



Formula Grants Program

Fiscal Years 2006—2008
Comprehensive 3-Year Plan
Application Kit

Due Date: March 30, 2006

12/2/05, 7:45 a.m.

OJJDP

**U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention**
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General

Regina B. Schofield
Assistant Attorney General

J. Robert Flores
Administrator

Office of Justice Programs
Partnerships for Safer Communities
www.ojp.usdoj.gov

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ojjdp

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

Table of Contents

Overview.....	1
Award Information.....	1
Eligibility	2
GMS Registration	2
Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424).....	2
Assurances and Certifications.....	3
Budget Detail Worksheet (Attachment #1).....	3
Planning and Administration Funds and Match Requirement.....	3
State Advisory Group Allocation	3
State Allocations and Program Areas	3
American Indian Passthrough Amount.....	4
Program Narrative (Attachments #2).....	4
Description of System.....	4
Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems and Juvenile Justice Needs.....	5
Plans for Compliance With the First Three Core Requirements of the JJDP Act and the State’s Plan for Compliance Monitoring	6
Plan for Compliance with Disproportionate Minority Contact Core Requirement	9
<i>(Required Components for the FY 2006-2008 DMC Compliance Plan)</i>	11
Coordination of Child Abuse and Neglect and Delinquency Programs	12
Program Descriptions	13
Subgrant Award Assurances	14
SAG Membership	15
Staff of the JJDP Formula Grants Program	15
Other Program Attachments (Attachment #3)	16
Due Date	16
For Additional Information.....	16
Appendix A: Certified Assurances of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act	17
Appendix B: Other Requirements.....	28
Appendix C: Application Checklist.....	34
Appendix D: Distribution of Formula Grants, by State (FY 2005)	35
Appendix E: American Indian Passthrough Amounts, by State (FY 2005)	37
Appendix F: Formula Grant Program Areas.....	39
Appendix G: Waiver of Passthrough Requirement of OJJDP Guidelines (OJJDP Form G 4040.4).....	43
Appendix H: Sample Budget Detail Worksheet	44
Appendix I: Instruction to Complete the State Advisory Group Membership Roster (with Sample Roster).....	45

Formula Grants Program

Overview

In an effort to simplify the Formula Grants application process, Congress amended the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP Act), Public Law 93-415, as amended and codified at §§ 5601 *et seq.*, to allow states to submit a plan to cover a 3-year period. To conform with this objective, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) began the use of a 3-year program plan cycle with the fiscal year (FY) 1982 applications. States must update their plan annually to cover new or modified state programs or objectives that address specific requirements in the JJDP Act. This announcement contains instructions applicable to the FY 2006 Formula Grants application and the comprehensive FY 2006-2008 3-Year Plan.

The Formula Grants Program is authorized under Sections 221–223 of the JJDP Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 5631-5633. Participating states may apply for FY 2006 Formula Grant funds provided under the JJDP Act through this application process. This program supports state and local delinquency prevention and intervention efforts and juvenile justice system improvements. The long-term and annual performance goals of the program are:

- By 2011, 100 percent of states and territories will meet minimal compliance for the four core requirements, which can be found at Sections 223(a)(11), (12), (13), and (22) of the JJDP Act (core requirements). (The baseline is 94 percent. The annual goal is at least a 1-percent increase in core requirements met; the 5-year goal is 100 percent compliance.)
- By 2011, 35-to-50 percent of program youth will exhibit a desired change in targeted behaviors. Rates are based on the specific behavior targeted.
- By 2011, no more than 30 percent of program youth will offend or re-offend. (No baseline is currently available. This rate is based on research of other prevention and intervention programs. It is expected that offense rates will be lower for youth in prevention programs. The annual goal is a 1-percent decrease; the 5-year goal is a 5-percent decrease.)

Please carefully read through the entire application kit before you develop your application.

Award Information

State allocation: Formula Grant allocation to states for FY 2006 will depend upon the fiscal year appropriation by Congress. OJJDP will notify each state of its respective Formula Grant allocation following the enactment of the FY 2006 Appropriations Bill. For planning purposes, states should use their FY 2005 funding levels, including the American Indian tribal passthrough amounts.

OJJDP will reduce a state's FY 2006 allocation by 20 percent for each of the core requirements for which the state was found to be not in compliance in FY 2005. Until the FY 2006 allocations become

available, these states should plan their FY 2006 expenditures using the correctly reduced amounts from their FY 2005 allocations.

Project period: The awards are for a 3-year project and budget period lasting from October 1, 2005, to September 30, 2008.

Eligibility

Only the agency designated by the chief executive (i.e., the governor) of each state is eligible to apply for these funds. The term “state” means any state of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. **Applicants who do not meet this criterion are not eligible to apply for this grant program.**

GMS Registration

Applicants must submit all applications for this program announcement online through OJP’s Grants Management System (GMS) (<https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov>). A detailed “Step-by-Step Guide to OJP’s Grants Management System” (<https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov/gmsHelp/index.html>) is available on OJJDP’s Web site to assist applicants through the online application process.

Applicants must register for this solicitation by selecting “FY ‘06 OJJDP Title II” from the Funding Opportunities page in GMS. To register, select “Apply Now,” read the warning message that appears, and select “Continue.” **The deadline for applicants to register on GMS is March 17, 2006.**

Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)

Applicants must complete the Overview, Applicant Information, and Project Information sections of GMS. These sections provide the information applicants need to generate the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424), a standard form that most federal agencies use.

Applicants must provide the following information to complete the SF-424:

- **DUNS Number.** Applicants can call 800-333-0505 to request a free DUNS number. Applicants must have a DUNS number *before* beginning the application process.
- **CFDA Number.** The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.540, titled “Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Allocation to States.”
- **Type of Application.** Select “New” in the drop-down menu for “Type of Application.”

Assurances and Certifications

Applicants are required to review and accept the “Certified Assurances of the JJDP Act” (see Appendix A on page 17) and “Other Requirements” (see Appendix B on page 28) to receive federal funds under this program. To accept the Assurances and Certifications in GMS, select the Assurances and Certifications link and click the “Accept” button at the bottom of the screen. Please verify that the contact information (name, address, phone number, fax number, and e-mail address) for the applicant’s authorizing official is correct.

Budget Detail Worksheet (Attachment #1)

This attachment should include the amount the applicant state has budgeted for each program area it has identified to receive FY 2006 Formula Grant funds. Funds allocated for the planning and administration funds and match requirement, the State Advisory Group (SAG), and the American Indian tribes passthrough (where applicable) are required line items (see sample worksheet in appendix H, page 44).

1. Planning and Administration Funds and Match Requirement

Pursuant to Section 222(c) of the JJDP Act, states may use no more than 10 percent of their Formula Grant allocation for state plan development, other pre-award activities associated with that state plan, administration of the Formula Grant Program, including evaluation, monitoring, and at least one full-time juvenile justice specialist position. States that experience a reduction in their Formula Grant allocation based on noncompliance with one or more of the JJDP Act’s core requirements will receive a reduction in their planning and administration funds accordingly. The state must match planning and administration funds dollar for dollar.

2. State Advisory Group Allocation

For planning and budget purposes, states may make up to \$30,000 of their annual allocations available to assist the SAG (based on FY 2005 figures in accordance with Section 222(d) of the JJDP Act). OJJDP will notify the states of the actual FY 2006 SAG allocation once it receives its final appropriation.

3. State Allocations and Program Areas

OJJDP will notify each state of its respective formula allocation following enactment of the FY 2006 Appropriations Bill. As Section 223(c) of the JJDP Act requires, OJJDP will reduce a state’s FY 2006 allocation by 20 percent for each of the core requirements for which the state was found to be not in compliance in FY 2005. Until that time, states should use their FY 2005 funding levels for planning purposes. Again, for states that were determined to be not in compliance with one or more core requirement in FY 2005, they should plan their FY 2006 expenditures using the correctly reduced amounts from their FY 2005 allocations.

See appendix D on pages 35–36 for FY 2005 distribution of Formula Grants by state and appendix F on pages 39–42 for Formula Grant program areas.

4. American Indian Passthrough Amount

The required American Indian passthrough amount represents the minimum dollars a state must pass through to tribes that perform law enforcement functions. Until 2006 calculations are finalized, states should use the FY 2005 American Indian passthrough amounts where applicable. (See appendix E on pages 37–38 for FY 2005 amounts.) Although this amount is based on a statutory formula, in many instances it is too small to support effective juvenile justice and delinquency prevention activities. Therefore, where appropriate, OJJDP encourages the states to pass through greater amounts. In addition, OJJDP advises states to encourage tribes to apply for a discretionary grant under the Tribal Youth Program.

Please note: Total costs that the state specifies in its complete budget must match the amount it provides in the Estimated Funding section of the Project Information screen in GMS. All funds listed in the budget will be subject to audit.

Program Narrative (Attachment #2)

Comprehensive 3-Year Plan Components

1. Description of System

A. Structure and Function of Juvenile Justice System

This description should include information on the organization, responsibilities, and functions of the major components of the formal juvenile justice system. Generally this would include law enforcement, juvenile detention and other pretrial programs, courts, corrections, and community-based programs for delinquent and status offenders.

B. System Flow

This section should include a display, with the use of a flow chart, of how youth move through the system.

C. Service Network

This section should include a description of major programs the state or local jurisdiction operate outside the formal juvenile justice system that directly affect delinquency reduction, control, or prevention. Examples include, but are not limited to, alcohol and drug programs, child abuse and neglect programs, mental health services available to juveniles in the juvenile justice system, alternatives or special education programs for delinquent youth, and job training and development.

2. Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems and Juvenile Justice Needs

States should base this analysis on the description of the system in section 1 above and include conditions they consider or determine to be relevant to addressing juvenile justice and delinquency prevention problems.

A. Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems¹

As part of the 3-year planning process, the state is required under Section 223(a)(7) of the JJDP Act to conduct an analysis of **current** juvenile crime problems (including juvenile gangs that commit crimes) and juvenile justice and delinquency prevention and educational needs within the state, including those geographic areas in which tribes perform law enforcement functions. This section should summarize the number and characteristics of youth handled at each stage of the process, from arrest through disposition. Please provide a minimum of 3 years of recent data for the areas listed below. Provide the **most recent** data to the extent possible by county, parish, or city. **If requested data is not available, describe the problem in obtaining the data and plans to improve data collection and reporting efforts, including designated resources for improvement in this area.**

Applicants should view the data reporting requirements below as the minimum needed for this section of the juvenile crime analysis. They should expand the information within the recommended categories 1–4 below if relevant to analyzing current juvenile crime problems and juvenile justice needs.

- (1) Juvenile arrests by offense type, gender, age, and race.
- (2) Number and characteristics (by offense type, gender, race, and age) of juveniles referred to juvenile court, a probation agency, or special intake unit for allegedly committing a delinquent or status offense.
- (3) Number of cases handled informally (nonpetitioned) and formally (petitioned) by gender, race, and type of disposition (e.g., diversion, probation, commitment, residential treatment).
- (4) Number of delinquent and status offenders admitted, by gender and race, to juvenile detention facilities and adult jails and lockups (if applicable).
- (5) Other social, economic, legal, and organizational conditions considered relevant to delinquency prevention programming.

¹ Include the extent of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) as displayed by *DMC Identification Spreadsheets* and their discussion in the DMC Compliance Plan.

B. List of State’s Priority Juvenile Justice Needs/Problem Statements

The product of the above analysis of juvenile crime problems shall be a series of problem statements. The state must establish a priority ranking for each problem statement.

A problem statement is defined as a written presentation that describes the magnitude, seriousness, rate of change, persons affected, and other aspects of a problem using qualitative and quantitative information. It identifies the nature, extent, and effect of system response, makes projections based upon historical precedent, and rigorously attempts to address the origins of the problem. The problem statements should be linked to the current data and needs analysis, the requirements of the JJDP Act, the functions of the juvenile justice system, geographic locations, and, whenever possible, related socioeconomic factors. A problem statement is a clear and succinct summary that reflects the results of the analysis undertaken. It does not necessarily represent all the analysis undertaken or all data collected for any given problem.

Aside from expenditures for planning and administration (program area 23; see appendix E) and SAG allocations (program area 31), these data-based problem statements and their priority ranking provide the state with the basis for developing its 3-Year Program Plan for funding juvenile justice programs. List and discuss in order of priority.

3. Plans for Compliance With the First Three Core Requirements of the JJDP Act and the State’s Plan for Compliance Monitoring (The plans must be data-based and program specific, including the necessary “who, what, where, how, and when” to provide clear plans of action.)

The Comprehensive 3-Year Plan shall contain:

A. Plan for Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (Removal of Status Offenders and Nonoffenders from Secure Detention and Correctional Facilities)

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(11) of the JJDP Act, the state must develop a plan that ensures status offenders and nonoffenders are not placed in secure detention or secure correctional facilities, except as allowed by OJJDP’s *Guidance Manual for Monitoring Facilities Under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002* (revised September 2003).

For those states that have not achieved substantial compliance as outlined in Section 223(c) of the Act, the plan must indicate and provide sufficient documentation of the state’s unequivocal commitment to achieving full compliance and a strategy, activities, and timetable for achieving full compliance.

B. Plan for Separation of Juveniles from Adult Offenders (Separation)

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(12) of the JJDP Act, the state must develop a plan that ensures juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent and status offenders shall not have

contact with adult inmates who are incarcerated because they have been convicted of a crime or are awaiting trial on criminal charges.

If the state uses the same staff to serve both the adult and juvenile populations in approved collocated juvenile detention facilities, it must have a policy in effect that requires individuals who work with both juveniles and adult inmates to be trained and certified to work with juveniles. **The state must submit a copy of this policy, including a description of the training and certification process, with this application.**

This section of the application must provide an assurance that juveniles who have been transferred or waived or are otherwise under the jurisdiction of a criminal court are moved to an adult facility or separated from other juvenile delinquent offenders in secure juvenile detention centers or correctional facilities within 6 months after the youth reaches the state's age of full criminal responsibility. If states are unable to provide an assurance, they must include a plan on how they will meet this requirement in this section of the plan.

C. Plan for Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups (Jail Removal)

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(13) of the JJDP Act, the state must develop a plan that ensures no juvenile shall be detained or confined in any adult jail or lockup, except as allowed by OJJDP's *Guidance Manual for Monitoring Facilities Under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002* (revised September 2003).

If any of the following exceptions to the secure holding of juveniles apply, describe how each exception is utilized:

- (1) **Six-hour hold exception:** Under Section 223(a)(13)(A) and OJJDP regulations, juveniles accused of committing criminal-type offenses (i.e., offenses that would be a criminal offense if committed by an adult) may be securely detained in an adult jail or lockup for up to 6 hours for the purpose of identification and processing or to arrange for release or transfer. This 6-hour period also applies to a time period both before and after a court appearance. Under this exception, the juvenile cannot have sight or sound contact with incarcerated adults during the time he or she is in secure custody in the adult jail or lockup.
- (2) **Rural removal exception:** Section 223(a)(13)(B) and OJJDP regulations provide for a rural removal exception with regard to juveniles accused of delinquent offenses, held in certain rural areas, and who are awaiting an initial court appearance. Under certain circumstances, such juveniles may be temporarily detained beyond the 6-hour time limit. It is important to note that the rural removal exception does not apply to status offenders. Status offenders may not be held for any length of time in an adult jail or lockup.
- (3) **Transfer or waiver exception:** If criminal felony charges have been filed against a juvenile in a court exercising criminal jurisdiction, he or she may be detained in

an adult jail or lockup. The jail and lockup removal requirement does not apply to those juveniles formally waived or transferred to criminal court and against whom criminal felony charges have been filed or to juveniles over whom a criminal court has original or concurrent jurisdiction and such court's jurisdiction has been invoked through the filing of criminal felony charges. It is important to note that waiver or transfer and the filing of criminal felony charges do not transform a juvenile into an adult. Therefore, such a juvenile can be detained (or confined after conviction) in a juvenile facility and commingled with juvenile offenders until he reaches the age of majority.

D. Plan for Compliance Monitoring for the First Three Core Requirements of the JJDP Act

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(14) of the JJDP Act, the state must provide for an adequate system of monitoring jails, lockups, detention facilities, correctional facilities, and nonsecure facilities.

The state must provide a monitoring plan that includes a **detailed** description of monitoring tasks and identifies the specific agency or agencies responsible for each task. The tasks to be included in the discussion are:

- (1) **Identification of the monitoring universe:** This refers to the identification of all facilities in the state that might hold juveniles pursuant to public authority. Every facility that has this potential, regardless of the purpose for housing juveniles, comes under the purview of the monitoring requirements. This also includes those facilities that public and private agencies own or operate.
- (2) **Classification of facilities:** This is the classification of all facilities in the state to determine which ones should be considered a secure detention or correctional facility, adult correctional institution, jail, lockup, or other type of secure or nonsecure facility.
- (3) **Inspection of facilities:** Inspection of facilities is necessary to ensure an accurate assessment of each facility's classification and record keeping. All facilities classified as secure detention or correctional facilities, jails, lockups, and other facilities must have periodic, onsite inspections to determine that they comply with Sections 223(a)(11), (12), and (13) of the JJDP Act.
- (4) **Data collection and verification:** States are required to collect and report data to determine whether facilities in the state comply with the applicable requirements of deinstitutionalization of status offenders (DSO), jail removal, and separation. The length of the reporting period should be up to 12 months but in no case less than 6 months. If reporting 6 months of data, the state must project the data for a full year in a statistically valid manner. If the facility self-reports the data or an agency other than the state agency receiving federal grant funds collects and

reports the data, the plan must describe a statistically valid procedure used to verify the reported data.

This section of the application shall also describe the legislative and administrative procedures and sanctions that the state has established to receive, investigate, and report compliance violations. If an agency other than the designated state agency is responsible for monitoring, describe how that agency maintains accountability for compliance with this requirement.

If monitoring is provided through contractual services, identify the funds provided to support this program and the name, address, and telephone number of the contractor. In addition, describe the procedures and activities the state agency uses to monitor the contract.

For each of the requirements (3A–3D) above, the state should describe:

- a. Strategy, specific activities, timetable covering the 3-year planning cycle, and resources to support the implementation of the plans.
- b. Barriers the state faces in achieving full compliance, and how it will overcome them.
- c. Role of the SAG in monitoring for compliance with the DSO, separation, and removal requirements.
- d. If the state has been found to be in full compliance with these requirements, provide an assurance that indicates:
 - (1) Adequate plans are on file and available for review.
 - (2) Resources to maintain compliance are identified, on file, and available to review.
 - (3) The state will notify OJJDP if circumstances arise or if resources are lost that would jeopardize the state’s capability of maintaining compliance with the requirements.
- e. For states out of compliance with one or more of these requirements, describe specific activities and resources designated to achieve full compliance.

