



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Assistance](#) (BJA) is seeking applications through the Price of Justice: Rethinking the Consequences of Justice Fines and Fees grant program for direct grants to units of state and local government and federally recognized Indian tribes and for a cooperative award to a technical assistance provider. This program furthers the Department's mission by soliciting innovations by units of state, local, and tribal government to test strategies to structure criminal justice legal financial obligations in ways that support, rather than undermine, rehabilitation and successful reintegration of justice-involved individuals into communities.

The Price of Justice: Rethinking the Consequences of Justice Fines and Fees FY 2016 Competitive Grant Announcement Applications Due: May 12, 2016

Eligibility

This solicitation has two categories.

Category 1: Eligible applicants are units of state and local government and federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior).

BJA expects eligible entities to submit applications on behalf of a consortium of governmental and nongovernmental partners to design and implement a strategy to further the consortium's goals. This partnership is not mandatory; however, any partnership should include parties necessary to execute the strategy proposed. If a unit of government proposes such a partnership, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the others must be proposed as subrecipients. The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for administering the funding and managing the entire project. The fiscal agent will be legally responsible for complying with all applicable federal rules and regulations in receiving and expending federal funds. The fiscal agent must demonstrate such capacity by showing experience engaging core criminal justice and other partners in statewide and/or local reform efforts.

Category 2: Eligible applicants are limited to national-scope private and nonprofit organizations (including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organizations) and colleges and universities, both public and private (including tribal institutions of higher education). For-profit organizations must agree to forgo any profit or management fee.

For Category 2, BJA welcomes applications that involve two or more entities that will carry out the funded federal award activities; however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the others must be proposed as subrecipients. The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for administering the funding and managing the entire project. Only one application per lead applicant will be considered; however, a subrecipient may be part of multiple proposals.

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

Deadline

Applicants must register with Grants.gov prior to submitting an application. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 12, 2016.

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

For additional information, see [How To Apply](#) in Section [D. Application and Submission Information](#).

Contact Information

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

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

For assistance with any other requirement of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email 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.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: BJA-2016-9144

Release date: March 14, 2016

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	6
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	6
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices	9
B. Federal Award Information.....	9
Type of Award.....	9
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls.....	10
Budget Information.....	10
Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement.....	11
Pre-Agreement Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals.....	11
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	12
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	12
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	12
C. Eligibility Information.....	13
Limit on Number of Application Submissions.....	13
D. Application and Submission Information	13
What an Application Should Include	13
How To Apply.....	23
E. Application Review Information.....	26
Selection Criteria.....	26
Review Process	30
F. Federal Award Administration Information	31
Federal Award Notices	31
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements.....	31
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	32
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	32
H. Other Information.....	32
Provide Feedback to OJP	32
Application Checklist	34

The Price of Justice: Rethinking the Consequences of Justice Fines and Fees CFDA #16.827

A. Program Description

Overview

Those who commit crimes should be accountable to victims and their communities. The role of the justice system is to determine a fair and impartial resolution on behalf of society. However, legal financial obligations resulting from criminal justice involvement—including fines, fees, and costs—may undermine these very goals if they are arbitrary, burdensome, or assessed without regard to ability to pay.

The current landscape of legal financial obligations has come under heightened scrutiny in recent months and years, particularly in light of the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division [Investigation of the Ferguson Police Department](#). A [December 2015 convening](#), organized by the White House Domestic Policy Council, the Office of Justice Programs, the Civil Rights Division, and the Office of Access to Justice, brought heightened attention to the broad issue of criminalization of poverty. Concurrent with the event, the White House Council of Economic Advisors released an issue brief, [Fines, Fees, and Bail: Payments in the Criminal Justice System That Disproportionately Impact the Poor](#), which observed that “[c]rime imposes real costs on society in terms of both the harm done to victims and in resources that must be allocated to policing, prosecution and incarceration. Increases in criminal justice spending have put a strain on local criminal justice budgets and led to the broader use of fine penalties and itemized criminal justice fees in an effort to support budgets.”

Attorney General Loretta E. Lynch’s [remarks](#) at the event underscored the pernicious effects of relying on fines and fees to support criminal justice operations:

“A debt must be capable of being paid, if it is not instead a yoke of servitude [W]hat we are seeing in this country amounts to nothing less than the criminalization of poverty. . . . [T]he consequences of the criminalization of poverty are not only harmful, but they are so far-reaching, they affect families beyond the individual lives; an individual’s ability to support their family. . . . [A]nd more than that . . . it contributes to a fundamental erosion of a faith in our government.

“What is the price of justice? [T]o try and reduce this ideal to mere coin is an effort not only doomed to fail but ultimately it is an effort that cheapens us all.”

