11
Budget Information.....	11
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement .....	11
Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs).....	11
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver .....	12
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs .....	13
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable) .....	13
C. Eligibility Information.....	13
D. Application and Submission Information .....	13
What an Application Should Include .....	13
How to Apply.....	27
E. Application Review Information.....	30
Review Criteria.....	30
Review Process .....	33
F. Federal Award Administration Information .....	34
Federal Award Notices .....	34
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements .....	34
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements .....	35
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s) .....	36
H. Other Information.....	36
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a).....	36
Provide Feedback to OJP .....	36
Application Checklist .....	38

# Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction Program: (Project Safe Neighborhoods) CFDA # 16.609

## A. Program Description

### Overview

BJA's "Smart Suite" of programs invests in the development of practitioner-researcher partnerships that use data, evidence, and innovation to create strategies and interventions that are effective and economical. This data-driven approach enables jurisdictions to understand the full nature and extent of the crime challenges they are facing and to direct resources to the highest priorities. The Smart Suite of programs, which includes Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN), 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.

PSN is designed to create safer neighborhoods through a sustained reduction in gang violence and gun crime. The program's effectiveness is based on the cooperation and partnerships of local, state, and federal agencies engaged in a unified approach led by the U.S. Attorney (USA) in each district. The USA is responsible for establishing a collaborative PSN team of federal, state, and local law enforcement and other community members to implement gang violence and gun crime enforcement, intervention, outreach, and prevention initiatives within the district. Through the PSN team, the USA will implement the five design features of PSN—partnerships, strategic planning, training, outreach, and accountability—to address specific gun crime and gang violence, in the most violent neighborhoods. Details on the five design features (also referred to as core elements) can be found on pages 5-7.

The PSN Program continues to be a competitive-based program. In a competitive environment, "need" and use of more effective, intelligence- and data-driven strategies will be key factors for funding selections, in addition to performance results and other factors. Therefore, grant awards for FY 2017 will be made through a competitive process to encourage and focus funding on high-performing and evidence-based programs where the need is greatest and where the most violent neighborhoods, within districts, are being addressed.

**Statutory Authority:** Any awards under this solicitation would be made under statutory authority provided by a full-year appropriations act for FY 2017. As of the writing of this solicitation, the Department of Justice is operating under a short-term "Continuing Resolution"; no full-year appropriation for the Department has been enacted for FY 2017.

### Program-Specific Information

An evaluation of PSN, funded by the National Institute of Justice and conducted by Michigan State University (MSU),<sup>1</sup> found that:

---

<sup>1</sup> McGarrell, E.F., et al. February 2009. "Project Safe Neighborhoods—A National Program to Reduce Gun Crime: Final Project Report." Final Report submitted to the National Institute of Justice. Washington, D.C.: Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

- PSN target cities achieved a 4.1 percent decline in violent crime compared to 0.9 percent decline in non-target cities.
- Of the PSN sites for which case studies were conducted, 8 out of 10 experienced statistically significant reductions in violent crime, ranging from 2 percent to 42 percent.

Research<sup>2</sup> has also shown that PSN has been associated with:

- 17 percent decrease in gun crime victimization in Detroit.<sup>3</sup>
- Reductions in re-offending among the parolees attending call-in forums in Chicago.<sup>4</sup>
- 31 percent reduction in shootings involving gangs in Boston.<sup>5</sup>

In their evaluation, MSU identified the following key factors for success: USAO leadership, cross-agency buy-in, strong integration of research partners, and the flexibility of the program to adjust to the realities of individual jurisdictions. Because there are significant differences among U.S. communities in the level and nature of gun crime and/or gang violence, PSN needs to be able to adapt to the unique circumstances of each local jurisdiction. The PSN evaluation findings also suggested that the likelihood of success of a PSN strategy improved if it incorporated and implemented the following design features with greater fidelity.

### **Required PSN Design Features**

*There are five PSN design features that all PSN grant applicants must address in their application. The five design features are:*

#### **1. Partnerships**

The PSN program is focused on increasing partnerships between federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies to identify and reduce gun crime and gang violence. PSN is also focused on increasing the partnerships with many elements of the local community. Coordinated by the U.S. Attorney's Office, the PSN team typically includes both federal and local prosecutors, federal law enforcement agencies (ATF, DEA, FBI, and U.S. Marshals), local and state law enforcement agencies, and probation and parole. PSN also has found to be essential the inclusion of local government leaders, social service providers, neighborhood leaders, members of the faith community, business leaders, and health care providers.

#### **2. Strategic Planning and Research Integration**

PSN is a strategic problem-solving<sup>6</sup> program, based on a strategic planning process<sup>7</sup> in which jurisdictions should define the specific components of their gun crime and/or gang violence problems with the help of proactive data analysis, research data, and focused strategies to target the identified problems through enforcement, prosecution, deterrence, community outreach/engagement and intervention/prevention. Recognizing that crime problems, including

<sup>2</sup> Please visit Appendix B, for additional PSN-related research information.

<sup>3</sup> McGarrell, E.F., Circo, G., and J. Rydberg. (2015). *Detroit Project Safe Neighborhoods: Final Project Report*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan Justice Statistics Center, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University.

<sup>4</sup> Wallace, Danielle, Andrew V. Papachristos, Tracey Meares, and Jeffrey Fagan. (2015). "Desistance and Legitimacy: The Impact of Offender Notification Meetings on Recidivism among High Risk Offenders." *Justice Quarterly*. DOI: [10.1080/07418825.2015.1081262](https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2015.1081262)

<sup>5</sup> Braga, A.A., Hureau, D.M., & Papachristos, A.V. (2014). "Deterring Gang-Involved Gun Violence: Measuring the Impact of Boston's Operation Ceasefire on Street Gang Behavior." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 30:113-139.

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/SPS\\_Model.pdf](http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/SPS_Model.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> Please see the PSN Strategic Action Plan template at: <http://www.psnmsu.com/psn-resources/>

gun crime and gang violence, illegal drug sales and distribution, as well as other related violent crime, vary from community to community across the United States, PSN includes a commitment to tailor the program to the local crime issue and to be data-informed and evidence-based.

Specifically, PSN requires the inclusion of a local research partner to work with the PSN team to analyze the local crime problem and help develop a proactive plan for gun crime and gang violence reduction. The goal for the research partner is to assist the team through analysis of crime patterns and trends that could help the team focus resources on the most serious people, places, and contexts of the violent crime problem. The research partner should help the team make sure they are following the approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) and bring evidence-based practices to the team discussions of gun crime and gang violence reduction strategies. The inclusion of the research partner is also intended to assist in the ongoing assessment of data in order to provide feedback to the team. The 2009 evaluation report of PSN suggested a PSN team that integrated research partners and available data into its decision making matrix to a greater extent improved the effectiveness of the PSN strategy. MSU found that overall, PSN teams appeared to operate more effectively when they consistently obtained quality data from reliable research partners. As such, applicants must set aside a **minimum of 20 percent** of their proposed budget to directly support the research partner (or a team of researchers) for the PSN team.

Note: George Mason University's Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy (CEBCP), has developed an e-Consortium for University Centers and Researchers for Partnership with Justice Practitioners. The purpose of this e-Consortium is to provide a resource to local, state, federal, and other groups who seek to collaborate with nearby (or other) university researchers and centers on partnerships and projects that are mutually beneficial. Access the e-Consortium at <http://gmuconsortium.org/>. There is also a list of researchers, along with their focus areas, listed on the Crime and Justice Research Alliance website: <http://crimeandjusticeresearchalliance.org/experts/>.