4. Plan for Compliance with the Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Core Requirement

Pursuant to section 223(a)(22) of the JJDP Act, states must address specific delinquency prevention and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring

numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of juvenile numbers of minority groups, who come into contact with the juvenile justice system. Disproportionate minority contact exists if the rate of contact with the juvenile justice system of a specific minority group is significantly different than the rate of contact for non-Hispanic whites or for other minority groups.

The purpose of this core requirement is to ensure equal and fair treatment for every youth (regardless of membership in a minority or majority population group) involved in the juvenile justice system. A state achieves compliance with this core requirement when it meets the following requirements by addressing DMC on an ongoing basis through identification (identify the extent to which DMC exists), assessment (examine and determine the factors that contributes to DMC, if it exists), intervention (develop and implement strategies to address contributing factors reduce DMC), evaluation (evaluate the efficacy of intervention strategies), and monitoring (track changes in DMC trends over time).

All states and territories, except for Puerto Rico, which has been exempted by the U.S. Census Bureau from reporting racial statistics shall submit *DMC Identification Spreadsheets* as part of the DMC Compliance Plan in their 3-year Plans. When a state determines that DMC exists, it shall provide in its 3-Year Plan and Plan Updates a DMC Compliance Plan and comply with the implementation guidelines below.

Circumstance necessitating an assessment. When a state identifies that DMC exists, it must undertake an assessment. States should also undertake assessments with particular focuses when they note significant changes in the relative rates of minority juvenile justice system contact in monitoring DMC trends or after they implement significant changes in laws, procedures, and policies within the juvenile justice system that may impact negatively on DMC.

Assessment. A DMC assessment is a comprehensive analysis, utilizing sophisticated research methodologies, to identify the factors that contribute to DMC by examining minority over-representation and explaining differences in all contact stages of the juvenile justice system. It should also include recommendations for specific intervention strategies. If a completed assessment is not available or needed, the state shall submit a time-limited plan for completing the assessment.

Intervention. Each state's DMC Compliance Plan shall, where DMC has been demonstrated and contributing factors determined, provide an intervention plan for reducing DMC. The state shall base the intervention plan on the results of the identification data and assessment findings. It should target comprehensive prevention and system improvement efforts to communities where DMC is most prominent and those contact stages of the system where major disproportionate rates occur and address any individual, family, community, educational system, and other issues related to juvenile justice system involvement and any features of its juvenile justice system and related laws and policies that may account for or contribute to DMC

Evaluation/Performance Measurement. States shall evaluate the efficacy of their efforts to reduce DMC. At a minimum, all intervention strategies to reduce DMC shall include specific goals, objectives, specific activities to reach them, and selected performance measures.

Monitoring/ DMC Data Updates. States and their selected localities shall monitor and track changes in DMC trends over time to identify emerging critical issues that may affect DMC and to determine whether there has been progress in reduction. All States must update their *DMC Identification Spreadsheets* at least once every 3 years when the 3-year Plans are due with the most recent available data statewide and at least three counties with the highest minority concentration or, preferably, the localities with focused DMC-reduction efforts.

OJJDP annual determination of States' compliance with the DMC core requirement is based on the completeness of their DMC Compliance Plans, the demonstration of actual, systematic, continuing, and good-faith implementation of their planned activities, and the progress reported each year.

Required Components for the FY 2006-2008 DMC Compliance Plan

A. Updated *DMC Identification Spreadsheets* (Attachment #3)

Using the most recent available data, provide the *DMC Identification Spreadsheets* for statewide, at least three jurisdictions with the highest minority concentrations or, preferably, the localities with focused DMC-reduction efforts. Until the Web-based DMC Data Entry System scheduled to be available in mid-February 2006, use the October 2005 version of the *DMC Identification Spreadsheets* downloadable from OJJDP's DMC Webpage at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/dmc. Enter the spreadsheets as Attachment #3. OJJDP will sponsor conference calls and training on the use of the Web-based data entry in early 2006. At a future date, OJJDP will provide guidance on how to upload the DMC data entered in OJJDP's DMC Data Entry System onto GMS.

After entering the spreadsheets on GMS, state "See attachment #3."

B. DMC Data Discussions:

- (1) When quantifiable documentation is unavailable or incomplete to determine whether DMC exists or changes, the state must provide a time-limited plan of action for developing and implementing a system for the routine data collection needed to track progress in DMC reduction and demonstrate consistent improvement in this area.
- (2) Discuss the Relative Rates Indexes (RRIs) obtained, make comparisons between the updated data and data obtained in earlier years, and illustrate how the data inform/guide the state's FY 2006–2008 DMC Compliance plan.

C. Progress Made in FY 2005

Discuss the status of **each** of the planned activities in the FY 2005 DMC Compliance Plan. **States with significant local DMC-reduction efforts should complete this section by localities as well.**

-
- (1) Which activities have been implemented? Discuss specific progress made.
 - (2) Which activities were not implemented? Discuss reasons that have prevented their implementation and plans to overcome these obstacles.

D. DMC-reduction Plan for FY 2006-2008

- (1) Include specific activities in data collection, data system improvement, assessment, programmatic and systems improvement intervention, evaluation and monitoring strategies, as appropriate.
- (2) Specify the timeline (i.e., FY 2006, FY 2007, or FY 2008) and funding amount and funding source(s) designated to conduct each of the planned activities.
- (3) Include planned Formula Grant-supported activities under "Program Descriptions" section below with amount budgeted and required descriptions of goals, objectives, and performance measures selected to document the output and outcomes of these activities.

5. Coordination of Child Abuse and Neglect and Delinquency Programs

The JJDP Act emphasizes interagency coordination and collaboration in addressing the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency. Applicants may fund such programming under program area 19; see appendix F.

A. Reducing the Caseload of Probation Officers

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(25) of the JJDP Act, the state may provide incentive grants to units of general local government that reduce the caseload of probation officers. Funds reserved for this purpose may not exceed 5 percent of the state's allocation (other than funds made available to the SAG).

B. Sharing Public Child Welfare Records With the Courts in the Juvenile Justice System

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(26) of the JJDP Act, the state shall to the maximum extent practicable implement a system to ensure that if a juvenile is before a court in the juvenile justice system, that juvenile's public child welfare records (including child protective services records) for the geographical area under the jurisdiction of that court will be made known to the court.

C. Establishing Policies and Systems To Incorporate Relevant Child Protective Services Records Into Juvenile Justice Records

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(27) of the JJDP Act, the state shall establish policies and systems to incorporate relevant child protective services records into juvenile justice

records for purposes of establishing and implementing treatment plans for juvenile offenders.

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(28) of the JJDP Act, this section of the application must provide an assurance that juvenile offenders whose placement is funded through Section 472 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 672) receive the protections specified in Section 471 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 671), including a case plan and case plan review as defined in Section 475 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 675).

6. Program Descriptions

Based on “List of State’s Priority Juvenile Justice Needs/Problem Statements” in section 2B, applications must include descriptions of programs that will be supported with JJDP Act Formula Grant funds during the 3-year period of the plan. Programs are groupings of projects with similar or common goals. Each item below must be addressed for each program:

- A. Program Area Code and Title:** Use only OJJDP’s codes and titles available in Appendix F.
- B. Problem Statement:** Briefly state which of the priority juvenile justice problems this program intends to address.
- C. Program goals:** Provide a broad statement (i.e., written in general terms) that conveys a program’s overall intent to change, reduce, or eliminate the problem described. Goals identify the program’s intended short- and long-term results.
- D. Program objectives:** Explain how the program will accomplish the goals. Objectives are specific, quantifiable statements of the program’s desired results, and they should include the target level of accomplishment, thereby further defining goals and providing the means to measure program performance.
- E. Activities and services planned:** Provide the specific steps or projects that the grantee will take or fund to accomplish each objective. This part of the program description must summarize which agencies will implement the program, where and when activities will take place, the specific services that the applicant will provide, who will benefit from the services, and the target population. This section must indicate how the program relates to similar state or local programs directed at the same or similar problems.
- F. Performance measures:** Represent the data/information that all subgrantees in this program area will collect at the program level to measure the specific outputs and short- and long-term outcomes their programs are designed to achieve. OJJDP requires all states to collect performance measurement data on their subgrant programs. States should indicate all mandatory and two nonmandatory **output** measures and all mandatory and two non-mandatory **outcome** measures (either short-term or long-term), when applicable. (Some core requirements and system improvement program areas require reporting on fewer measures.) Choose these measures from OJJDP’s Formula Grants and Title V

Performance Measurement Web site at http://dsgonline.com/Program_Logic_Model/fg_pm.htm. For more information on choosing measures and other useful performance measurement information, visit the Performance Measurement Web site at http://www.dsgonline.com/performance_measures.htm. For technical assistance in choosing performance measure, contact Lisa Reynolds at lreynolds@dsgonline.com or at (301) 951-5373.

- G. Budget:** Present total federal funds the state plans to use in this program area from its Formula Grant allocation, along with any expected state, local, or private funds:

Fiscal Year	Formula Grant Funds (\$)	State/Local/Private Funds (\$)	Total (\$)
2006			
2007			
2008			

7. Subgrant Award Assurances

- A. Subaward Selection:** Pursuant to Section 223(a)(21)(A) and (B) of the JJDP Act, states shall, to the extent practicable, give priority in funding to evidence-based programs and activities. Further, under Section 223(a)(21)(C) of the JJDP Act, states shall not continue to fund a program if the subgrant recipient who carried out that program during the preceding 2-year period fails to demonstrate that the program achieved substantial success in meeting the goals specified in the original subgrant application.