Findings of a growing body of analyses and investigative reports, consistent with the Attorney General’s remarks, reveal people being incarcerated for failing to pay fines and fees despite inability to do so; justice agencies focused less on public safety and rehabilitation than on maximizing revenue; and racial and ethnic disparity in the impacts of criminal justice debt. Other common themes include:

- Sanctions leading to high levels of debt, incarceration for failure to pay, and barriers to successful reintegration.
- Increasing use of fines and fees at every stage of the criminal justice process, e.g., citations, bail, court appearances, charges for public defender representation, case

disposition, room and board at jail or prison, drug testing, counseling services, electronic monitoring, probation and parole supervision, fees for late payment or nonpayment, interest charges, and other miscellaneous surcharges.

- Lack of transparency regarding the extent to which government agencies rely on fines and fees.
- Little evidence regarding the cost-effectiveness of collecting fines and fees (i.e., some reports claim that the costs of recouping monies from those who are unable to pay, such as contracts with collections agencies and arresting and jailing individuals who fail to pay, may exceed the monies actually collected).
- Scant research on the effects of fines and fees on justice-involved individuals, their families, and their communities.
- Multiple agencies vying for limited resources from the small payments people can make.
- Alternatives to paying fines and fees that are too rarely available or too narrowly focused to be true alternatives.
- Probation terms being extended or not discharged in accordance with evidence-based practice because of failure to pay (risking revocation and cycling back into prison).
- Judges issuing arrest warrants or incarcerating people for failing to pay full amounts immediately, not entering into payment agreements or negotiating balances, and failing to consider or determine inability to pay.
- Decision makers levying non-payment penalties, such as interest or late fees, compounding criminal justice debt without a means determination, increasing debt burden on those who cannot pay all at once or at all.
- Driver license suspensions for failure to pay, limiting ability to engage in work, school, treatment, and other pro-social activities.¹

¹ White House Council of Economic Advisors, *Fines, Fees, and Bail: Payments in the Criminal Justice System That Disproportionately Impact the Poor* (Issue Brief, 2015). See also Jessica Eaglin and Danyelle Solomon, [Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Jails: Recommendations for Local Practice](#) (Brennan Center for Justice, 2015); Neil L. Sobol, [Charging the Poor: Criminal Justice Debt & Modern-Day Debtors' Prisons](#), Maryland L. Rev. (forthcoming 2015); Chris Albin-Lackey, [Profiting from Probation: America's 'Offender Funded' Probation Industry](#) (Human Rights Watch, 2014); Douglas N. Evans, [The Debt Penalty – Exposing the Financial Barriers to Offender Reintegration](#) (John Jay College of Criminal Justice, 2014); American Civil Liberties Union of Ohio, [The Outskirts of Hope: How Ohio's Debtors' Prisons Are Ruining Lives and Costing Communities](#) (2013); Carl Reynolds and Jeff Hall, [Courts are not Revenue Centers](#) (Conference of State Court Administrators, 2012); Rebecca Vallas and Roopal Patel, [Sentenced to a Life of Criminal Debt: A Barrier to Reentry and Climbing out of Poverty](#), Clearinghouse Review Journal of Poverty Law and Policy (2012); Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety and Security, [Inmate Fees as a Source of Revenue: Review of Challenges](#) (2011); Katherine Beckett and Alexes Harris, [On Cash and Conviction: Monetary Sanctions as Misguided Policy](#), Criminology & Public Policy (2011); Alicia Bannon, Mitali Nagrecha and Rebekah Diller, [Criminal Justice Debt: A Barrier to Reentry](#) (Brennan Center for Justice, 2010); Rebekah Diller, [The Hidden Costs of Florida's Criminal Justice Fees](#), (Brennan Center for Justice, 2010) National Center for State Courts, [Report to the Joint Interim Committee on State Justice System Revenues: State of Oregon](#) (2010); Nastassia Walsh, [Baltimore Behind Bars: How to Reduce the Jail Population, Save Money and Improve Public Safety](#) (Justice Policy Institute, 2010); Helen A. Anderson, [Penalizing Poverty: Making Criminal Defendants Pay for their Court-Appointed Counsel Through Recoupment and Contribution](#); (2008); Katherine A. Beckett, Alexes M. Harris and Heather Evans, [The Assessment and Consequences of Legal Financial Obligations in Washington State](#) (Washington State Minority and Justice Commission, 2008); Rhode Island Family Life Center, [Court Debt and Related Incarceration in Rhode Island from 2005 through 2007](#) (2008); Council of State Governments Justice Center, [Repaying Debts](#) (2007).

These observations raise concerns about the efficacy and fairness of criminal justice systems that are not sensitive to, and in fact may compound, poverty, increase incarceration of those unable to pay, and undermine reintegration and community trust in law enforcement and the criminal justice system.

There is reason for cautious optimism, however. Courts and other justice system leaders across the nation are leading efforts to revise court rules and procedures, developing best practice tools such as bench books and bench cards, declaring amnesty days for criminal justice debts, establishing rehabilitative and restorative alternatives to fines and fees, and embracing evidence-based pretrial practices. Beyond ensuring constitutional minima, this solicitation aims to support, test, and disseminate emerging best practices.

Funding for this initiative is anticipated through the Fiscal Year 2016 U.S. Department of Justice, Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI) appropriation.