For information on identifying and working with a Research Partner, please visit:

<http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/ResearchPartnerQ&A.pdf>

### **3. Training and Technical Assistance**

A core component of PSN is its provision of available training opportunities to PSN teams to assist them in the effective implementation of the critical components identified in their approved Strategic Action Plans. PSN teams can request<sup>8</sup> training and technical assistance in a number of areas, including:

- Strategic Planning
- Gun Crime Investigations
- Crime Gun Identification and Tracing
- Strategic Problem Solving
- Social Network Analysis
- Community Policing and Procedural Justice
- Characteristics of an Armed person
- Drug Market Intervention
- Safety in Search and Seizure

---

<sup>8</sup> To request training or technical assistance, PSN teams will need to complete and submit the PSN TTA request form, located at: [https://www.bja.gov/Programs/PSN/psn\\_ta\\_request\\_frm.pdf](https://www.bja.gov/Programs/PSN/psn_ta_request_frm.pdf)

- Group Violence Intervention
- Trauma-Informed Practices
- Community Outreach and Engagement
- Basic and Advanced Gang Investigations
- Using Data and Crime Analysis to be more Strategic
- Identifying, Selecting, and Implementing Evidence-Based Practices
- Effective Prosecution of Gun and Gang Cases
- Building Trust in the Community
- Sustainability

#### **4. Outreach**

PSN teams should be sending a deterrent message to those at risk to commit a gun crime or become involved in gang violence, with simultaneous promotion of educational, intervention/prevention, reentry, and employment alternatives. The inclusion of community partners, service providers, the faith community, and other local partners can help provide additional resources for the development of prevention and intervention programs geared toward reducing gun crime and gang violence. Community-based prevention programs aimed at the children or younger siblings of gun offenders could potentially yield long-term prevention benefits. Faith-based or victim advocate intervention with shooting victims can possibly prevent retaliation. Mentoring and job placement programs for formerly incarcerated persons could provide important resources for individuals returning to the community from prison. The inclusion of community members and community leaders could be crucial to establishing legitimacy and support for PSN.

#### **5. Accountability, Data Analysis, and Data-informed Efforts**

This element emphasizes that PSN teams will collect and analyze data to focus on outcomes—i.e., reduced gun crime, reduced gang violence, —as opposed to a focus on outputs such as arrests and cases prosecuted. That is, PSN’s success is ultimately measured by the reduction in violent crime, specifically gun crime and gang violence. This accountability component is linked to strategic planning whereby PSN teams, working with their local research partner, are asked to monitor crime data over time as related to the targeted problems and/or targeted areas.

#### **Leveraging Other Resources in FY 2017 and Beyond**

PSN should be a part of an *overall comprehensive violence reduction, public safety, and community engagement strategy*. Applicants are encouraged to leverage other federal grant dollars and existing resources already in the community, and to partner with a research partner to conduct an assessment<sup>9</sup> of the PSN initiative. This may help to strengthen and sustain the PSN initiative.

#### **Assistance of BJA’s Training and Technical Assistance Providers**

Successful applicants will work closely with BJA’s national PSN training and technical assistance (TTA) partners, to assist them with incorporating intelligence-led, research-based policing as a fundamental element in their response to crime. A listing of current PSN TTA providers can be found at:

[https://www.bja.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?Program\\_ID=74#horizontalTab3](https://www.bja.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?Program_ID=74#horizontalTab3)

Information about BJA’s National Training and Technical Assistance Center can be found at:

---

<sup>9</sup> The PSN team should work with their research partner to determine the most appropriate assessment(s).

<https://www.bjatrainiq.org/>

### **Deconfliction and Officer Safety**

Consistent with the Department of Justice's priority on officer safety, PSN teams should note that PSN funding can be used to address critical law enforcement officer safety concerns related to PSN target areas and activities. This includes identifying specific officer safety threats through improved analytic capabilities locally or through the relevant state and local fusion center, improved situational awareness and information sharing, providing needed training, and protective equipment<sup>10</sup> for state, local, and tribal officers not otherwise available.<sup>11</sup> Applicants must demonstrate a direct nexus to PSN in order for these expenses to be considered.

It is also strongly encouraged that PSN team enforcement operations/events (e.g., surveillance, warrant service, undercover operations, take downs, and staging areas, etc.) be deconflicted through the DOJ-funded RISSafe Deconfliction System and other no-cost systems where applicable. More on RISSafe can be found at [www.riss.net/Resources/RISSafe](http://www.riss.net/Resources/RISSafe).

### **Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables**

The purpose of PSN is to reduce gun crime and gang violence by employing a research-driven, intelligence-led, and strategic problem-solving approach to reducing firearm crimes and gang violence through enforcement, prosecution, deterrence, community outreach/engagement and intervention/prevention. BJA is seeking proposals from U.S. Attorney certified fiscal agents interested in developing innovative, comprehensive, data-informed approaches to reduce chronic gun crime and/or gang violence in their proposed jurisdiction. Please work with your research partner to determine the most appropriate violence reduction strategy for your jurisdiction.

#### Objectives:

- Establish and expand evidence-based programming in PSN teams that enables them to effectively and sustainably prevent and respond to gun crime and gang violence.
- Establish sustainable research partnerships that are integrated into the strategic and tactical operations of PSN teams and community agencies.
- Foster effective and consistent collaborations within police agencies, with external agencies, and the communities in which they serve that increase public safety and minimize gun crime and gang violence.
- Create and maintain coordination among federal, state, local and tribal law enforcement officials, with an emphasis on prevention, tactical intelligence gathering, more vigorous and strategic prosecutions of gun crime and gang violence, and enhanced accountability.

This program's required deliverables are:

- Have the PSN team complete the Violence Reduction Assessment Tool (VRAT)<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> Please review the Law Enforcement Equipment Working Group policies before including this request in your application, [https://www.bja.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?Program\\_ID=118](https://www.bja.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?Program_ID=118)

<sup>11</sup> In terms of information sharing, training and equipment, applicants should note that the DOJ-funded Regional Information Sharing Systems (RISS) Program provides state, local, tribal, and federal law enforcement agencies with secure methods for sharing criminal intelligence information, no-cost analytic services, training and loans of specialized investigative equipment and confidential funds. RISS membership fees are allowable costs under this program. More on RISS can be found at [www.riss.net](http://www.riss.net).

<sup>12</sup> The Violence Reduction Assessment Tool (VRAT) is a planning and support instrument that allows communities to assess their capacity for effective implementation and to identify concrete action steps to increase their capacity to

- Complete a SAP.<sup>13</sup> The SAP is produced by the grantee at the outset of each award, which includes the project's problem analysis; violence reduction strategy; strategy development and modification; organizational changes, innovations, and improved practices; police agency-research relationships and integration. The action plan is envisioned as a product of collaboration among the PSN team. The information from the VRAT can help each grantee complete the SAP.
- Periodic reports, presentations, and briefings for the PSN team and community members.
- A final analysis report of the project's implementation and outcomes produced by the research partner and submitted to BJA at the conclusion of the project.

The Goals, Objectives and Deliverables are directly related to the performance measures set out in the table in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), under "Program Narrative."

### **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](http://www.crimesolutions.gov) website 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**

BJA expects to make up to 12 awards of up to \$200,000-\$500,000 each (depending on the Category) for an estimated 24-month project period, beginning on Oct 1, 2017.

---

adopt evidence-based practices. The VRAT has been developed by Michigan State University (MSU) under a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). Individual feedback and potentially team feedback will be provided upon completion of the VRAT. It is recommended that participants represent the various sectors of your team—law enforcement, prosecution, other criminal justice partners, social services, community, research partner, and other stakeholders as appropriate for your initiative. <http://www.psnmsu.com/vrat/>

<sup>13</sup>Strategic Action Plans must address: problem analysis; violence reduction strategy; strategy development and modification; organizational changes, innovations, and improved practices; police agency-research relationships and integration. SAP template available at: <http://www.psnmsu.com/psn-resources/>

- Category 1 (Competition ID: BJA-2017-12380): USAO district populations of 5 million or more. Contingent upon the availability of funds, awards of up to \$500,000 will be made.
- Category 2 (Competition ID: BJA-2017-12381): USAO district populations of 2 million–4,999,999. Contingent upon the availability of funds, awards of up to \$350,000 will be made.
- Category 3 (Competition ID: BJA-2017-12382): USAO district populations under 2 million. Contingent upon the availability of funds, awards of up to \$200,000 will be made.
- Category 4 (Competition ID: BJA-2017-12383): Federally recognized American Indian tribes and Alaska Native tribes, and/or tribal organizations. Contingent upon the availability of funds, awards of up to \$200,000 may be made.

Applicants selected to receive funding will have 3 to 6 months to complete the Violence Reduction Assessment Tool (VRAT) and fully develop their PSN Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that describes their 2-year implementation and evaluation strategy. The SAP will be developed concurrently during the implementation period. An applicant's PSN project implementation and *access to all award funding* are contingent upon the BJA's approval of its SAP. Additionally, as part of the SAP development, all applicants selected should identify potential gaps or training needs associated with their project. Once the gaps or training needs are identified, a review of PSN TTA providers and resources and the BJA National Training and Technical Assistance Center (NTTAC)<sup>14</sup> resources should be conducted to identify possible solutions to the gaps or training needs.