To enable local subgrantees to implement evidence-based juvenile justice programs, OJJDP has developed the Model Programs Guide and Database, a searchable Web site containing information on the full range of evidence-based juvenile justice programs, from delinquency prevention and intervention to reentry (see http://www.dsgonline.com/mpg_index.htm). Communities can use the database to locate evidence-based juvenile justice strategies that will fit their needs and enhance their likelihood for success.

Describe the procedures/process that the state will use to assure the implementation of the above two requirements of the subgrant award process.

- B. Geographic Information:** To help OJP develop a geographic information system (GIS) strategic planning capacity, applicant states must provide to OJJDP geographic information for each subgrant. Such information should contain the following two items of information on the geographic area(s) that the subgrant recipient will serve (“service area(s)”) in the format specified below:

- Physical address:** If the mailing address is a P.O. box, specify the physical address(es) of the location(s) where the subgrantee will provide services. If the mailing address is in a rural area with no street address, include the nearest street intersection. If the subgrant program has multiple service areas, include the required information for each.

(example with street address)

ABC Associates
123 First Street
Shrewsbury, PA 17361

(example with no street address)

ABC Associates
First Street and Holiday Drive
Shrewsbury, PA 17361

- **Map and Street Description:** Provide a road map (with local detail) with the service area(s) clearly depicted. State applicants should mark the map with information identifying the federal formula/block award number it is tied to, including state name, and subgrantee contact name and phone number. Also include a written description of streets bounding the service area. If GIS files are available, e-mail them to OJJDP’s Mapping Section, attention: Sarah Breen at sarah.breen@usdoj.gov.

Provide a description of how the state plans to obtain the above geographic information from each subgrant recipient and a statement indicating the state’s commitment to fulfilling this requirement.

8. SAG Membership

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(3)(A) of the JJDP Act, the SAG shall consist of not less than 15 and not more than 33 members appointed by the chief executive officer of the state. At least one member shall be a locally elected official representing general purpose local government. At least one-fifth of the members shall be younger than 24 years old at the time of appointment. At least three members shall have been or currently are under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system. A majority of the members (including the chairperson) shall not be full-time employees of federal, state, or local government. The membership qualifications are described in subsections i–v of Section 223(a)(3)(A) of the JJDP Act, as amended. (See appendix I on pages 45–47 for detailed membership instructions and a sample membership table.)

9. Staff of the JJDP Formula Grants Program

The state must provide the following to OJJDP:

- The organizational chart of the agency designated to implement the Formula Grants Program.
- A list of the other programs administered by the agency or division administering the Formula Grants Program.
- The staffing and management plan for the state agency/division implementing the Formula Grants Program, including names, titles of staff, funding sources (and state match), and percentage of time devoted to the JJDP program.
- Descriptions of the duties for the Juvenile Justice Specialist (at least one full-time position is required) and other juvenile justice and delinquency prevention staff.

Other Program Attachments (Attachment #3)

Attach updated *DMC Identification Spreadsheets* here. See section 4A on page 11.

Due Date

Applicant states must register for this funding opportunity by March 17, 2006, and they must submit completed applications online through OJP's Grants Management System (<https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov>) by 8:00 p.m. ET, March 30, 2006.

For Additional Information

If you have questions about this program announcement, please contact your OJJDP State Representative or Heidi Hsia, Formula Grant Program Manager, at 202-616-3667 or Heidi.Hsia@usdoj.gov. If you have questions of a technical nature, call the GMS Help Desk at 1-888-549-9901 (option 3). Address financial questions to the Office of the Comptroller, Customer Service Center: 1-800-458-0786 (press 2) or at ask.oc@usdoj.gov.

Appendix A: Certified Assurances of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act

By submitting the application for the Formula Grants Program, states certify that they have met and will comply with all provisions of the JJDP Act and, specifically, Sections 221–223, as implemented by OJJDP through the agency’s regulations and guidance instructions.

In cases where states cannot certify that they have met the requirements, they must provide an explanation under the heading “Exceptions to the Certified Assurances” and a statement as to when they will correct the omission.

Below is a general description of selected requirements set forth in the JJDP Act and OJP regulations. For an authoritative reference of OJJDP’s legal requirements, applicable when accepting OJJDP Formula grant funds, the applicant should consult the JJDP Act.

1. Plan Supervision, Administration, and Implementation

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(1) and (2) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that it is the sole agency that supervises the preparation and administration of the plan and has the legal authority to implement the formula grant plan that Section 223 of the Act requires.

2. Planning and Administration (P&A) Funds

Pursuant to Section 222(c) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that it will make planning and administration funds available to units of local government on an equitable basis (indicate the amount of P&A funds allocated to the state on Attachment 1: Budget Detail Worksheet). The grantee further assures that the total of such funds may not exceed 10 percent of the total JJDP award and it will match the award dollar for dollar, in cash.

3. Supervisory Board

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(1) of the JJDP Act, the grantee:

- A. Assures it has a supervisory board that supervises the preparation, administration, and implementation of the formula grant plan that Section 223 of the Act requires.

-
- B. Assures that one of the following boards serves as the supervisory board:
- (1) The State Advisory Group (SAG) appointed under Section 223(a)(3); **or**
 - (2) A broad-based law enforcement and criminal justice supervisory board (council) meeting all the requirements of Section 402(b)(2) of the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979. The grantee will provide a list of all current supervisory board members, including their dates of appointment and how each meets the membership requirements specified in Section 402(b)(2) of the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979; **or**
 - (3) A board with balanced representation of juvenile justice interests that has been specifically approved by the OJJDP Administrator.
- C. Assures, if applicable, by having a broad-based law enforcement and criminal justice supervisory council serving as the supervisory board, that such a board has been continuously maintained since the enactment of the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979. The grantee further assures that such board's membership includes the chairperson and at least two additional citizen members of the SAG and that any executive committee of the board includes the same proportion of juvenile justice advisory group members as are included in the board membership.

4. State Advisory Group

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(3) of the JJDP Act, the grantee:

- A. Shall provide a list of all current advisory group members (see appendix A for detailed instructions), including their respective dates of appointment and how each member meets the membership criteria specified in this section of the Act. The grantee must identify members appointed prior to their 24th birthday (youth members) as well as those members who also serve on a separate supervisory board, if one exists. The grantee assures that the information on the SAG listing is accurate and current.
- B. Assures that three members who have been or are now under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system have been appointed to the advisory group.
- C. Assures that it will comply with Section 222(d) of the JJDP Act.

-
- D. Assures that a majority of SAG members and the chairperson are not full-time employees of the federal, state, or local government.
 - E. Assures that it complies with all requirements of Section 223(a)(3) of the JJDP Act.
 - F. Assures, if applicable pursuant to Section 223(b) of the JJDP Act, that the supervisory board has received and considered the SAG's advice and recommendations prior to approving and submitting them to OJJDP.

5. Consultation With and Participation of Units of General Local Government and Indian Tribes

Pursuant to Sections 223(a)(4), (5), and (6) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that:

- A. Units of general local government or combinations of such units have been actively consulted and have participated in the development of the state plan.
- B. Indian tribes, a combination of eligible Indian tribes, or an organization(s) designated by qualifying tribes within the state has been actively consulted in the state plan development, which adequately takes into account the juvenile justice needs and request of those Indian tribes that perform law enforcement functions within the state.
- C. Every effort has been made to incorporate the needs of such units into the state plan.
- D. The chief executive officer of each major unit of general local government has been given the opportunity to assign responsibility for the preparation and administration of its part of the state or the supervision thereof to an appropriate local agency.

6. Passthrough Requirements

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(5) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that:

-
- A. The amount and percentage of funds specified below will be passed through to units of general local government, local private agencies, and eligible Indian tribes. For purposes of this requirement, “local private agency” is defined as a private nonprofit agency or organization that provides program services within an identifiable unit or combination of units of general local government. (In calculating the minimum passthrough amount, the state takes the total formula grant award, subtracts the 5 percent SAG allocation, then multiplies by 66.6 percent.)

For information regarding a waiver of the 66.6-percent passthrough requirement, see OJJDP Guideline 4040.4 in appendix G. Note that the grantee may include planning and administration funds passed through to units or a combination of units of local government under Section 222(c) and reported in assurance 2 above and the Indian passthrough funds reported in assurance 6B below in meeting the total Section 223(a)(5) passthrough requirement.

- B. The grantee will make funds available to Indian tribes that perform law enforcement functions. The grantee further assures that the program budget provides for the required minimum amount of American Indian passthrough funds.

7. Equitable Distribution of Juvenile Justice Funds and Assistance

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(6) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that:

- A. The state will adhere to procedures that ensure equitable distribution of JJDP Act Formula Grant Program funds within the state.
- B. The problem and need analyses have examined the needs of disadvantaged youth and that assistance will be available equitably to deal with special juvenile justice and delinquency prevention program needs identified for these juveniles.

8. Concentration of State Effort

The grantee assures that pursuant to Section 223(a)(7)(A) of the JJDP Act, a plan for the concentration of state efforts as they relate to the coordination of all policy and development of objectives and priorities for all state juvenile delinquency programs and activities is on file.