Program-Specific Information

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The goal of this program is to encourage and disseminate best practices for coordinated and appropriate justice system responses to justice-involved individuals' inability to pay fines, fees, and related charges, including eliminating unnecessary and unconstitutional confinement. The objectives of the program are the following:

- Increase corrections costs saved or avoided by reducing unnecessary confinement.
- Support the use of data analysis upon which fair and effective policies and practices related to criminal justice financial obligations can be based.
- Promote and increase collaboration and data sharing among criminal justice agencies and officials regarding assessment, collection, prioritization, and tracking of fines, fees, and related costs, including state and local policymakers, law enforcement, prosecution, defense, pretrial, courts, probation, treatment, corrections, reentry, and parole.
- Support tailored alternatives to fines, fees, and costs that promote, rather than undermine, rehabilitation, reintegration, and community trust.

Category 1: The Price of Justice Grants. Competition ID: BJA-2016-9336

Mandatory Considerations

All projects are required to include the following components within their proposal materials:

- Demonstrate the lead agency's commitment to the proposed initiative, as well as the commitment of other critical partners to collaborate and share data. The governance body for the proposal must include the relevant court and the sheriff or local department of corrections (i.e., jail administrator). Additional stakeholders should be included as relevant to the proposal, e.g., public defender, prosecution, law enforcement, probation, and parole.
- Propose to increase accessibility of information regarding fines, fees, and costs; payment options; and consequences for non-payment.
- In partnership with the technical assistance provider selected through Category 2 of this solicitation, successful applicants will be expected to develop a work plan that defines the problem, goals, objectives, and action steps. In addition, applicants will work with the

provider to conduct and publish analysis of existing fines, fees, and costs as established by statute or administrative or local orders, rules, or ordinances; an accounting of collection and disbursement of such monies; and an analysis of the jail population to determine the prevalence and incidence of jail use for failures to pay.

Allowable Uses for Award Funds

Allowable uses for award funds can include one or more of the following activities to decrease unnecessary confinement due to inability to pay fines, fees, and costs:

- **Promote and increase collaboration and data sharing among criminal justice agencies and officials regarding assessment, collection, prioritization, and tracking of fines, fees, and related costs.** One of the major reported challenges to ensuring criminal justice fines and fees are not overly burdensome is the lack of data and coordination regarding amounts owed and paid to a variety of agencies. Applicants may propose a project to improve this infrastructure and related business practices, and may include state and local policymakers, law enforcement, prosecution, defense, pretrial, courts, probation, treatment, corrections, reentry, parole. Such a project should emphasize development of standardized questionnaires and schedules for determining indigency, reasonable payment schedules for individuals with the financial ability to pay, unified collection activities, and non-incarcerative alternatives to payment. Partnerships with child support enforcement agencies are encouraged.
- **Pilot or scale up alternatives to fines, fees, and costs.** Applicants may design and implement or scale up alternatives to fines, fees, and costs that aim to improve individuals' life circumstances, particularly related to job readiness and employment. Applicants may propose alternatives such as education, community service, or day fines. For more information on these approaches, applicants can refer to the following resources:
 - [Ability to Pay Workgroup: Tools and Guidance for Determining and Addressing an Obligor's Ability to Pay](#), and [Appendix I, Payment Alternatives](#)
 - [Midtown Community Court: Documented Results](#)
 - [Alternatives to Custodial Supervision: The Day Fine](#)
 - [How to Use Structured Fines \(Day Fines\) as an Intermediate Sanction](#)
- **Improve and institutionalize innovative approaches to determinations of ability to pay and willful nonpayment.** Applicants should propose innovations in the practice of determining ability to pay and willful nonpayment. Applicants may propose to develop, test, and institutionalize efficient, consistent, and data-driven methods of making these determinations, analogous to assessment of risk of recidivism. Applicants may also propose information sharing solutions that streamline and automate, to the degree possible, the determination of inability to pay. BJA may promote and disseminate deliverables from successful projects nationally.
- **Develop and implement another strategy to further this solicitation's goal.** Applicants may also develop another strategy, not listed here, that furthers this solicitation's goal—to reduce unnecessary confinement due to justice-involved individuals' inability to pay fines, fees, and related charges. Such proposals should include a logic model and clearly cite and describe the research supporting the proposed strategy, if any.

Category 2: The Price of Justice Technical Assistance. Competition ID: BJA-2016-9337

To support the program, BJA seeks an entity to provide technical assistance to successful

grantees. The goal of this assistance is to support the selected jurisdiction's capacity to reduce unnecessary confinement due to justice-involved individuals' inability to pay fines, fees, and related charges. Objectives of this assistance include:

- Increasing transparency in the jurisdiction among stakeholders and justice-involved individuals regarding the fines, fees, and costs; payment options; and consequences for non-payment.
- Increasing understanding of the incentives created through justice agencies' reliance on fines and fees through budget analysis to map monies required to be paid, actually received, and disbursed.
- Increasing understanding of and establishing regular reporting of use of jail or prison resources for responding to failures to pay and related violations (e.g., failure to appear related to failure to pay and probation or parole violations leading to revocation).
- Improving adherence to and application of key legal concepts including indigence, inability to pay, and willful nonpayment.