BJA may, in certain cases, provide additional funding in future years to awards made under this solicitation, through supplemental awards. In making decisions regarding supplemental awards, OJP will consider, among other factors, the availability of appropriations, OJP's strategic priorities, and OJP's assessment of both the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and 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**

BJA expects that any award under this solicitation will be made in the form of a grant. See [Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for a brief discussion of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants.

---

<sup>14</sup>The BJA NTTAC works to improve the criminal justice system by providing rapid, expert, coordinated, and data-driven TTA to support practitioners in the effort to reduce crime, recidivism, and unnecessary confinement in state, local, and tribal communities. The BJA NTTAC web site can be found at: <https://www.bjatrain.org/>.

## Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities<sup>15</sup>) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements<sup>16</sup> as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

- (a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the Federal award that provides reasonable assurance that [the recipient (and any subrecipient)] 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 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 recipient’s (and any subrecipient’s)] compliance with statutes, 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 recipient (or any subrecipient)] considers sensitive consistent with applicable Federal, state, local, and tribal laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

To help ensure that applicants understand applicable administrative requirements and cost principles, OJP encourages prospective applicants to enroll, at no charge, in the DOJ Grants Financial Management Online Training, available [here](#).

## Budget Information

### Cost Sharing or 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.

### Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)

Pre-agreement costs are costs incurred by the applicant prior to the start date of the period of performance of the federal award.

---

<sup>15</sup> For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (“subgrant”) to a subrecipient (“subgrantee”) to carry out part of the funded award or program.

<sup>16</sup> The “Part 200 Uniform Requirements” means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

OJP does **not** typically approve pre-agreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. All such costs incurred prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of the applicant. (Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs.) Should there be extenuating circumstances that make it appropriate for OJP to consider approving pre-agreement costs, the applicant may contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this solicitation for the requirements concerning written requests for approval. If approved in advance by OJP, award funds may be used for pre-agreement costs, consistent with the recipient's approved budget and applicable cost principles. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#) for more information.

### **Approval of Strategic Action Plan**

Each award recipient must submit a Strategic Action Plan (SAP) for review. Grantees and subgrantees should not incur costs until the SAP is approved.

Note: Award recipients should not commit any funds to subgrantees, especially for hiring personnel, until BJA approves the recipient's final post-award SAP. In some instances, final BJA approval may not occur until months after the award announcement, and funds will not be dispersed to the grantee until the SAP is approved.

### **Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver**

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% 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.<sup>17</sup> The 2017 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management [website](#). 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. (Non-federal funds used for any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds, where match requirements apply.) If only a portion of an employee's time is charged to an OJP award, the maximum allowable compensation is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

The Assistant Attorney General for OJP may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, this limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant that requests a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of its application. An applicant that does not submit a waiver request and justification with its application should anticipate that OJP will require the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

The justification should address -- in the context of the work the individual would do under the award -- the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of a service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the proposed program or project, and a statement that explains whether and how the individual's salary under the award would be commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work he/she would do under the award.

---

<sup>17</sup> OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed in Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

### **Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs**

OJP strongly encourages every applicant that proposes to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity (or similar event) to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP and DOJ policy and guidance on approval, planning, and reporting of such events, available at

[www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm](http://www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.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 conference, meeting, and training costs for cooperative agreement recipients, as well as some conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, which include 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 "Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards" in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

## **C. Eligibility Information**

For eligibility information, see the title page.

For information on cost sharing or match requirements, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

## **D. Application and Submission Information**

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

This section describes in detail what an application should include. An applicant should anticipate that if it fails to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may negatively affect the review of its application; and, should a decision be made to make an award, it may result in the inclusion of award conditions that preclude the recipient from accessing or using award funds until the recipient satisfies the conditions and OJP makes the funds available.

Moreover, an applicant should anticipate that an application that OJP determines is nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that OJP determines does not include the application elements that BJA has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review, nor receive further consideration. For this solicitation, BJA has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Abstract, Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and an **Approval "certification" letter from the relevant U.S. Attorney**. An applicant 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](#) (below) 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,” “Timelines,” “Memoranda of Understanding,” “Résumés”) for all attachments. Also, OJP recommends that applicants include résumés 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 the OJP 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).

To avoid processing delays, an applicant must include an accurate legal name on its SF-424. Current OJP award recipients, when completing the field for “Legal Name,” should use the same legal name that appears on the prior year award document which is also the legal name stored in OJP’s financial system. On the SF-424, enter the Legal Name in box 5 and Employer Identification Number (EIN) in box 6 exactly as it appears on the prior year award document. An applicant with current active award(s) must ensure that its GMS profile is current. If the profile is not current, the applicant should submit a Grant Adjustment Notice updating the information on its GMS profile prior to applying under this solicitation.

A new applicants should enter the Official Legal Name and address of the applicant entity in box 5 and the EIN in box 6 of the SF-424. Applicants must attach official legal documents to its applications (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501C3, etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424.

**Intergovernmental Review:** This solicitation (“funding opportunity”) is subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). An applicant may find the names and addresses of State Single Points of Contact (SPOCs) at the following website: [www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants\\_spoc/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_spoc/). If the State appears on the SPOC list, the applicant must contact the State SPOC to find out about, and comply with, the State’s process under E.O. 12372. In completing the SF-424, an applicant whose State appears on the SPOC list is to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 once the applicant has complied with its State E.O. 12372 process. (An applicant whose State does not appear on the SPOC list should answer question 19 by selecting the response 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 (such as 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 [ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf](http://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf).

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

In the project abstract template, each applicant is asked to indicate whether it gives OJP permission to share the applicant's project abstract (including contact information for individuals) with the public. Granting (or failing to grant) this permission will not affect OJP's funding decisions. Moreover, if the application is not funded, providing permission will not ensure that OJP will share the abstract information, nor will it assure funding from any other source.

**Note:** OJP may choose not to list a project that otherwise would have been included in a listing of 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 must respond to the solicitation (see Program-Specific Information on pages 4-7) and the Selection Criteria (1-4). The program narrative should be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins, and should not exceed 25 pages. Number pages "1 of 25," "2 of 25," 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. Applicants are encouraged to incorporate information about their overall violence reduction strategy and how the PSN award will enhance that strategy.

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative<sup>18</sup>:

- 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

---

<sup>18</sup> For information on subawards (including the details on proposed subawards that should be included in the application), see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

OJP will require each successful applicant to submit specific performance measures data as part of its reporting under the award (see “[General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements](#)” in [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#)). The performance measures correlate to the goals, objectives, and deliverables identified under "Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables" in [Section A. Program Description](#).

The application should describe the applicant's plan for collection of all of the performance measures data listed in the table below under “Data Recipient Provides,” should it receive funding.

Post award, recipients will be required to submit quarterly performance metrics through BJA’s online Performance Measurement Tool (PMT), located at [www.bjaperformancetools.org](http://www.bjaperformancetools.org). Applicants should review the complete list of PSN Program performance measures at: <https://bjaperformancetools.csrincorporated.com/help/PSNMeasures.pdf>.

Objective	Catalog ID	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
Establish and expand evidence-based programming in teams that enables them to effectively and sustainably prevent and respond to gun and gang crime.	146	Percentage of grantees integrating PSN into their organization’s daily activities	Baseline: Number of grantees (Data provided by BJA)
			List of Strategic Action Plan Items
	393	Number of personnel who received training	Number of personnel who received training by training area and personnel type
	512	Percentage of grantees reporting <u>positive</u> impact of program  Percentage of grantees reporting a <u>negative</u> impact of program  Percentage of grantees reporting a <u>neutral</u> impact of program	Baseline: Number of grantees (Data provided by BJA)  List of quantitative measures tracked to determine impact  Impact of response on problem area of focus (positive, negative, or neutral)
	630	Percentage of PSN sites performing data analysis	Baseline: Number of PSN sites (Data provided by BJA)  Indicate (by type) A. the personnel conducting data analysis for the PSN program B. the data sources used in conducting data analysis for the PSN program C. data analysis conducted to inform the work of the PSN site task force D. the PSN program activities inform by the data analysis