9. Participation of Public and Private Agencies

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(8) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that private agencies have been actively consulted and allowed to participate in the development and execution of the state plan and that there is coordination and maximum use of existing juvenile delinquency programs and other related programs, such as recreation, education, special education, health, and welfare, within the state.

10. Advanced Techniques

The grantee assures that at least 75 percent of the JJDP Act funds, other than funds made available to the State Advisory Committee, will be used to support advanced-technique programs as identified in Section 223(a)(9)(A–S).

11. Analytical and Training Capacity

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(10) of the JJDP Act, the state ensures that it will develop and conduct research, training, and evaluation activities appropriate to the state's needs.

12. Equitable Treatment

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(15), the grantee assures that youth in the juvenile justice system are treated equitably on the basis of gender, race, family income, and mental, emotional, and physical limitations.

13. Strengthening and Maintaining Family Units

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(16) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that it will consider and provide assistance for approaches to strengthen and maintain the families of delinquent and other youth and provide family counseling during the confinement of juvenile family members and coordinate family services where appropriate and feasible.

14. Right of Privacy for Recipients of Services

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(17) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that it has established procedures to ensure that programs funded under the JJDP Act shall not disclose program records containing the identity of individual juveniles. Exceptions to this requirement include (a) authorization by law, (b) consent of either the juvenile or his

or her legally authorized representative, or (c) justification that the functions of this title cannot be performed otherwise. Under no circumstances may public project reports or findings contain names of actual juvenile service recipients.

15. Equitable Arrangements for Employees Affected by Assistance in This Act

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(18) of the JJDP Act, the state assures that it has established all terms and conditions for the protection of employees affected by the JJDP Act.

16. Fiscal Control and Fund Accountability

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(19) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that it shall provide fiscal control, fund accounting, auditing, monitoring, evaluation procedures, and such records as OJJDP prescribes to assure fiscal control, proper management, and efficient disbursement of funds received. This requirement applies to funds that units of local government disburse and entitlement areas and funds that the grantee disburses directly.

17. Nonsupplanting

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(20) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that it will use the Formula Grant funds to supplement and increase (but not supplant) the level of the state, local, and other nonfederal funds that it would make available in the absence of the Formula Grant funds for programs and will in no event replace such state, local, and other nonfederal funds.

18. Annual Performance Report

Pursuant to Section 223(a) and Section 223(a)(21) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that the state will review at least annually the Formula Grant plan and submit to the OJJDP Administrator an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the programs and activities carried out under the Formula Grant plan and any modifications in the plan. The report will describe the grantee's progress in implementing programs contained in the plan and will identify the status of compliance with the state plan requirements.

19. Comprehensive and Coordinated Services

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(24), the grantee assures that it will expend program fund allocations in excess of 105 percent of the amount the state received in FY 2000 through or for programs that are part of a “comprehensive and coordinated system of services.”

20. Lobbying

The grantee assures that it will not use funds paid pursuant to Section 223(a)(9)(D) of the Act to any public or private agency, organization, or institution or to any individual (whether directly or through a state criminal justice council) to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone communication, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence a member of Congress or any other federal, state, or local elected official to favor or oppose any act, bills, resolutions, or similar legislation or any referendum, initiative, constitutional amendment, or any similar procedure by the Congress, any state legislature, any local council, or any similar governing body. This assurance shall not preclude the grantee from using such funds in connection with communications to federal, state, or local elected officials, upon the request of such officials through proper official channels, pertaining to authorization, appropriation, or oversight measures directly affecting the operation of the program involved.

The grantee further assures, pursuant to Section 319 of Pub. L. 101–121, to comply with the provisions of this law as it relates to lobbying activities and the disclosure of such lobbying activities.

21. Biomedical Experimentation

Pursuant to Section 299(d) of the JJDP Act, the grantee assures that it will not use any Formula Grant funds for any biomedical or behavior control experimentation on individuals or any research involving such experimentation.

22. Open Meetings and Public Access to Records

The grantee assures that it, the supervisory board, and the SAG will follow applicable state open-meeting and public-access laws and regulations in the conduct of meetings and the maintenance of records relating to their functions.

23. Fund Termination

The grantee understands that OJJDP may terminate this grant or suspend or discontinue fund payments if the state substantially fails to comply with regulations promulgated thereunder.

24. Match Requirements for Juvenile Justice Programs

The grantee assures that:

- A. Financial assistance it extends under the provision of the JJDP Act shall be 100 percent of approved costs of any program or activity with the exceptions of planning and administration funds and construction activities.
- B. It shall limit financial assistance for construction programs and projects to not more than 50 percent of the cost of construction. In addition, the JJDP Act limits this construction to innovative community-based facilities for less than 20 persons. The state shall subject all such programs and projects to prior OJJDP approval and guidelines that the OJJDP Administrator promulgates.

25. Reports

The applicant assures that it shall maintain data and information and submit reports in such a form at such times and containing such data and information as OJJDP may reasonably require to administer the program.

26. Drug-Free Workplace

The applicant assures that it will comply with Title V of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 and regulations that the federal government has promulgated to maintain a drug-free workplace.

27. Debarment and Suspension

The applicant assures it will comply with Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, 28 CFR Part 67, Section 67.510.

28. Release of Information

The applicant acknowledges that it is required to make available to OJJDP all records, papers, and other documents relating to the receipt and disposition of JJDP funds that recipients of such funds and their subgrantees and contractors keep. OJJDP requires grantees to make available these records and other documents submitted to OJJDP and its grantees pursuant to other provisions of the Act, including plans and applications for funds, under the terms and conditions of the Federal Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552.

29. Published Material

The applicant assures that all published material and written reports it submits under this grant or in conjunction with contractors under this grant will be originally developed material unless otherwise specially provided in the grant or contract document. When the applicant includes material not originally developed for the report, it will identify the source. This identification may be in the body of the report or by footnote. This provision applies when the material is quoted or extensively paraphrased.

30. Copyrights and Rights in Data

The applicant acknowledges that where activities that this grant supports produce original computer programs, writing, sound recordings, pictorial reproductions, drawings or other graphical representations, and works of any similar nature (the term “computer programs” includes executable computer programs and supporting data in any form), the government has the right to use, duplicate, and disclose them, in whole or in part in any manner for any purpose whatsoever, and have others do so. If the material is copyrightable, the grantee may copyright such, but the government reserves a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irreversible license to reproduce, publish, and use such materials in whole or in part and to authorize others to do so. The grantee shall include provisions appropriate to effectuate the purpose of this condition in all contracts of employment, consultants’ agreements, contracts, or subgrants.

31. Electronic Surveillance

Under 18 U.S.C. 2512, transactions involving devices “primarily useful for the purpose of the surreptitious interception of wire or oral communication” and advertising that promotes the use of any devices for such purposes are prohibited, unless, in the case of the state officer, his conduct with regard to such a device falls within “the normal course of activities of . . . [the] State . . .” (18 U.S.C. 2512 [2][b]). Normally, officers of a state that has no enabling statute under 18 U.S.C. 2516(2) would have no occasion to use,

possess, or otherwise deal with devices within the scope of 18 U.S.C. 2512(1). Without such legislation, only consensual use is permitted. OJJDP will not authorize any grants relating to such devices and their use in states that do not have enabling legislation unless the state furnishes special justification, as explained below. Accordingly, all applicants that list the acquisition of equipment, with either federal or matching funds, that may be used for electronic surveillance purposes in a state that does not have enabling legislation must include as part of the budget narrative for such equipment the following information:

- A. A complete description of each item of equipment to be obtained.
- B. A statement of how each item of equipment will be used.
- C. The legal citations and justifications for the purchase and intended use of each item of equipment.
- D. A description of the controls the state will establish regarding access to, use of, and ultimate disposal of such equipment.

Each subgrantee application must contain the following statement signed by the project director: “(Applicant) agrees not to purchase or use in the course of this project any electronic, mechanical, or other device for surveillance purposes in violation of 18 U.S.C. 2511 and any applicable state statute related to wiretapping and surveillance.”

The grantee assures to review all subgrant applications for compliance.

32. Patents

The grantee assures that if any discovery or invention arises or is developed in the course of, or as a result of, work performed under this grant, the grantee shall refer the discovery or invention to OJJDP. The grantee hereby agrees that determination of rights to inventions made under this grant shall be made by the administrator of OJJDP or his duly authorized official representative, who shall have the sole and exclusive powers to determine whether and where patent applications should be filed and to determine the disposition of all rights in such inventions, including title which may issue thereon. The determination of the Administrator, or his duly authorized representative, shall be accepted as final. In addition, the grantee hereby agrees and otherwise recognizes that the government shall acquire at least an irrevocable, nonexclusive, royalty-free license to practice and have practiced throughout the world for governmental purposes any invention made in the course of or under this grant. The grant shall include

provisions appropriate for effectuating the purpose of this condition in contracts or subgrants.

Appendix B: Other Requirements

Anti-Lobbying Act

Applicants should be aware that the Anti-Lobbying Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1913, recently was amended to expand significantly the restriction on the use of appropriated funding for lobbying. This expansion also makes the anti-lobbying restrictions enforceable via large civil penalties, with civil fines between \$10,000 and \$100,000 per each occurrence of lobbying activity. These restrictions are in addition to the anti-lobbying and lobbying disclosure restrictions imposed by 31 U.S.C. § 1352. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is currently amending the OMB cost circulars and the common rule (codified at 28 CFR part 69 for U.S. Department of Justice grantees) to reflect these modifications. However, in the interest of full disclosure, all applicants must understand that no federally appropriated funding made available under this grant program may be used, either directly or indirectly, to support the enactment, repeal, modification, or adoption of any law, regulation, or policy, at any level of government, without the express approval by OJP. Any violation of this prohibition is subject to a minimum \$10,000 fine for each occurrence. This prohibition applies to all activity, even if currently allowed within the parameters of the existing OMB circulars.