Because the allowable uses of grant funding and lead agency can vary based on the proposed activities, the provider (including any co-applicant partner organizations) will be expected to have capacity, either through staff or through subcontracted consultants, to deliver assistance on a broad range of subjects, including court administration, budget formulation, debt collection, probation and parole practices, pretrial, and jail admissions. The provider will assist stakeholders in planning to ensure timely and faithful implementation of proposed activities and provide technical expertise and guidance regarding operational and programmatic aspects of implementation.

As described above, assistance will vary by applicant, but is expected to include:

- Assistance developing an action plan with each grantee helping define the problem and work to be done (see Award Special Condition at page 11).
- Analysis of the jurisdiction's existing statutory and regulatory framework for fines, fees, and costs, and recommendations for reform. Analysis may include assessment of an agency's and/or jurisdiction's dependence on justice fines and fees as a percentage of their budget.
- Analysis of the jail and/or prison population to facilitate understanding of trends over time in use of correctional resources to respond to failures to pay, including the costs of incarcerating people for nonpayment.
- Analysis of budget(s) and accounting for the jurisdiction that maps monies expected to be paid, actually paid, and disbursed.
- Development of performance measures for selected sites and support for ongoing measurement of performance and outcomes.
- Development of a sustainability plan to establish goals and activities for continued system improvements in keeping with the goals of this solicitation.
- Publishing policy briefs or other content summarizing key issues and lessons learned for broad dissemination.
- Convening selected sites to share best practices, innovations, and lessons learned.
- A final report detailing the process and progress of each site and the changes recommended and implemented.

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://OJP.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

Amount and Length of Award

Category 1: BJA estimates that it will make up to four awards of up to \$500,000 for an estimated total of \$2,000,000 for a 36-month project period, beginning on or about October 1, 2016.

Category 2: BJA estimates that it will make one award of up to \$500,000 for a 36-month project period, beginning on or about October 1, 2016.

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

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

Type of Award²

BJA expects that it will make any award from Category 1 in the form of a grant. BJA expects that it will make any award from Category 2 in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a particular type of grant used if BJA expects to have ongoing substantial involvement in award activities. Substantial involvement includes direct oversight and involvement with the grantee

² See *generally* 31 U.S.C. §§ 6301-6305 (defines and describes various forms of federal assistance relationships, including grants and cooperative agreements [a type of grant]).

organization in implementation of the grant, but does not involve day-to-day project management. See [Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements](#), under Section [F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for details regarding the federal involvement anticipated under an award from this solicitation.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including any recipient or subrecipient funded in response to this solicitation that is a pass-through entity³) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements 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.

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

Budget Information

Unallowable and Unreasonable Uses for Award Funds

In addition to the unallowable costs identified in the [Financial Guide](#), award funds may not be used for the following:

- Prizes/rewards/entertainment/trinkets (or any type of monetary incentive)
- Gift cards
- Stipends
- Vehicles

³ For purposes of this solicitation (or program announcement), “pass-through entity” includes any entity eligible to receive funding as a recipient or subrecipient under this solicitation (or program announcement) that, if funded, may make a subaward(s) to a subrecipient(s) to carry out part of the funded program.

- Food and beverage
- Costs that do not support approved project activities

Applicants under Category 1 must budget funding to travel to DOJ-sponsored grant meetings. Applicants should estimate the costs of travel and accommodations for three staff to attend two meetings in Washington, D.C. Applicants in Category 2 must budget to plan and host one meeting for grantees under Category 1. All expenses must be reasonable, allowable, and necessary to the project. The estimates must provide a breakdown of all costs and adhere to the federal per diem.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the [2015 DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).

Cost Sharing or Matching 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.

For additional information on cost sharing and matching requirements, see the [Financial Guide](#).

Award Special Condition – Withholding of Funds for BJA Action Plan

Once awarded, each grant award in Category 1 will have in place a special condition withholding all but \$150,000, which will allow grantees to engage in the analysis and planning process with the technical assistance provider as soon as practicable, but no later than one year of receiving final approval of the project’s budget from the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO). The recipient will not be authorized to obligate, expend, or draw down funds in excess of \$150,000 until BJA has reviewed and approved the plan and a Grant Adjustment Notice has been issued and approved to remove the special condition. The action plan must:

- Include a comprehensive project work plan developed in consultation with the technical assistance provider to include:
 - Description of the problem and the data that led to its identification.
 - Logic model that identifies the solution(s) to be tested, intended outcomes, and performance metrics.
 - Project Timeline with each project goal, related objective, activity, expected completion date, and responsible person or organization.
- Include letters of commitment from external agencies or organizations that are expected to participate in the project, to the extent that letters have not already been provided.
- Demonstrate executive support and commitment of agency resources to the project.