Establish sustainable research partnerships that are integrated into the strategic and tactical operations of police agencies.	410	Percentage of PSN sites with completed strategic action plans	Baseline: Number of PSN sites (Data provided by BJA)  Indicate whether your PSN task force completed all activities in your site's Strategic Action Plan  Indicate the status of each Strategic Action Plan activity
	630	Percentage of PSN sites that have completed a problem analysis	Indicate whether the problem analysis was completed
	266	Percent change in number of reports/products provided by researcher	Indicate activities performed by research partner in support of the program  Indicate types of data used in support of the program  Number of products provided by research partner
Foster effective and consistent collaborations within police agencies, with external agencies, and with the communities in which they serve to increase public safety and minimize gun and gang crime.	243	Percent change in number/type of working group partners	Baseline: Number of working group partners by type prior to PSN implementation or establishment  Indicate working group partners actively involved in the PSN program
	146	Percentage of grantees holding partnership meetings	Baseline: Number of grantees (Data provided by BJA)  Indicate how often your PSN task force held organized meetings
	242	Percentage of grantees with partners that are actively involved in the program	Baseline: Number of grantees (Data provided by BJA)  Partner's level of active involvement rated on a 1-5 scale
	141	Percentage of grantees that are involved in community events	Baseline: Number of grantees (Data provided by BJA)  Indicate how often the PSN task force was involved in community activities (by type)
Create and maintain coordination among federal, state, local and tribal law enforcement	449	Percentage of PSN task forces conducting coordination activities	Indicate activities the task force carried out

officials, with an emphasis on prevention, tactical intelligence gathering, more vigorous and strategic prosecutions of gun and gang crimes, and enhanced accountability.	630	Percentage of grantees using data to inform project activities	Indicate whether your task force has a subcommittee that work on assigned PSN tasks Baseline: Number of grantees (Data provided by BJA)
	84	Percentage of grantees utilizing evidence-based responses	Indicate the data types used in analysis Indicate the project activities informed by data analysis Baseline: Number of grantees (Data provided by BJA)
	378	Percentage of PSN sites providing direct services as part of the PSN initiative	Indicate the evidence-based models supporting response activities Baseline: Number of PSN sites (Data provided by BJA) Indicate the direct services provided
Develop and enhance neighborhood development, education and school-based prevention programs targeting the reduction of gun and gang crime.	84	Percentage of grantees using crime prevention models/strategies	Baseline: Number of grantees (Data provided by BJA) Indicate by type the crime prevention models/strategies used in the PSN site
	141	Percentage of grantees that are involved in community events	Indicate how often the PSN task force was involved in community activities (by type)

### Note on Project Evaluations

An applicant that proposes to use award funds 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.” Each applicant should provide sufficient information for OJP to determine whether the particular project it proposes would either intentionally or unintentionally collect and/or use information in such a way that it meets the DOJ definition of research that appears at 28 C.F.R. Part 46 (“Protection of Human Subjects”).

Research, for purposes of human subjects protection 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 for purposes of human subjects protection, applicants should consult the decision tree in the “Research and the protection of human subjects” section of the [“Requirements related to Research”](#) web page of the "Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017," available through the [OJP Funding Resource](#)

[Center](#). Every prospective applicant whose application may propose a research or statistical component also should review the “Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements” section on that web page.

#### **4. Budget and Associated Documentation**

##### **a. Budget Detail Worksheet**

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at [www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf](http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf). An applicant that submits its budget in a different format should use the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should break out costs by year.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).

##### **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).

An applicant should demonstrate in its budget narrative how it will maximize cost effectiveness of award 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 budget narrative should be mathematically sound and correspond clearly 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 those costs are necessary 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 describe costs by year.

##### **c. Information on Proposed Subawards (if any), as well as on Proposed Procurement Contracts (if any)**

Applicants for OJP awards typically may propose to make "subawards." Applicants also may propose to enter into procurement "contracts" under the award.

Whether -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- a particular agreement between a recipient and a third party will be considered a "subaward" or instead considered a procurement "contract" under the award is determined by federal rules and applicable OJP guidance. It is an important distinction, in part because the federal administrative rules and requirements that apply to "subawards" and to procurement "contracts" under awards differ markedly.

In general, the central question is the relationship between what the third-party will do under its agreement with the recipient and what the recipient has committed (to OJP) to do under its award to further a public purpose (e.g., services the recipient will provide, products it will

develop or modify, research or evaluation it will conduct). If a third party will provide some of the services the recipient has committed (to OJP) to provide, will develop or modify all or part of a product the recipient has committed (to OJP) to develop or modify, or will conduct part of the research or evaluation the recipient has committed (to OJP) to conduct, OJP will consider the agreement with the third party a subaward for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements.

This will be true **even if** the recipient, for internal or other non-federal purposes, labels or treats its agreement as a procurement, a contract, or a procurement contract. Neither the title nor the structure of an agreement determines whether the agreement -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- is a "subaward" or is instead a procurement "contract" under an award.

Additional guidance on the circumstances under which (for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements) an agreement constitutes a subaward as opposed to a procurement contract under an award, is available (along with other resources) on the [OJP Part 200 Uniform Requirements](#) web page.

## **1. Information on proposed subawards**

A recipient of an OJP award may not make subawards ("subgrants") unless the recipient has specific federal authorization to do so. Unless an applicable statute or DOJ regulation specifically authorizes (or requires) subawards, a recipient must have authorization from OJP before it may make a subaward.

A particular subaward may be authorized by OJP because the recipient included a sufficiently-detailed description and justification of the proposed subaward in the application as approved by OJP. If, however, a particular subaward is not authorized by federal statute or regulation, and is not sufficiently described and justified in the application as approved by OJP, the recipient will be required, post-award, to request and obtain written authorization from OJP before it may make the subaward.

If an applicant proposes to make one or more subawards to carry out the federal award and program, the applicant should (1) identify (if known) the proposed subrecipient(s), (2) describe in detail what each subrecipient will do to carry out the federal award and federal program, and (3) provide a justification for the subaward(s), with details on pertinent matters such as special qualifications and areas of expertise. Pertinent information on subawards should appear not only in the Program Narrative, but also in the Budget Detail Worksheet and budget narrative.

## **2. Information on proposed procurement contracts (with specific justification for proposed noncompetitive contracts over \$150,000)**

Unlike a recipient contemplating a subaward, a recipient of an OJP award generally does not need specific prior federal authorization to enter into an agreement that -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- is considered a procurement contract, **provided that** (1) the recipient uses its own documented procurement procedures and (2) those procedures conform to applicable federal law, including the Procurement Standards of the (DOJ) Part 200 Uniform Requirements (as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.317 - 200.326). The Budget Detail Worksheet and budget narrative should identify proposed procurement

contracts. (As discussed above, subawards must be identified and described separately from procurement contracts.)

The Procurement Standards in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, however, reflect a general expectation that agreements that (for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements) constitute procurement “contracts” under awards will be entered into on the basis of full and open competition. If a proposed procurement contract would exceed the simplified acquisition threshold -- currently, \$150,000 -- a recipient of an OJP award may not proceed without competition unless and until the recipient receives specific advance authorization from OJP to use a non-competitive approach for the procurement.

An applicant that (at the time of its application) intends -- without competition -- to enter into a procurement “contract” that would exceed \$150,000 should include a detailed justification that explains to OJP why, in the particular circumstances, it is appropriate to proceed without competition. Various considerations that may be pertinent to the justification are outlined in the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).

**d. Pre-Agreement Costs**

For information on pre-agreement costs, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

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

Indirect costs may be charged to an award only if:

- (a) The recipient has a current (that is, unexpired), federally-approved indirect cost rate; or
- (b) The recipient is eligible to use, and elects to use, the “de minimis” indirect cost rate described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f).

An applicant with a current (that is, unexpired) federally-approved indirect cost rate is to attach a copy of the indirect cost rate agreement to the application. An applicant that does not have a current federally-approved rate may request one through its cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant entity, or, if the applicant’s accounting system permits, applicants may propose to allocate costs in the direct cost categories.

For assistance with identifying the appropriate cognizant federal agency for indirect costs, please contact the OCFO 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 <http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf>.

Certain OJP recipients have the option of electing to use the “de minimis” indirect cost rate. An applicant that is eligible to use the “de minimis” rate that wishes to use the “de minimis” rate should attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both-- (1) the applicant’s eligibility to use the “de minimis” rate, and (2) its election to do so. If an eligible applicant elects the “de minimis” rate, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. The “de minimis” rate may no longer be used once an approved federally-negotiated indirect cost rate is in place. (No entity that ever has had a federally-approved negotiated indirect cost rate is eligible to use the “de minimis” rate.)

## 6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

A tribe, tribal organization, or third party that proposes to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in its application a resolution, letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that demonstrates (as a legal matter) that the applicant has the requisite authorization from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for an award 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 award. 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.