Civil Rights Compliance

All recipients of federal grant funds are required to comply with nondiscrimination requirements contained in various federal laws. In the event that a court or administrative agency due process hearing makes a finding of discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion, national origin (see also “Services to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons” on page 32), gender, disability, or age, the recipient of funds must forward a copy of the finding to the Office of Civil Rights, Office of Justice Programs. All applicants should consult the Assurances they are required to submit with the application to understand the applicable legal and administrative requirements.

Confidentiality and Human Subjects Protection

Applicants should be aware of the U.S. Department of Justice’s requirements for privacy and confidentiality in research and statistical efforts, as stipulated by 42 U.S.C. § 3879g. The U.S. Department of Justice has issued a specific regulation concerning the implementation of this statutory requirement in 28 CFR Part 22. In accordance with 28 CFR Part 22, applicants requesting funds for research or statistical activities must submit a Privacy Certificate with the application. The Privacy Certificate should ensure that the applicant has appropriate policies and procedures in place to protect the confidentiality of data identifiable to private persons. Specifically, the Privacy Certificate must comply with the requirements of 28 CFR § 22.23. OJJDP has developed guidelines for preparing a Privacy Certificate in accordance with the confidentiality regulation. Copies of the Privacy Certificate Guidelines, a Privacy Certificate Face Sheet, and a Sample Attachment for a Privacy Certificate are available on the OJJDP Web site (ojjdp.ncjrs.org/funding/privacy.pdf).

Applicants are further advised that an institutional review board² (IRB), in accordance with U.S. Department of Justice regulations at 28 CFR Part 46, must review any project that will involve the use of human research subjects. IRB review is not required prior to submission of the application. However, if an award is made and the project involves research using human subjects, OJJDP will place a special condition on the award requiring that an appropriate IRB approve the project before OJJDP will disburse federal funds for activities involving human subjects. Applicants should include plans for IRB review, where applicable, in the project timeline submitted with the proposal. A copy of “Confidentiality of Identifiable Research and Statistical Information (28 CFR Part 22)” is available on the OJJDP Web site (ojjdp.ncjrs.org/funding/confidentiality.pdf).

Coordination of Federal Efforts

To encourage better coordination among federal agencies in addressing state and local needs, the U.S. Department of Justice requests that applicants provide information on the following: (1) active federal grant award(s) supporting this or related efforts,³ including awards from the U.S. Department of Justice; (2) any pending application(s) for federal funds for this or related efforts; and (3) plans for coordinating any funds described in items (1) or (2) with the funding that this application seeks. For each federal award, applicants must include the program or project title, the federal grantor agency, the amount of the award, and a brief description of its purpose.

² Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) are the governing bodies that assure that data collection efforts are in accordance with all relevant local, state, and federal laws to protect human subjects. Background information on IRBs is available from the National Institute of Justice (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/humansubjects/index.html) and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (www.hhs.gov/ohrp/).

Most local and state governments, colleges and universities, hospitals, and private contract research firms have IRBs in place. Agencies that might help you find an IRB to review your data collection plans for the purpose of the application include a local jail, hospital, mental health treatment facility, public health agency, community college, or 4-year college or university. Try calling these agencies, explain that you are submitting an application for federal funding and are required to collect data on the children you serve, and you therefore need IRB clearance and ask if they have ever encountered this situation and what they did about it. It is likely that at least one of these agencies will have some experience they would be willing to share.

IRB reviews are now available from for-profit organizations, if the potential applicant does not have access to an IRB through his/her own institution. They cost about \$6,000–\$10,000, and those costs would need to be built into the first year's budget. Query the term “Institutional Review Board” with any Internet search engine to find these firms.

You do not need to have IRB clearance at the time you submit your application to OJJDP. In your application, you can outline the process for getting IRB clearance in your community. If possible, you should start the process, so that you could say in your application that an IRB is reviewing your study/plan/design and give the expected date for final clearance. Applicants are not required to get final clearance until/if they are funded. In fact, some IRBs won't review a study until after funding is secured.

³ “Related efforts” is defined for these purposes as one of the following: efforts for the same purpose (i.e., the proposed award would supplement, expand, complement, or continue activities funded with other federal grants); another phase or component of the same program or project (e.g., to implement a planning effort using other federal funds or to provide a substance abuse treatment or education component within a criminal justice project); or services of some kind (e.g., technical assistance, research, or evaluation) rendered to the program or project described in the application.

Funding to Faith-Based and Community Organizations

Consistent with President George W. Bush's Executive Order 13279, dated December 12, 2002, and 28 C.F.R. Part 38, it is OJP policy that faith-based and community organizations that statutorily qualify as eligible applicants under OJP programs are invited and encouraged to apply for assistance awards to fund eligible grant activities. OJP will consider faith-based and community organizations for awards on the same basis as any other eligible applicants and, if they receive assistance awards, OJP will treat these groups on an equal basis with all other grantees in the administration of such awards. OJP will not discriminate for or against any eligible applicant or grantee on the basis of its religious character or affiliation, religious name, or the religious composition of its board of directors or persons working in the organization. Faith-based organizations receiving OJP assistance awards retain their independence and do not lose or have to modify their religious identity (e.g., removing religious symbols) to receive assistance awards. Faith-based groups, however may not use OJP grant funds to fund any inherently religious activity, such as prayer or worship. Inherently religious activity is permissible, although it cannot occur during an activity funded with OJP grant funds; rather, the grantee must separate such religious activity in time or place from the OJP funded program. Further, participation in such activity by individuals receiving services must be voluntary. Programs that OJP funds are not permitted to discriminate in the provision of services on the basis of a beneficiary's religion.

Financial and Government Audit Requirements

Federal grants are governed by the provisions of the OMB circulars applicable to financial assistance and OJP's *Financial Guide*, which is available from the OJP Web site (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/oc). The *Guide* includes information on allowable costs, methods of payment, audit requirements, accounting systems, and financial records. This document will govern how all successful applicants administer funds.

The state and local units of government, institutions of higher education, and other nonprofit institutions must comply with the organizational audit requirements of OMB circular A-133, which states that recipients who expend \$500,000 or more of federal funds during their fiscal year are required to submit a single organizationwide financial and compliance audit report to the Federal Audit Clearinghouse within 9 months after the close of each fiscal year during the term of the award.

Grantees must comply with the following OJP reporting requirements:

- **Subgrantee information form.** Subgrantee are required to submit these forms through OJP's GMS system within 30 days of granting the subaward.
- **Financial status reports (SF 269).** Grantees must submit these financial reports quarterly by the 45th day following the end of each calendar quarter, and a final report is due 120 days following the end of the award period. SF-269 forms may be filed online through the Internet at <https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov>. **Grant recipients who do not submit SF-269 reports by the due date will be unable to drawdown funds.**

-
- **Annual performance reports.** OJJDP requires states to submit annual performance reports, due December 31. See the Performance Measures section for formatting requirements. Annual performance reports should be submitted online through GMS using the “Application” module. Questions concerning GMS may be addressed to the GMS Help Desk at 1-888-549-9901.

NEPA Compliance

The use of these grant funds are subject to compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. § 4331 *et seq.*) and other related federal environmental impact review requirements, including the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. § 470 *et seq.*). These requirements are applicable whenever the grantee plans such activities as construction or renovation using either grant funds or the applicant’s or a third party’s funds, as long as the proposed construction or renovation is a prerequisite to the use of the grant funds. Whenever these environmental impact review requirements apply to a grant activity, the applicant must help OJP meet these requirements completely prior to the commitment of the affected funds. This assistance may include, at a minimum, providing information on the age and historic importance of any buildings to be affected as well as their floodplain status. OJP may also request that applicants assist in preparing environmental assessments, should they be required.

Performance Measures

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), Public Law 103–62, requires that recipients of federal grant awards collect, analyze, and report data that measure the results of strategies implemented with federal funds. To ensure compliance with GPRA, grantees are required to collect and report data that measure the results of the programs implemented with this grant.

OJJDP has developed a performance measurement system to enable grantees to demonstrate the effectiveness of their programs. OJJDP requires states to submit annual performance reports, using OJJDP’s Performance Measurement System. States are required to submit aggregated performance measure data from subgrants and awards that the state makes.

To better assure that programs funded with federal awards will produce positive outcomes, states shall to the extent practicable give priority in funding to programs and activities that have been proven effective based on systematic and objective research. To enable local subgrantees to implement evidence-based juvenile justice programs, OJJDP has developed the Model Programs Guide and Database, a searchable Web site containing information on the full range of evidence-based juvenile justice programs, from delinquency prevention and intervention to reentry (see http://www.dsgonline.com/mpg_index.htm). Communities can use the database to locate evidence-based juvenile justice strategies that will fit their needs and enhance their likelihood for success.

Award recipients will be required to collect and report data in support of these measures. Recipient states’ assistance in obtaining this information will facilitate future program planning and will allow OJP to provide Congress with measurable program results of federally funded programs.