Pre-Agreement Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals

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

OJP does not typically approve pre-agreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. If approved, pre-agreement costs could be paid from grant funds consistent with a grantee’s approved budget, and under applicable cost standards. However, all such costs prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of an applicant. Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before*

submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs. Should there be extenuating circumstances that appear to be appropriate for OJP's consideration as pre-agreement costs, the applicant should contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this announcement for details on the requirements for submitting a written request for approval. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the [Financial Guide](#), for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, recipients may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the award recipient at a rate that exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.⁴ The 2016 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. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.) For employees who charge only a portion of their time to an award, the allowable amount to be charged 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, the limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant requesting a waiver should include a detailed justification in the Budget Narrative of the application. Unless the applicant submits a waiver request and justification with the application, the applicant should anticipate that OJP will request the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

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

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

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully – before submitting an application – the OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at <http://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 and of some conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, including a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

⁴ This limitation on use of award funds does not apply to the nonprofit organizations specifically named at Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. part 200.

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

C. Eligibility Information

For additional eligibility information, see title page.

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

Limit on Number of Application Submissions

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, BJA will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. For more information on system-validated versions, see [How To Apply](#).

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

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

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

OJP strongly recommends that applicants use appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., "Program Narrative," "Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative," "Timelines," "Memoranda of Understanding," "Position Descriptions and 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).

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

2. Project Abstract

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

- Written for a general public audience.
- Submitted as a separate attachment with "Project Abstract" as part of its file name.
- Single-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins.
- **Include the following clearly labeled and delineated information:**
 - Legal name of the grant recipient and the title of the project.
 - Project's goals and deliverables.
 - Project design elements including the allowable uses of funds that will be incorporated into the project.
 - The projected number of participants to be served through the project and target population characteristics and target geographical area, if applicable.

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. In addition, BJA requests that the abstract be submitted as a text file, such as Word .doc format.

Permission to Share Project Abstract with the Public: It is unlikely that BJA 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 proposals.

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

If the applicant elects to grant permission, please submit a version of the abstract (in addition to the Word version) using the detailed template available at ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf.

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 and the Selection Criteria (a-e) in the order given. The Program Narrative must be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with no less than 1-inch margins, and must not exceed 15 pages. Number pages “1 of 15,” “2 of 15,” etc.

If the Program Narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, BJA may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions.

The following sections should be included as part of the Program Narrative: See “Selection Criteria” on page 26 for more information about what each section should include.

- 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

To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist the Department with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111–352, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide the data requested in the “Data Grantee Provides” column so that OJP can calculate values for the “Performance Measures” column. Performance measures for Category 1 of this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Catalog ID	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
Increase corrections costs saved or avoided by reducing unnecessary confinement	541	Percent increase in costs saved since the previous fiscal year	<p>During the previous fiscal year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Total corrections costs B. Corrections costs attributable to population confined due to failure to pay prior to project implementation <p>During the reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Total corrections costs B. Corrections costs attributable to population confined due to failure to pay during the reporting period
	625	Percent decrease in the confined (jail or prison) population due to reducing use of confinement as a response to failures to pay	<p>During the previous fiscal year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Number of new admissions to jail or prison due to failures to pay B. Number of offenders released from jail or prison (where the reason for admission is failure to pay) C. As of the last day of the previous fiscal year, the number of individuals confined in jail or prison D. As of the last day of the previous fiscal year, the number of individuals confined in jail or prison due to failure to pay <p>During the reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Number of new admissions to jail or prison due to failure to pay B. Number of offenders released from jail or prison (where the reason for admission is failure to pay) C. As of the last day of the reporting period, number of individuals confined in jail or prison D. As of the last day of the reporting period, number of individuals confined in jail or prison due to failure to pay
	503	Number of strategies implemented to reduce unnecessary confinement	Number of strategies implemented to reduce unnecessary confinement

Increase the use of data analysis upon which fair and effective policies and practices related to criminal justice financial obligations can be based	170	Number of new or updated analyses, policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions implemented to address issues identified through analyses	Number of new or updated analyses, policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions implemented to address issues identified through analyses
---	-----	---	---

Post-award, successful Category 2 applicants will be required to submit performance metric data quarterly through BJA’s online Training and Technical Assistance (TTA) Reporting Portal located at www.bjatrain.org. In addition, the selected TTA provider must collect and report data regarding the following program-specific objectives, depending on the type of assistance to be provided:

Provide jurisdictions with technical expertise and guidance to assist in the problem definition, analysis, recommendations, and implementation guidance related to a jurisdiction’s approach to inability to pay determinations and responses to failures to pay	527	Number of onsite visits completed	Number of onsite visits completed
	353	Number of reports submitted	Number of reports submitted to the grantees assessment organization (to be selected)
	54	Percentage of participating agencies/organizations successfully completing problem definition, analysis, and implementation activities	<p>A. Number of jurisdictions (participating agencies/organizations)</p> <p>B. Number of jurisdictions completing problem definition, analysis, and implementation activities to include, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish policies and practices • Establish high-performing programs • Provide key staff with relevant training • Provide key staff with training on implementing and validating tools • Establish, collect data, and report out performance measures, including jail or prison populations cost savings