## 7. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (including applicant disclosure of high-risk status)

**Every** applicant (other than an individual applying in his/her personal capacity) is to download, complete, and submit the [OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire](#), as part of its application.

Among other things, the form requires each applicant to disclose whether it currently is designated “high risk” by a federal grant-making agency outside of DOJ. For purposes of this disclosure, high risk includes any status under which a federal awarding agency provides additional oversight due to the applicant’s past performance, or other programmatic or financial concerns with the applicant. If an applicant is designated high risk by another federal awarding agency, the applicant must provide the following information:

- The federal awarding agency that currently designates the applicant high risk
- The date the applicant was designated high risk
- The high-risk point of contact at that federal awarding agency (name, phone number, and email address)
- The reasons for the high-risk status, as set out by the federal awarding agency

OJP seeks this information to help ensure appropriate federal oversight of OJP awards. An applicant that is considered “high risk” by another federal awarding agency is not automatically disqualified from receiving an OJP award. OJP may, however, consider the information in award decisions, and may impose additional OJP oversight of any award under this solicitation (including through the conditions that accompany the award document).

## 8. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Each applicant must complete and submit this information. An applicant that expends any funds for lobbying activities is to provide all of the information requested on the form [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities \(SF-LLL\)](#). An applicant that does not expend any funds for lobbying activities is to enter “N/A” in the text boxes for item 10 (“a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant” and “b. Individuals Performing Services”).

**9. Additional Attachments**

**a. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications**

Each applicant is to disclose whether it has (or is proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications for federally-funded grants or cooperative agreements that (1) include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed in the application under this solicitation, and (2) would cover any identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted to OJP as part of the application under this solicitation. The applicant is to disclose applications made directly to federal awarding agencies, and also applications for subawards of federal funds (e.g., applications to State agencies that will subaward (“subgrant”) 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.

Each applicant that has one or more pending applications as described above is 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 federal or State funding agency

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/Email for Point of Contact at Federal or State Funding Agency
DOJ/Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS)	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov
Health and Human Services/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

Each applicant should include the table as a separate attachment to its application. The file should be named “Disclosure of Pending Applications.” The applicant Legal Name on the application must match the entity named on the disclosure of pending applications statement.

Any applicant that does not have any pending applications as described above is to submit, as a separate attachment, a statement to this effect: “[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have (and is not proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally-funded grants or cooperative agreements (or for subawards under federal grants or cooperative agreements) that request funding to support the same project being proposed in this application to OJP and that would cover any identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted as part of in this application.”

## **b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity**

If an application proposes research (including research and development) and/or evaluation, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence and integrity, including appropriate safeguards, before it may receive award funds. The applicant must demonstrate independence and integrity regarding both this proposed research and/or evaluation, and any current or prior related projects.

Each application should include an attachment that addresses **both** i. and ii. below.

- i. For purposes of this solicitation, each applicant is to document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including one of the following two items:
  - a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its application to identify any actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients), and that the applicant has identified no such conflicts of interest – whether personal or financial or organizational (including on the part of the applicant entity or on the part of staff, investigators, or subrecipients) – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, and reporting of the research.

OR

- b. A specific description of actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified – including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research. These conflicts may be personal (e.g., on the part of investigators or other staff), financial, or organizational (related to the applicant or any subrecipient entity). Some examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations are 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 would not be given an award 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), because the organization in such an instance might 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, each applicant is to address 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 actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. The applicant also is to include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and prevent (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OR

- b. If the applicant has identified actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) that could affect the independence and integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research, the applicant must is to provide a specific and robust mitigation plan to address each of those conflicts. At a minimum, the applicant is expected to explain the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OJP will assess research and evaluation independence and integrity based on considerations such as the adequacy of the applicant's efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the applicant entity (and any subrecipients) 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. Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation**

An applicant that is a nonprofit organization may be required to make certain disclosures relating to the processes it uses to determine the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees.

Under certain circumstances, a nonprofit organization that provides unreasonably high compensation to certain persons may subject both the organization's managers and those who receive the compensation to additional federal taxes. A rebuttable presumption of the reasonableness of a nonprofit organization's compensation arrangements, however, may be available if the nonprofit organization satisfied certain rules set out in Internal Revenue Service regulations with regard to its compensation decisions.

Each applicant nonprofit organization must state at the time of its application (in the "OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire" mentioned earlier) whether or not the applicant entity believes (or asserts) that it currently satisfies the

requirements of 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6 (which relate to establishing or invoking a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness of compensation of certain individuals and entities).

A nonprofit organization that states in the questionnaire that it believes (or asserts) that it has satisfied the requirements of 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6 must then disclose, in an attachment to its application (to be titled "Disclosure of Process related to Executive Compensation"), the process used by the applicant nonprofit organization to determine the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees (together, "covered persons").

At a minimum, the disclosure must describe in pertinent detail: (1) the composition of the body that reviews and approves compensation arrangements for covered persons; (2) the methods and practices used by the applicant nonprofit organization to ensure that no individual with a conflict of interest participates as a member of the body that reviews and approves a compensation arrangement for a covered person; (3) the appropriate data as to comparability of compensation that is obtained in advance and relied upon by the body that reviews and approves compensation arrangements for covered persons; and (4) the written or electronic records that the applicant organization maintains as concurrent documentation of the decisions with respect to compensation of covered persons made by the body that reviews and approves such compensation arrangements, including records of deliberations and of the basis for decisions.

For purposes of the required disclosure, the following terms and phrases have the meanings set out by the Internal Revenue Service for use in connection with 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6: officers, directors, trustees, key employees, compensation, conflict of interest, appropriate data as to comparability, adequate documentation, and concurrent documentation.

Applicant nonprofit organizations should note that following receipt of an appropriate request, OJP may be authorized or required by law to make information submitted to satisfy this requirement available for public inspection. Also, a recipient may be required to make a prompt supplemental disclosure after the award in certain circumstances (e.g., changes in the way the organization determines compensation).

#### **d. Other**

- Project Time and Task Plan with each project goal, related objective, activity, expected completion date, and responsible person or organization.
- Job descriptions that outline the roles, responsibilities, and qualifications for all key positions, including the research partner.
- Information regarding the research partner that includes the following: a contract, memoranda of understanding, or other agreement that clearly delineates the role and responsibilities of the research partner. This document should establish the authority of the research partner to access agency data, interview personnel, and monitor operations that are relevant to the evaluation of the initiative.
- Resumes for staff identified for these positions, if known.
- Letters of support and commitment of the PSN team and other key partners, including the research partner.
- A Memorandum of Understanding for law enforcement and partner agencies that clearly outlines their roles and responsibilities. Because the PSN team is diverse and requires

careful coordination to ensure success, member agencies' roles should be clearly defined. The extent to which the applicant is able to demonstrate a functional partnership among all key players to include the sharing of information and data, will be a key factor in assessing the strength of the application and its potential for success.

- **Letter of certification of the fiscal agent from the local United State Attorney.**

### How to Apply

Applicants must register in, and submit applications through Grants.gov, a primary source 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**, which operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on 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 of registration and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date, in order to allow time for the applicant 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.

OJP 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.

**Browser Information:** Grants.gov was built to be compatible with Internet Explorer. For technical assistance with Google Chrome, or another browser, contact Grants.gov Customer Support.

**Note on Attachments:** Grants.gov has two categories of files for attachments: “mandatory” and “optional.” OJP receives all files attached in both categories. Please ensure that all required documents are attached in either Grants.gov category.

**Note on File Names and File Types:** Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in the file names of attachments. Valid file names may include only the characters shown in the table below. Grants.gov rejects any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains any characters not shown in the table below. Grants.gov forwards successfully-submitted applications to the OJP 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>Applicants must use the “&amp;” format in place of the ampersand (&amp;) when using XML format for documents.</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:

Every applicant entity must comply with all applicable System for Award Management (SAM) and unique entity identifier (currently, a Data Universal Numbering System [DUNS] number) requirements. If an applicant entity has not fully complied with applicable SAM and unique identifier requirements by the time OJP makes award decisions, OJP may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive an award and may use that determination as a basis for making the award to a different applicant.

An individual who wishes to apply in his/her personal capacity should search Grants.gov for funding opportunities for which individuals are eligible to apply. Use the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) to register. (An applicant applying as an individual must comply with all applicable Grants.gov individual registration requirements.)

Complete the registration form at <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister> to create a username and password for Grants.gov. (An applicant applying as an individual should complete all steps except 1, 2 and 4.)