Services to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons

Recipients of OJP financial assistance are required to comply with several Federal civil rights laws, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VI”) and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (“Safe Streets Act”), as amended. These laws prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, and sex in the delivery of services.

National origin discrimination includes discrimination on the basis of limited English proficiency (LEP). To ensure compliance with Title VI and the Safe Streets Act, recipients are required to take reasonable steps to ensure that LEP persons have meaningful access to their programs. Meaningful access may entail providing language assistance services, including oral and written translation, where necessary. *OJP encourages grantees to consider the need for language services for LEP persons they serve or encounter both in developing their proposals and budgets and in conducting their programs and activities. OJP considers reasonable costs associated with providing meaningful access for LEP individuals to be allowable program costs.*

The U.S. Department of Justice has issued guidance for grantees to assist them in complying with Title VI requirements. The guidance document can be accessed on the Internet at www.lep.gov, by contacting OJP’s Office for Civil Rights at 202–307–0690, or by writing to the following address:

Office for Civil Rights
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street NW., 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20531

Single Point of Contact Review

Executive Order 12372 requires applicants from state and local units of government or other organizations providing services within a state to submit a copy of the application to the state Single Point of Contact (SPOC) if one exists and if the state has selected this program for review. A list of state SPOCs is available on the OMB Web site (www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html). Applicants must contact their state SPOCs to determine whether their programs have been selected for state review. The applicant should enter the date that the application was sent to the SPOC or the reason such submission is not required in Block 3 of the Overview section of the GMS application.

Supplanting Prohibition

Grantees must use federal funds to supplement existing funds for program activities and may not replace (supplant) nonfederal funds that they have appropriated for the same purpose. Potential supplanting will be the subject of monitoring and an audit. Violations can result in a range of penalties, including suspension of current and future funds under this program, suspension or debarment from federal grants, recoupment of monies provided under this grant, and civil and/or criminal penalties.

Information Technology Standards Compliance

As appropriate, all equipment and software that the grantee develops under awards that result from this solicitation must comply with U.S. Department of Justice Information Technology interface standards, including the National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan (see http://it.ojp.gov/documents/National_Criminal_Intelligence_Sharing_Plan.pdf), Global Justice XML Data Model (see <http://it.ojp.gov/jxdm/>), and the Law Enforcement Information Sharing Plan (LEISP). Applicants can find a list of additional standards at the OJP Standards Clearinghouse (<http://it.ojp.gov/jsr/intro/intro03.html>).

Suspension or Termination of Funding

OJJDP may suspend funding in whole or in part, terminate funding, or impose other sanctions on a recipient for the following reasons:

- Failing to comply substantially with the requirements or statutory objectives of the appropriate Act, program guidelines issued thereunder, or other provisions of federal law.
- Failing to make satisfactory progress toward the goals, objectives, or strategies set forth in the application.
- Failing to adhere to the requirements in the agreement, standard conditions, or special conditions.
- Proposing or implementing substantial plan changes to the extent that, if originally submitted, the application would not have been selected for funding.
- Failing to submit reports.
- Filing a false certification in this application or other report or document.

Before imposing sanctions, OJJDP will provide reasonable notice to the recipient of its intent to impose sanctions and will attempt to resolve the problem informally. Hearing and appeal procedures will follow those in U.S. Department of Justice regulations in 28 CFR Part 18.

Appendix C: Application Checklist

Formula Grants Program

Applicants must submit all applications electronically through OJP's Grants Management System (GMS).

- Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) is generated by completing the Overview, Applicant Information, and Project Information screens in GMS.
- Assurances and Certifications must be reviewed and accepted online by the applicant's authorizing official.
- Budget Detail Worksheet (Attachment #1) must include a worksheet that identifies and a narrative that justifies all proposed costs (see sample worksheet in appendix H on page 44).
- Program Narrative (Attachment #2) must address all nine required items.
- Other Attachment (Attachment #3) must include required updated *DMC Identification Spreadsheets*.

Applicants must submit files attached to their GMS application as a Microsoft Word document (.doc), PDF file (.pdf), or text document (.txt). Refer to the program announcement for detailed descriptions of these items.

Deadlines

- Applicants must register on GMS by March 17, 2006.
- Applicants must submit completed applications by 8 p.m. ET March 30, 2006.

OJJDP will accept only those applications submitted through the GMS online application system. OJJDP will not consider mailed or faxed applications.

Appendix D: Distribution of Formula Grants, by State (FY 2005)

State	Formula Grant Allocation
Alabama	\$940,000
Alaska	\$600,000
Arizona	\$1,143,000
Arkansas	\$600,000
California	\$7,736,000
Colorado	\$921,000
Connecticut	\$704,000
Delaware	\$600,000
District of Columbia	\$600,000
Florida	\$3,050,000
Georgia	\$1,814,000
Hawaii	\$600,000
Idaho	\$600,000
Illinois	\$2,714,063
Indiana	\$1,317,000
Iowa	\$614,000
Kansas	\$600,000
Kentucky	\$832,000
Louisiana	\$1,020,000
Maine	\$600,000
Maryland	\$1,134,000
Massachusetts	\$1,255,000
Michigan	\$2,171,000
Minnesota	\$1,076,000
Mississippi	\$648,000
Missouri	\$1,194,000
Montana	\$600,000
Nebraska	\$600,000
Nevada	\$600,000
New Hampshire	\$600,000
New Jersey	\$1,746,000
New Mexico	\$600,000
New York	\$3,923,000
North Carolina	\$1,643,000
North Dakota	\$600,000
Ohio	\$2,416,000
Oklahoma	\$746,000
Oregon	\$708,000
Pennsylvania	\$2,444,000
Rhode Island	\$600,000
South Carolina	\$844,000
South Dakota	\$600,000
Tennessee	\$1,170,000
Texas	\$4,924,000
Utah	\$601,000

Vermont State	\$600,000 Formula Grant Allocation
Virginia	\$1,454,000
Washington	\$1,266,000
West Virginia	\$600,000
Wisconsin	\$1,145,000
Wyoming	\$600,000
American Samoa	\$100,000
Guam	\$100,000
Puerto Rico	\$913,000
No. Mariana Islands	\$100,000
Virgin Islands	\$100,000
Total	\$68,026,063

Appendix E: American Indian Passthrough Amounts, by State (FY 2005)

State	Total Juvenile Population*	Juvenile Native American Population	FY 2005 Formula Grant Allocation	Total State Native American Pass-Through
Alabama	1,123,422	72	\$940,000	\$40
Alaska	190,717	14,917	\$600,000	\$31,283
Arizona	1,366,947	71,731	\$1,143,000	\$39,982
Arkansas	680,369	0	\$600,000	\$0
California	9,249,829	3,904	\$7,736,000	\$2,176
Colorado	1,100,795	3,873	\$921,000	\$2,160
Connecticut	841,688	719	\$704,000	\$401
Delaware	194,587	0	\$600,000	\$0
District of Columbia	114,992	0	\$600,000	\$0
Florida	3,646,340	274	\$3,050,000	\$153
Georgia	2,169,234	0	\$1,814,000	\$0
Hawaii	295,767	0	\$600,000	\$0
Idaho	369,030	8,309	\$600,000	\$9,005
Illinois	3,245,451	0	\$2,714,063	\$0
Indiana	1,574,396	0	\$1,317,000	\$0
Iowa	733,638	0	\$614,000	\$0
Kansas	712,993	1,795	\$600,000	\$1,007
Kentucky	994,818	0	\$853,000	\$0
Louisiana	1,219,799	176	\$1,020,000	\$98
Maine	301,238	795	\$600,000	\$1,056
Maryland	1,356,172	0	\$1,134,000	\$0
Massachusetts	1,500,064	40	\$1,255,000	\$22
Michigan	2,595,767	2,383	\$2,171,000	\$1,329
Minnesota	1,286,894	11,405	\$1,076,000	\$6,357
Mississippi	775,187	2,129	\$648,000	\$1,186
Missouri	1,427,692	0	\$1,194,000	\$0
Montana	230,062	22,023	\$600,000	\$38,287
Nebraska	450,242	2,823	\$600,000	\$2,508
Nevada	511,799	2,173	\$600,000	\$1,698
New Hampshire	309,562	0	\$600,000	\$0
New Jersey	2,087,558	0	\$1,746,000	\$0
New Mexico	508,574	48,121	\$600,000	\$37,844
New York	4,690,107	923	\$3,923,000	\$515
North Carolina	1,964,047	2,576	\$1,643,000	\$1,436
North Dakota	160,849	7,420	\$600,000	\$18,450
Ohio	2,888,339	0	\$2,416,000	\$0
Oklahoma	892,360	127,668	\$746,000	71,145
Oregon	846,526	3,951	\$708,000	\$2,203
Pennsylvania	2,922,221	0	\$2,444,000	\$0
Rhode Island	247,822	13	\$600,000	\$21
South Carolina	1,009,641	0	\$844,000	\$0
South Dakota	202,649	18,618	\$600,000	\$36,746
Tennessee	1,398,521	0	\$1,170,000	\$0
Texas	5,886,759	344	\$4,924,000	\$192

State	Total Juvenile Population*	Juvenile Native American Population	FY 2003 Formula Grant Allocation	Total State Native American Pass-Through
Utah	718,698	3,038	\$601,000	\$1,693
Vermont	147,523	0	\$600,000	\$0
Virginia	1,738,262	0	\$1,454,000	\$0
Washington	1,513,843	34,383	\$1,266,000	\$19,167
West Virginia	402,393	0	\$600,000	\$0
Wisconsin	1,368,756	11,858	\$1,145,000	\$6,612
Wyoming	128,873	6,823	\$600,000	\$21,175
American Samoa	21,766	0	\$100,000	\$0
Guam	46,894	0	\$100,000	\$0
Puerto Rico	1,092,101	0	\$913,000	\$0
No. Mariana Islands	10,720	0	\$100,000	\$0
Virgin Islands	35,427	0	\$100,000	\$0
Total	73,500,720	415,278	\$68,026,063	\$355,949

* Population figures are based on Census 2000 data.