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

Note on Project Evaluations

Applicants that propose to use funds awarded through this solicitation to conduct project evaluations should be aware that certain project evaluations (such as systematic

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

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

e. Impact/Outcomes, Evaluation, and Sustainment

4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet (i.e., A. Personnel, B. Fringe Benefits, C. Travel, D. Equipment, E. Supplies, F. Construction, G. Consultants/Contracts, H. Other Costs, I. Indirect Costs). The Budget Detail Worksheet should be broken down by year.

Budgets should clearly itemize the project’s spending plan for the project period. Computations should be mathematically sound and detailed. Budgets should also refrain from including unallowable costs and costs that are not necessary for project activities (e.g., unreasonable costs).

The budget categories and amounts included in the Budget Detail Worksheet should mirror the amounts in the Budget Narrative.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the [2015 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).

Applicants should demonstrate in their Budget Narratives how they will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget Narratives should generally describe cost

effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project. For example, a Budget Narrative should detail why planned in-person meetings are necessary, or how technology and collaboration with outside organizations could be used to reduce costs, without compromising quality.

The narrative should be mathematically sound and correspond with the information and figures provided in the Budget Detail Worksheet, including the match requirement, if applicable (see Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement on page 11). The narrative should explain how the applicant estimated and calculated all costs, and how they are relevant to the completion of the proposed project. The narrative may include tables for clarification purposes but need not be in a spreadsheet format. As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the Budget Narrative should be broken down by year.

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

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

d. Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals

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

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only under the following circumstances:

- (a) The applicant has a current, federally approved indirect cost rate; or
- (b) The applicant 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).

Attach a copy of the federally approved indirect cost rate agreement to the application. Applicants that do not have an approved rate may request one through their cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or, if the applicant’s accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct cost categories. For the definition of Cognizant Federal Agency, see the “Glossary of Terms” in the [Financial Guide](#). For assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, please contact the Customer Service Center at 800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf.

In order to use the “de minimis” indirect rate, attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both the applicant’s eligibility (to use the “de minimis” rate) and its election. If the applicant elects the “de minimis” method, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. In addition, if this method is chosen then it must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as you choose to negotiate a federally approved indirect cost rate.⁵

⁵ See 2 C.F.R. § 200.414(f).

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

Tribes, tribal organizations, or third parties proposing to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in their applications a resolution, a letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that certifies that the applicant has the legal authority from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for a grant on behalf of a tribe or multiple specific tribes, the application should include appropriate legal documentation, as described above, from all tribes that would receive services or assistance under the grant. A consortium of tribes for which existing consortium bylaws allow action without support from all tribes in the consortium (i.e., without an authorizing resolution or comparable legal documentation from each tribal governing body) may submit, instead, a copy of its consortium bylaws with the application.

7. Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status

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

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

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

8. Additional Attachments

- Letters of Support** from chief executives of all key partner organizations, including presiding judge or other leadership from the relevant court, detailing the commitment to work with the applicant to promote the mission of the project.
- Position Descriptions** for key positions and **Resumes** for personnel in those positions.
- Organizational Chart** and accompanying text explaining governance structure of the project and relationships among participating stakeholders.
- Detailed Implementation Plan (Category 2 only)** with key benchmarks for completing the tasks outlined on page 8.

e. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

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

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

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

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

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/Email for Point of Contact at Funding Agency
DOJ/COPS	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov
HHS/ Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration	Drug Free Communities Mentoring Program/ North County Youth Mentoring Program	John Doe, 202/000-0000; john.doe@hhs.gov

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment to their application. The file should be named “Disclosure of Pending Applications.”

Applicants that do not have pending applications as described above are to include a statement to this effect in the separate attachment page (e.g., “[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the Budget Narrative and Budget Detail Worksheet in the application under this solicitation.”).

f. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

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

- i. For purposes of this solicitation, applicants must document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its proposal to identify any research integrity issues (including all principal investigators and subrecipients) and it has concluded that the design, conduct, or reporting of research and evaluation funded by BJA grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts will not be biased by any personal or financial conflict of interest on the part of part of its staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients responsible for the research and evaluation or on the part of the applicant organization.

OR

- b. A specific listing of actual or perceived conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified in relation to this proposal. These conflicts could be either personal (related to specific staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients) or organizational (related to the applicant or any subgrantee organization). Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include, but are not limited to, those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse's work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization could not be given a grant to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), as the organization in such an instance would appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.
- ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation applicants must address the issue of possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. Applicants **MUST** also include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest.

OR

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

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

9. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire

In accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.205, federal agencies must have in place a framework for evaluating the risks posed by applicants before they receive a federal award. To facilitate part of this risk evaluation, **all** applicants (other than an individual) are to download, complete, and submit this [form](#).

10. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

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

How To Apply

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

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

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

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

Characters	Special Characters		
Upper case (A – Z)	Parenthesis ()	Curly braces { }	Square brackets []
Lower case (a – z)	Ampersand (&)	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Underscore (_)	Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (')
Hyphen (-)	At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign (\$)
Space	Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)
Period (.)	When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the “&#amp;” format.		

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

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

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

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

Individual applicants should search Grants.gov for a funding opportunity for which individuals are eligible to apply. Use the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) to register. Complete the registration form at <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister> to create a username and password. Individual applicants should complete all steps except 1, 2 and 4.

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

- 2. Acquire registration with the System for Award Management (SAM).** SAM is the repository for standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. OJP requires all applicants (other than individuals) for federal financial assistance to maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Applicants must **update or renew their SAM registration annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

Applications 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 up to 48 hours.** OJP recommends that the applicant register or renew registration with SAM as early as possible.

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

- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations, go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister>.
- 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 number for this solicitation is 16.827, titled "Justice Reinvestment Initiative," and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2016-9144.
- 6. Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application and the second will state whether the application has been successfully validated, or rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges applicants to submit applications **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 12, 2016.

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

Note: Duplicate Applications

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

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

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

The following conditions are generally insufficient to justify late submissions:

- Failure to register in SAM or Grants.gov in sufficient time. (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, including firewalls.

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

E. Application Review Information

Selection Criteria

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

Category 1 Criteria

1. Statement of the Problem (20 percent)

- Using relevant data, describe the problem that the consortium of stakeholders aims to address. Include in the problem statement data regarding the number and percentage of

the jail population that is confined due to inability to pay and information regarding fines and fees imposed and collected, if known, and any limitations in the ability to collect this information.

- Describe efforts to date to improve policies, practices, and collaboration related to criminal justice financial obligations, and to offer tailored alternatives to fines, fees, and costs that promote, rather than undermine, rehabilitation and reintegration.
- Describe challenges faced in achieving intended outcomes that this project is designed to address.
- Explain the inability to fund the project adequately without federal assistance.

2. Project Design and Implementation (35 percent)

- Describe specifically which activities the proposed project will undertake (i.e., specify which of the “Allowable Uses for Award Funds” on page 7 the proposal incorporates).
- Clearly articulate the goals established for this project and connect them to the overarching goals of the solicitation set forth on page 6.
- Use data to support the project design.
- If applicable, indicate the number of people who would receive services if this proposal is funded.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (25 percent)

- Describe the management structure and staffing of the project, identifying the agency responsible for the project and the grant coordinator. The grant coordinator must be a knowledgeable primary point of contact for the TA provider, BJA, and all project partners and must ensure effective communication and prompt deliverables throughout the life of the grant. Materials that will be considered in scoring this criterion include an organizational chart, position descriptions, and resumes (see “Additional Attachments” on page 20).
- Demonstrate the capability of the applicant to ensure proper fiscal and programmatic oversight of the grant, make and administer subgrants as appropriate, and manage the collaborative partnerships involved, if applicable.
- List the partners (governmental and non-governmental, if applicable) and describe their competencies, the relationship of those agencies to the applicant, and the history of collaboration among the partners. Relevant letters of support will be considered in scoring this criterion (see “Additional Attachments” on page 20).

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

- Describe the process for assessing the project’s effectiveness through the collection and reporting of the required performance metrics data (see Performance Measures on pages 15-17), as well as any additional performance measures the applicant proposes to collect. Describe how data will be captured and who will be responsible for collecting data and assessing and addressing data quality.

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

- Identify goals and objectives for project development, implementation, and outcomes.
- Describe how performance will be documented, monitored, and evaluated, and identify the impact of the strategy once implemented.
- Outline what data and information will be collected and describe how evaluation and collaborative partnerships will be leveraged to build long-term support and resources for the project.
- Discuss how this effort will be integrated into the state or tribal justice system plans or commitments, how the project will be financially sustained after federal funding ends, and the expected long-term results for the program.

6. Budget (5 percent)

- Submit a budget that is complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget Narratives should generally demonstrate how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget Narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.⁶

Category 2 Criteria

1. Statement of the Problem (20 percent)

- Describe in general terms the variety of reforms implemented to improve the fairness and efficiency of fines, fees, and costs.
- Describe in general terms the prevalence of jail or prison use to respond to failure to pay and the availability of data at the state and local level to guide and improve decisionmaking.
- Describe challenges in implementing a fair and efficient system of fines, fees, and costs that supports rehabilitation and reintegration. Describe strategies for overcoming these challenges and for sustaining quality implementation over time.