- 1. Acquire a unique entity identifier (currently, a DUNS number).** In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires every applicant for a federal award (other than an individual) to include a "unique entity identifier" in each application, including an application for a supplemental award. Currently, a DUNS number is the required unique entity identifier.

A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit identification number provided by the commercial company Dun and Bradstreet. This unique entity identifier is used for tracking purposes, and to validate address and point of contact information for applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. It will be used throughout the life cycle of an OJP award. 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 certain standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. All applicants for OJP awards (other than individuals) must maintain current registrations in the SAM database. An applicant must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Each applicant must **update or renew its SAM registration at least annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

An application cannot be successfully submitted in Grants.gov until Grants.gov receives the SAM registration information. Once the SAM registration/renewal is complete, **the information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take as long as 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. An applicant entity's "unique entity identifier" (DUNS number) must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations and other entities, go to <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/OrcRegister>. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to <http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/individual-registration.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. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. 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 ("CFDA") number for this solicitation is 16.609, titled "Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction Program," and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2017-11482.
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. The second will state whether the application has been validated and successfully submitted, or whether it has been 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 an application well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges each applicant to submit its application **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. Applications must be successfully submitted through Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on March 28, 2017.

Click [here](#) for further details on DUNS numbers, SAM, and Grants.gov registration steps and timeframes.

#### **Note: Application Versions**

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, OJP will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted.

#### **Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues**

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov [Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and

receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the BJA contact identified in the Contact Information section on the title page **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. The applicant's email must describe the technical difficulties, and must 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: OJP does not automatically approve requests to submit a late application.** After OJP reviews the applicant's request, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to verify 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 untimely application submission was due to the applicant's failure to follow all required procedures, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit its application.

The following conditions generally are insufficient to justify late submissions:

- Failure to register in SAM or Grants.gov in sufficient time (SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete. The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours.)
- Failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its website
- Failure to follow each instruction in the OJP solicitation
- Technical issues with the applicant's computer or information technology environment, such as issues with firewalls or browser incompatibility.

**Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP [Funding Resource Center](#) web page.**

## E. Application Review Information

### Review Criteria

Applications that meet basic minimum requirements will be evaluated by peer reviewers using the following review criteria.

#### 1. Statement of the Problem (20%)

For the proposed area of focus/target area, please describe:

- The violent crime problem and provide the violent crime rate (please provide UCR or NIBRS data).
- The gun crime and/or gang violence problem (please provide UCR or NIBRS data).
  - For example, data on fatal and non-fatal shootings in the past 12 months.
- The current overall violence reduction strategy, and how PSN will be incorporated into this strategy.
- The current gaps and needs to reduce gun crime and gang violence.
- The current resources available to address the identified gaps and needs to reduce gun crime and gang violence.
- Any other ongoing violence reduction efforts.
- The successes and challenges to reducing gang violence and gun crime.

- Any community engagement or outreach efforts that are occurring in conjunction with your violence reduction efforts.

## **2. Project Design and Implementation (30%)**

For the proposed area of focus/target area, please describe:

- How the five design features will be incorporated.
- Which team members were involved in planning and determining your strategy?
- Data and research that are being used to determine the jurisdiction's target area and/or target population as well as violent crime reduction strategy model (please include type of data, data elements, and type of statistical analysis).
- What are the key drivers of gun crime and gang violence?
- Describe the specific drivers of gun crime and/or gang violence that will be the focus of your intervention.
- What violent crime reduction strategies will be implemented to address these gun and gang drivers? (e.g., Boston Ceasefire, Drug Market Intervention, etc.). Please also briefly describe the research-base that supports the proposed strategy or strategies?
- The role of your research partner in the planning and proposed implementation phases.
- How information will be exchanged between probation/parole, correctional facilities, and law enforcement.
- What are the expected results of your proposed approach?
- Your team's plan for community engagement.
- The methods that will be used to share information and gather feedback from the community.
- Plan for sustaining cross-sector relationships/partnerships during and beyond the life of this BJA award.
- Plan for sustaining the commitment of key leaders and organizations.
- Plan for sustaining implementation of specific strategies or activities.
- Plan for sustaining your research partnership.

## **3. Capabilities and Competencies (30%)**

Fully describe the applicant's capabilities to implement the project, including its ability to collect and provide data to support the research component, and the competencies of the PSN team that will be part of the initiative. In addition, applicants should demonstrate sound crime and criminal intelligence analysis capacity. Applicants should include memoranda of understanding or letters documenting support and participation from their designated research partner (as an attachment). Applicants should also address the following:

- The organizations and partners who will be involved in the planning, analysis, implementation, and assessment process.
- Please describe your proposed research partner's experience completing the following activities as a member of a team or implementation team:
  - Developing logic models
  - Collecting and analyzing criminal justice and public safety data
  - Using data to identify criminal justice and public safety related problems
  - Identifying and proposing proven strategies/interventions to address problems
  - Documenting and measuring program operations and processes
  - Using data to determine program effectiveness
  - Assessing implementation fidelity

- Regularly presenting findings and conclusions both orally and in written form to a team/implementation team
- Making recommendations for program improvement
- Developing "real-time" products and resources for strategic decision making
- Working with the team to develop a sustainability plan
- Communicating with a wide variety of public sector, private, and community individuals – for example, prosecutors, law enforcement leadership and line officers, community members, clergy representatives, funding agency representatives, legislators, city council members, and even offenders are some of the individuals research partners may be called upon to present their evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

**4. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures (10%)**

Describe the process for measuring project performance. Identify who will collect the data, who is responsible for performance measurement, and how the information will be used to guide and assess the program. Applicants must collect data relevant to the goals listed in their application. Identify how the data that is linked to the goals and objectives will be collected and used for future improvements or strategies. BJA will provide grantees with specific performance measures to be used for semi-annual progress reports. Applicants must conduct an impact evaluation upon completion of the project and provide the results to BJA.

**5. Budget and Detailed Budget Narrative (10%):**

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 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.<sup>19</sup> The budget must support the strategies and approaches outlined in the project design and include a narrative to describe the expenditures under each cost area and how it will contribute to the overall program goals.

The budget must support travel for a four-person team (project coordinator, research partner, and two individuals key to implementation) to attend the Smart Suite Researcher-Practitioner Fellows Academy. Washington, DC can be used as the host site to estimate the travel costs.

Applicants must set aside a minimum of 20 percent of their proposed budget to directly support the researcher’s operations and activities (e.g., collecting data, analyzing data, salary, etc.) to support the PSN team, as well as attend the PSN Orientation course conducted by MSU for BJA.

For applicants that include sub-grantees or sub-contracts please provide detailed budgets and narratives for each sub-grantee and sub-contractor.

---

<sup>19</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.

## Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for making awards. 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 an application meets basic minimum requirements and should proceed to further consideration, OJP screens applications for compliance with those requirements. Although specific requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP programs:

- The application must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant
- The application must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable)
- The application must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation
- The application must include all items designated as “critical elements”
- The applicant must not be identified in SAM as excluded from receiving federal awards

For a list of the critical elements for this solicitation, see “What an Application Should Include” under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

Peer review panels will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. BJA may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications on technical merit using the solicitation’s review criteria. 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. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although reviewer views are considered carefully. Other important considerations for OJP include underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the extent to which the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.

Pursuant to the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, before award decisions are made, OJP also reviews information related to the degree of risk posed by applicants. Among other things to help assess whether an applicant that has one or more prior federal awards has a satisfactory record with respect to performance, integrity, and business ethics, OJP checks whether the applicant is listed in SAM as excluded from receiving a federal award. If OJP anticipates that an award will exceed \$150,000 in federal funds, OJP also must review and consider any information about the applicant that appears in the non-public segment of the integrity and performance system accessible through SAM (currently, the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System; “FAPIS”).

**Important note on FAPIS:** An applicant, at its option, may review and comment on any information about itself that currently appears in FAPIS and was entered by a federal awarding agency. OJP will consider any such comments by the applicant, in addition to the other information in FAPIS, in its assessment of the risk posed by applicants.