2. Project Design and Implementation (40 percent)

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

⁶ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

information contained in the implementation plan (see page 20) will contribute to the assignment of points relative to this criterion.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (20 percent)

- Clearly articulate why the applicant is positioned to assist with implementation of criminal justice reforms described in the “Statement of the Problem” section.
- Provide a detailed description of the capacity of the organization to deliver the required services and perform the key tasks described on page 8.
- Provide information on the required TTA and project oversight that will ensure successful application of the resources available throughout the project.
- Clearly articulate the organization’s history of involvement with related national scope state-level, and local criminal justice analysis and implementation projects. Include as an attachment writing samples and/or links to websites and publications developed previously that are emblematic of the applicant’s ability to distill, present, and disseminate information to the criminal justice field on related topics.
- Discuss the staffing resources, either permanent full-time staff or proposed consultants, to effectively implement the program, including the applicant’s ability to manage subcontractors with appropriate accountability.
- Job descriptions, resumes of key project staff, and appropriate letters of support will contribute to the assignment of points related to this criterion (see Additional Attachments on page 20).

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

- Describe a process for assessing the project’s effectiveness (see Performance Measures).
- Describe how assistance will be provided to successful applicants and participating stakeholders to ensure sustainment of implementation and performance measurement activities after technical assistance concludes.

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

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

6. Budget (10 percent)

- Applicants should submit a budget that is complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget Narratives should generally demonstrate how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget Narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.⁷

⁷ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

Review Process

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

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

- Applications must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant.
- Applications must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable).
- Applications must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation.
- Applications must include all items designated as “critical elements.”
- Applicants will be checked against the System for Award Management (SAM).

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

BJA may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications meeting basic minimum requirements on technical merit using the solicitation’s selection 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. A peer review panel will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although their views are considered carefully. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior BJA and OJP awards, and available funding.

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

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

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

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

OJP sends award notification 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 how to accept the award in GMS. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date (by September 30, 2016). Recipients will be required to log in; accept any outstanding assurances and certifications on the award; designate a financial point of contact; and review, sign, and accept the award. The award acceptance process involves physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the agency-approved project proposal and budget, the recipient must comply with award terms and conditions, and other legal requirements, including but not limited to OMB, DOJ or other federal regulations which will be included in the award, incorporated into the award by reference, or are otherwise applicable to the award. OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review the information pertaining to these requirements **prior** to submitting an application. To assist applicants and recipients in accessing and reviewing this information, OJP has placed pertinent information on its [Solicitation Requirements](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

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

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

Upon grant approval, OJP electronically transmits (via GMS) the award document to the prospective award recipient. In addition to other award information, the award document contains award terms and conditions that specify national policy requirements⁸ with which recipients of federal funding must comply; uniform administrative requirements, cost principles, and audit requirements; and program-specific terms and conditions required based on applicable program (statutory) authority or requirements set forth in OJP solicitations and

⁸ See generally 2 C.F.R. 200.300 (provides a general description of national policy requirements typically applicable to recipients of federal awards, including the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 [FFATA]).

program announcements, and other requirements which may be attached to appropriated funding. For example, certain efforts may call for special requirements, terms, or conditions relating to intellectual property, data/information-sharing or -access, or information security; or audit requirements, expenditures and milestones, or publications and/or press releases. OJP also may place additional terms and conditions on an award based on its risk assessment of the applicant, or for other reasons it determines necessary to fulfill the goals and objectives of the program.

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

As stated above, BJA anticipates that it will make any award from Category 2 of this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement. Cooperative agreement awards include standard “federal involvement” conditions that describe the general allocation of responsibility for execution of the funded program. Generally stated, under cooperative agreement awards, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient in implementing the funded and approved proposal and budget, and the award terms and conditions. Responsibility for oversight and redirection of the project, if necessary, rests with BJA.

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

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

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

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

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s), see title page.

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

H. Other Information

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

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

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

Application Checklist
FY 2016 The Price of Justice:
Rethinking the Consequences of Justice Fines and Fees

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

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 24)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 25)

To Register with Grants.gov:

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

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 25)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 23)
- _____ 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](#) (see page 12)

After application submission, receive Grants.gov email notifications that:

- _____ (1) application has been received, and
- _____ (2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 25)

If no Grants.gov receipt, and validation or error notifications are received:

- _____ contact the NCJRS Response Center regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 23)

General Requirements:

- _____ Review the [Solicitation Requirements](#) in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Scope Requirement:

- _____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$500,000.

Eligibility Requirement:

- _____ Eligible applicants for Category 1 are units of state and local government and federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior). Eligible applicants for Category 2 are national-scope private and nonprofit organizations (including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organizations) and colleges and universities, both public and private (including tribal institutions of higher education)

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 13)
- _____ Intergovernmental Review (see page 14)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 14)
- _____ *Program Narrative (see page 15)
- _____ *Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative (see page 18)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 19)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 20)
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status (see page 20)
- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Letters of Support from All Key Partners (see page 20)
 - _____ Position Descriptions and Resumes (see page 20)
 - _____ Organizational Chart (see page 20)
 - _____ Detailed Implementation Plan (Category 2 only) (see page 20)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 20)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 21)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 23)
- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 23)
- _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 12)

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