The evaluation of risks goes beyond information in SAM, however. OJP itself has in place a framework for evaluating risks posed by applicants for competitive awards. OJP takes into account information pertinent to matters such as --

1. Applicant financial stability and fiscal integrity
2. Quality of the management systems of the applicant, and the applicant's ability to meet prescribed management standards, including those outlined in the DOJ Grants Financial Guide
3. Applicant's history of performance under OJP and other DOJ awards (including compliance with reporting requirements and award conditions), as well as awards from other federal agencies
4. Reports and findings from audits of the applicant, including audits under the Part 200 Uniform Requirements
5. Applicant's ability to comply with statutory and regulatory requirements, and to effectively implement other award requirements

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 take into account not only peer review ratings and BJA recommendations, but also other factors as indicated in this section.

## **F. Federal Award Administration Information**

### **Federal Award Notices**

Award notifications will be made by September 30, 2017. OJP sends award notifications by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and steps to take in GMS to start the award acceptance process. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date.

For each successful applicant, an individual with the necessary authority to bind the applicant will be required to log in; execute a set of legal certifications and a set of legal assurances; designate a financial point of contact; thoroughly review the award, including all award conditions; and sign and accept the award. The award acceptance process requires 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 OJP-approved application, the recipient must comply with all award conditions, as well as all applicable requirements of federal statutes, regulations, and executive orders (including applicable requirements referred to in the assurances and certifications executed in connection with award acceptance). OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review information on post-award legal requirements and common OJP award conditions **prior** to submitting an application.

Applicants should consult the “[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards](#),” available in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#). In addition, applicants should examine the following two legal documents, as each successful applicant must execute both documents before it may receive any award funds.

- [Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements](#)
- [Standard Assurances](#)

Applicants may view these documents in the Apply section of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

The web pages accessible through the “[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards](#)” are intended to give applicants for OJP awards a general overview of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants and cooperative agreements awarded in FY 2017. Individual OJP awards typically also will include additional award conditions. Those additional conditions may relate to the particular statute or program, or solicitation under which the award is made; to the substance of the funded application; to the recipient's performance under other federal awards; to the recipient's legal status (e.g., as a for-profit entity); or to other pertinent considerations.

### **General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements**

In addition to the deliverables described in [Section A. Program Description](#), any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to submit the following reports and data.

Required reports. Recipients typically must submit quarterly financial reports, quarterly progress reports, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements or specific award conditions. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent. (In appropriate cases, OJP may require additional reports.)

Awards that exceed \$500,000 will include an additional condition that, under specific circumstances, will require the recipient to report (to FAPIIS) information on civil, criminal, and administrative proceedings connected with (or connected to the performance of) either the OJP award or any other grant, cooperative agreement, or procurement contract from the federal government. Additional information on this reporting requirement appears in the text of the award condition posted on the OJP web site at <http://ojp.gov/funding/FAPIIS.htm>.

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, an award recipient also must provide data that measure the results of the work done under the award. To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist DOJ in 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, OJP will require any recipient, post award, to provide the data listed as “Data Recipient Provides” in the performance measures table in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), under “Program Narrative,” so that OJP can calculate values for this solicitation's performance measures.

## G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For OJP contact(s), see the title page.

For contact information for Grants.gov, see the title page.

## H. Other Information

### Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)

All applications submitted to OJP (including all attachments to applications) are subject to the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and to the Privacy Act. By law, DOJ may withhold information that is responsive to a request pursuant to FOIA if DOJ determines that the responsive information either is protected under the Privacy Act or falls within the scope of one of nine statutory exemptions under FOIA. DOJ cannot agree in advance of a request pursuant to FOIA not to release some or all portions of an application.

In its review of records that are responsive to a FOIA request, OJP will withhold information in those records that plainly falls within the scope of the Privacy Act or one of the statutory exemptions under FOIA. (Some examples include certain types of information in budgets, and names and contact information for project staff other than certain key personnel.) In appropriate circumstances, OJP will request the views of the applicant/recipient that submitted a responsive document.

For example, if OJP receives a request pursuant to FOIA for an application submitted by a nonprofit or for-profit organization or an institution of higher education, or for an application that involves research, OJP typically will contact the applicant/recipient that submitted the application and ask it to identify -- quite precisely -- any particular information in the application that applicant/recipient believes falls under a FOIA exemption, the specific exemption it believes applies, and why. After considering the submission by the applicant/recipient, OJP makes an independent assessment regarding withholding information. OJP generally follows a similar process for requests pursuant to FOIA for applications that may contain law-enforcement sensitive information.

### Provide Feedback to OJP

To assist OJP in improving its application and award processes, OJP encourages applicants to provide feedback on this solicitation, the application submission process, and/or the application review process. Provide feedback to [OJPSolicitationFeedback@usdoj.gov](mailto:OJPSolicitationFeedback@usdoj.gov).

**IMPORTANT:** This email is for feedback and suggestions only. OJP does **not** reply from this mailbox to messages it receives in this mailbox. Any prospective applicant that has specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation **must** use the appropriate telephone number or email listed on the front of this document to obtain information. These contacts are provided to help ensure that prospective applicants can directly reach an individual who can address specific questions in a timely manner.

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please email your résumé to [ojpeerreview@imsolas.com](mailto:ojpeerreview@imsolas.com). (Do not send your résumé to the OJP Solicitation

Feedback email account.) **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization or entity can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization/entity has submitted an application.

**Application Checklist  
FY 2017 Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction Program  
(Project Safe Neighborhoods)**

This application checklist has been created as an aid in developing an application.

**What an Applicant Should Do:**

*Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 28)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 28)

*To Register with Grants.gov:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 29)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 29)

*To Find Funding Opportunity:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 29)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Select the correct Competition ID (see page 29)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 29)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 27)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at [ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm](http://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm) (see page 13)

*After Application Submission, Receive Grants.gov Email Notifications That:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) application has been received,
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 29)

*If No Grants.gov Receipt, and Validation or Error Notifications are Received:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ contact NCJRS regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 29)

**Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Review the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards](#)" in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

**Scope Requirement:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit of \$200,000–\$500,000.

**Eligibility Requirement:** See the title page.

## What an Application Should Include:

- \_\_\_\_\_ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 14)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Intergovernmental Review (see page 14)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Project Abstract (see page 14)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Program Narrative (see page 15)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 19)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Budget Narrative (see page 19)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 21)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 22)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 11)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 22)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Additional Attachments
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications(see page 23)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 24)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation (see page 25)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Project Time and Task Plan (see page 26)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Job Descriptions (see page 26)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Résumés (see page 26)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Letters of support and commitment (see page 26)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Memorandum of Understanding (see page 26)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Letter of certification from the relevant United States Attorney (see page 27)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable) (see page 12)

## APPENDIX A Resources

**BJA Center for Research Partnerships and Program Evaluation (CRPPE)**

<https://www.bja.gov/programs/crppe/>

**BJA Police and Mental Health Toolkit**

<https://pmhctoolkit.bja.gov/>

**BJA Project Safe Neighborhoods webpage**

[https://www.bja.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?Program\\_ID=74#horizontalTab1](https://www.bja.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?Program_ID=74#horizontalTab1)

**Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy: Community Policing and Procedural Justice**

<http://cebcp.org/evidence-based-policing/what-works-in-policing/research-evidence-review/community-policing/>

**Childhood Trauma. Changing Minds.**

<https://changingmindsnow.org/healing>

**CrimeSolutions.gov**

<http://www.crimesolutions.gov/>

**Fair & Impartial Policing**

<http://www.fairimpartialpolicing.com/>

**Identifying and Working With a Research Partner:**

*Frequently Asked Questions and Answers*

<http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/ResearchPartnerQ&A.pdf>

**International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP): Project Safe Neighborhoods Initiative**

<http://www.theiacp.org/psnInitiative>

**National Gang Center**

<https://www.nationalgangcenter.gov/>

**National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice**

<http://trustandjustice.org/>

**PSN Resources webpage (Michigan State University)**

<http://www.psnmsu.com/psn-resources/>

**Smart Policing Initiative (SPI) webinars/videos webpage**

<http://www.smartpolicinginitiative.com/webinar-videos>

**Violence Reduction Network Clearinghouse**

<https://www.vrnetwork.org/Clearinghouse>

**Webinar: Analyzing your Crime Problem**

<https://www.bja.gov/programs/spi-webinar.html>

## APPENDIX B

### PSN-related research information

**McGarrell, E.F., Circo, G., and J. Rydberg. (2015). *Detroit Project Safe Neighborhoods: Final Project Report*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan Justice Statistics Center, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University.**

This report presents the findings of the Detroit PSN program that was part of the Comprehensive Violence Reduction Partnership (CVRP). PSN/CVRP involved a multi-agency collaboration of local, state, and federal criminal justice agencies, community partners, and a research partner following a data-driven strategic effort to reduce gun crime and gang violence. The strategy combined focused enforcement with youth outreach and intervention. Detroit PSN focused on two high violent crime precincts on the westside of Detroit (6<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> precincts). The results of the evaluation indicated a 17 percent decrease in gun crime victimization. When controlling for violent crime trends in similar parts of the city, it appeared that PSN was responsible for an approximate 9 percent decline in gun crime.

**Wallace, Danielle, Andrew V. Papachristos, Tracey Meares, and Jeffrey Fagan. (2015). “Desistance and Legitimacy: The Impact of Offender Notification Meetings on Recidivism among High Risk Offenders.” *Justice Quarterly* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2015.1081262>**

Chicago’s Project Safe Neighborhoods program has included parolee forums with high risk offenders returning to the community as a key component of its overall violence reduction strategies. This study presents the results of an evaluation of the forums and finds significant reductions in re-offending among the parolees attending the forums.

**Violence: Measuring the Impact of Boston’s Operation Ceasefire on Street Gang Behavior.” *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 30:113-139.erring Gang-Involved Gun <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10940-013-9198-x>**

This article asserts that the original evaluation of Boston’s Ceasefire program had a relatively weak design, leading to uncertainty about the results. To remedy this, this revised study used a more rigorous design to find that the total number of shootings involving Boston gangs dropped by 31% when subjected to Operation Ceasefire. This result helps to bolster the findings in previous studies.

**Bynum, T. S., Grommon, E., et al. (2014). *Evaluation of a Comprehensive Approach to Reducing Gun Violence in Detroit*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/244866.pdf>**

This report examines the PSN program in Detroit, MI. The Detroit program followed the standard PSN model with mixed-agency teams and case reviews. The process evaluation found a significant increase in the number of charges for carrying a concealed weapon. The outcome evaluation found a significant decrease in the number of fatal and non-fatal shootings in the target areas.

**Braga, A. A., Apel, R., et al. (2013). “The Spillover Effects of Focused Deterrence on Gang Violence.” *Evaluation Review*, 37(3/4): 314–342.**

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24569771>

This article examines the diffusion of benefits from a focused deterrent program such as PSN. The article finds that when certain gangs are targeted for enforcement, other gangs take notice and can be deterred as well. Total shootings went down for both gangs targeted and those targeted vicariously (allies and rivals of targeted gangs).

**Corsaro, N., R. Brunson, and E.F. McGarrell. (2013). "Problem-Oriented Policing and Open-Air Drug Markets: Examining the Pulling Levers Deterrence Strategy in Rockford, Illinois." *Crime and Delinquency*.**

<https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/AbstractDB/AbstractDBDetails.aspx?id=267149>

This article presents the results of the Drug Market Intervention (DMI) strategy conducted in Rockford, Illinois. The results indicated a significant reduction in crime, drug and nuisance offenses in the DMI neighborhood.

**Engel, R.S., M.S. Tillyer, and N. Corsaro. (2013). Reducing Gang Violence Using Focused Deterrence: Evaluating the Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence (CIRV). *Justice Quarterly* 30,3: 403-439.**

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07418825.2011.619559>

This article presents the findings of the evaluation of the Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence (CIRV). The article describes the nature of the initiative and reports significant declines in group member involved homicides and violent firearm incidents.

**McGarrell, E.F., N. Corsaro, C. Melde, N. Hipple, T. Bynum, and J. Cobbina. (2013) "Attempting to Reduce Firearms Violence Through a Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative (CAGI): An Evaluation of Process and Impact." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 41:33-43.**

<https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/AbstractDB/AbstractDBDetails.aspx?id=264734>

This article presents the results of an evaluation of the Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative (CAGI). The results did not indicate a consistent impact on gang violence but rather reductions in violent crime were limited to those jurisdictions that were able to successfully implement the enforcement components of the strategy. Suggestions for addressing implementation challenges are presented.

**Webster, D., Whitehill, J., et al. (2013). "Effects of Baltimore's Safe Streets Program on Gun Violence: A Replication of Chicago's Ceasefire Program." *Journal of Urban Health*, 90(1): 27-40.**

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3579298/>

This research examines Baltimore's Safe Streets program, a replication of the Ceasefire program in Chicago. The only major difference was the lack of "interrupters" in the Baltimore program. The program was implemented in four areas with high gun crime. Three of these areas had a significant decrease in one or more measures of gun violence. The authors estimate the program prevented about 35 shootings and 5 homicides over about 9 years.

**Braga, Anthony A., and David L. Weisburg. 2012. *Pulling Levers Focused Deterrence Strategies to Prevent Crime*.** No. 6 of Crime Prevention Research Review. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

[https://nnscommunities.org/uploads/Pulling\\_Levers.pdf](https://nnscommunities.org/uploads/Pulling_Levers.pdf)

The authors examined the effectiveness of pulling levers focused deterrence programs by reviewing all available academic studies evaluating pulling levers strategies. The basic findings of the review were very positive. Nine out of 10 eligible studies reported strong and statistically significant crime reductions associated with the approach. In addition, the findings of eligible focused deterrence evaluations fit well within existing research suggesting that deterrence-based strategies, if applied correctly, can reduce crime.

**Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2012). “The Effects of ‘Pulling Levers’ Focused Deterrence Strategies on Crime.” *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 8(6).**

<http://campbellcollaboration.org/lib/project/96/>

**This practice was rated on Crimesolutions.gov as promising.** 

This study examines focused deterrence or “pulling levers,” a strategy used in Operation Ceasefire and at the heart of PSN. Focused deterrence relies on targeting chronic offenders and informing them of heightened penalties if they do not stop. It is usually backed up by crackdowns on those who continue committing crimes. This meta-analysis found a significant, medium-size crime reduction from these strategies.

**Corsaro, N., Hunt, E. D., et al. (2012). “The Impact of Drug Market Pulling Levers Policing on Neighborhood Violence: An Evaluation of the High Point Drug Market Intervention.” *Criminology and Public Policy*, 11(2):167–199.**

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1745-9133.2012.00798.x/abstract>

**This program was rated on Crimesolutions.gov as effective.** 

This report details the DMI program in High Point, NC, that concentrated resources on problem areas and chronic offenders involved in the drug markets. The program focused on identifying these areas, notifying offenders of the harsh sanctions, and offering community resources. Areas targeted by the program saw an almost 8 percent drop in violence, while a comparison area had a similar increase in violence.

**Corsaro, N., R.K. Brunson, and E.F. McGarrell. (2010). “Evaluating a Policing Strategy Intended to Disrupt an Illicit Street-Level Drug Market.” *Evaluation Review* 34,6: 513-548.**

<http://erx.sagepub.com/content/early/2010/12/15/0193841X10389136.abstract>

This study examined the implementation of the Drug Market Intervention (DMI) in a neighborhood in Nashville, Tennessee that had long experienced open air drug dealing. The results indicated a significant reduction in drug and narcotics incidents and reports of large increases in the perceived quality of neighborhood life.

**McGarrell, Edmund, Nicholas Corsaro, Natalie Kroovand Hipple, and Timothy Bynum. (2010). “Project Safe Neighborhoods and Violent Crime Trends in US Cities: Assessing Violent Crime Impact.” *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 26: 165–90.**

**This program was rated on Crimesolutions.gov as promising.** 

Compared with cities that did not implement Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN), McGarrell and colleagues (2010) found that treatment cities experienced a statistically significant decline in violent crime. Between 2000 and 2006, PSN cities experienced an average 4.1 percent decline in violent crime, while non-PSN cities experienced a 0.9 percent decline. Furthermore, cities that received a higher dosage of PSN were significantly more likely to experience decreases in violent crime, relative to cities that did not fully implement PSN. Every unit increase in PSN implementation was associated with a 5.7 percent decrease in the city's violent crime rate.

**Corsaro, N., & McGarrell, E. (2009). "Testing a Promising Homicide Reduction Strategy: Reassessing the Impact of the Indianapolis 'Pulling Levers' Intervention." *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 5(1):63–82.**

<https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/publications/abstract.aspx?ID=248740>

**This program was rated on Crimesolutions.gov as promising. **

This article evaluates the Indianapolis "Pulling Levers" program, modeled after Boston's Operation Ceasefire. The program focused on reducing gang homicide by targeting chronic offenders. The results show an overall decrease in homicides. However, when the data are disaggregated, the authors show that the program had a greater effect on gang homicides than non-gang homicides. This supports the proposition that the program caused the decrease.