Appendix F: Formula Grant Program Areas

- 01 **Aftercare/Reentry.** Programs to prepare targeted juvenile offenders to successfully return to their communities after serving a period of secure confinement in a training school, juvenile correctional facility, or other secure institution. Aftercare programs focus on preparing juvenile offenders for release and providing a continuum of supervision and services after release.
- 02 **Alternatives to Detention.** Alternative services provided to a juvenile offender in the community as an alternative to confinement.
- 03 **Child Abuse and Neglect Programs.** Programs that provide treatment to juvenile offenders who are victims of child abuse or neglect and to their families to reduce the likelihood that such juvenile offenders will commit subsequent violations of law.
- 04 **Children of Incarcerated Parents.** Services to prevent delinquency or treat delinquent juveniles who are the children of incarcerated parents.
- 05 **Community Assessment Centers (CACs).** Centers that lead to more integrated and effective cross-system services for juveniles and their families. CACs are designed to positively affect the lives of youth and divert them from a path of serious, violent, and chronic delinquency. Using a collaborative approach, CACs serve the community in a timely, cost-efficient, and comprehensive manner.
- 06 **Compliance Monitoring.** Programs, research, staff support, or other activities primarily to enhance or maintain a state's ability to adequately monitor jails, detention facilities, and other facilities to assure compliance with Sections 223(a)(11), (12), (13), and (22) of the JJDP Act.
- 07 **Court Services.** Programs to encourage courts to develop and implement a continuum of pre- and postadjudication restraints that bridge the gap between traditional probation and confinement in a correctional setting. Services include expanded use of probation, mediation, restitution, community service, treatment, home detention, intensive supervision, electronic monitoring, translation services and similar programs, and secure, community-based treatment facilities linked to other support services.
- 08 **Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders.** Programs, research, or other initiatives to eliminate or prevent the placement of accused or adjudicated status offenders and nonoffenders in secure facilities, pursuant to Section 223(a)(11) of the JJDP Act.

-
- 09 **Delinquency Prevention.** Programs, research, or other initiatives to prevent or reduce the incidence of delinquent acts and directed to youth at risk of becoming delinquent to prevent them from entering the juvenile justice system or to intervene with first-time and nonserious offenders to keep them out of the juvenile justice system. This program area excludes programs targeted at youth already adjudicated delinquent, on probation, in corrections, and those programs designed specifically to prevent gang-related or substance abuse activities undertaken as part of program areas 12 and 32.
- 10 **Disproportionate Minority Contact.** Programs, research, or other initiatives primarily to address the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system, pursuant to Section 223(a)(22) of the JJDP Act.
- 11 **Diversion.** Programs to divert juveniles from entering the juvenile justice system.
- 12 **Gangs.** Programs, research, or other initiatives primarily to address issues related to juvenile gang activity. This program area includes prevention and intervention efforts directed at reducing gang-related activities.
- 13 **Gender-Specific Services.** Services to address the needs of female offenders in the juvenile justice system.
- 14 **Graduated Sanctions.** A system of sanctions that escalate in intensity with each subsequent, more serious delinquent offense.
- 15 **Gun Programs.** Programs (excluding programs to purchase from juveniles) to reduce the unlawful acquisition and illegal use of guns by juveniles.
- 16 **Hate Crimes.** Programs to prevent and reduce hate crimes committed by juveniles.
- 17 **Jail Removal.** Programs, research, or other initiatives to eliminate or prevent the placement of juveniles in adult jails and lockups, as defined in Section 223(a)(13) of the JJDP Act.
- 18 **Job Training.** Projects to enhance the employability of juveniles or prepare them for future employment. Such programs may include job readiness training, apprenticeships, and job referrals.

-
- 19 **Juvenile Justice System Improvement.** Programs, research, and other initiatives to examine issues or improve practices, policies, or procedures on a systemwide basis (e.g., examining problems affecting decisions from arrest to disposition and detention to corrections).
 - 20 **Mental Health Services.** Services include, but are not limited to, the development and/or enhancement of diagnostic, treatment, and prevention instruments; psychological and psychiatric evaluations; counseling services; and/or family support services.
 - 21 **Mentoring.** Programs to develop and sustain a one-to-one supportive relationship between a responsible adult age 18 or older (mentor) and an at-risk juvenile (mentee) that takes place on a regular basis.
 - 22 **American Indian Programs.** Programs to address juvenile justice and delinquency prevention issues for American Indians and Alaska Natives.
 - 23 **Planning and Administration.** Activities related to state plan development, other preawarded activities, and administration of the Formula Grant Program, including evaluation, monitoring, and one full-time staff position pursuant to Section 222 (c) of the JJDP Act and the OJJDP Formula Grant Regulation.
 - 24 **Probation.** Programs to permit juvenile offenders to remain in their communities under conditions that the juvenile court prescribes.
 - 25 **Restitution/Community Service.** Programs to hold juveniles accountable for their offenses by requiring community service or repayment to the victim.
 - 26 **Rural Area Juvenile Programs.** Prevention, intervention, and treatment services in an area located outside a metropolitan statistical area as designated by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.
 - 27 **School Programs.** Education programs and/or related services to prevent truancy, suspension, and expulsion. School safety programs may include support for school resource officers and law-related education.
 - 28 **Separation of Juveniles From Adult Inmates.** Programs that ensure that juveniles will not be detained or confined in any institutions where they may come into contact with adult inmates, pursuant to Section 223(a)(12) of the JJDP Act.

-
- 29 **Serious Crime.** Programs, research, or other initiatives to address serious and violent criminal-type behavior by youth. This program area includes intervention, treatment, and reintegration of serious and violent juvenile offenders.
- 30 **Sex Offender Programs.** Programs to support the assessment, treatment, rehabilitation, supervision, and accountability of juvenile sex offenders.
- 31 **State Advisory Group Allocation.** Activities related to carrying out the State Advisory Group's responsibilities under Section 223(a)(3) of the JJDP Act.
- 32 **Substance Abuse.** Programs, research, or other initiatives to address the use and abuse of illegal and other prescription and nonprescription drugs and the use and abuse of alcohol. Programs include control, prevention, and treatment.
- 33 **Youth Advocacy.** Projects to develop and implement advocacy activities focused on improving services for and protecting the rights of youth affected by the juvenile justice system.
- 34 **Youth Courts (also known as teen courts).** Juvenile justice programs in which peers play an active role in the disposition of the juvenile offender. Most communities use youth courts as a sentencing option for first-time offenders charged with misdemeanor or nonviolent offenses who acknowledge their guilt. The youth court serves as an alternative to the traditional juvenile court.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE,

RESEARCH, AND STATISTICS



APPENDIX G

OJJDP G 4040.4

January 6, 1982

Guideline

Subject: WAIVER OF PASSTHROUGH REQUIREMENT OF
OJJDP GUIDELINES

1. Purpose. To notify CJs of Waiver of Passthrough requirement criteria.
2. Scope. This information affects all Criminal Justice Councils and OJJDP personnel.
3. Information. Section 223(a)(5) of the JJDP Act, as amended, provides the passthrough requirement for funds received by the state under Section 222. This notice set forth the waiver of passthrough criteria the state must submit to the Administrator of OJJDP.
4. The state must make all requests for waivers to the Administrator of OJJDP.

The following essential elements must be included:

- a. The extent of state and local implementation of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs.
 - b. The extent of state and local financial responsibility for juvenile delinquency programs.
 - c. The extent to which the state provides services or direct outlays for or on behalf of local governments (as distinct from statewide services).
 - d. The approval of the state Juvenile Justice Advisory Group.
 - e. Specific comments from local units of government expressing their position regarding their waiver.
5. Contact. For further information or clarification contact your JJDP specialist.

/s/

CHARLES A. LAUER
ACTING ADMINISTRATOR
OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE
AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

Distribution: CJs, ALL OJJDP PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

Initiated By: OJJDP

GMS: <https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov>

GMS Help Desk: 888-549-9901

Appendix H: Sample Budget Detail Worksheet

Formula Grant Program FY 2006

Program Areas	Program Area Title	Total Funds	OJJDP Federal Share	State Match
23	Planning and Administration	\$120,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
31	State Advisory Group Allocation	30,000	30,000	60,000
17	Jail Removal	410,000	410,000	0
8	Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders	50,000	50,000	0
10	Disproportionate Minority Contact	35,000	35,000	0
26	Rural Area Juvenile Programs	15,000	15,000	0
	TOTALS	\$660,000	\$600,000	\$60,000

The planning and administrative costs cover:

1. The salaries of a full-time juvenile justice specialist, a part-time compliance monitor, and a part-time administrative assistant.
2. Travel costs of staff for the following:
 - To attend national and regional OJJDP-sponsored conferences and workshops, as appropriate.
 - To attend Coalition for Juvenile Justice-sponsored national and regional conferences, as appropriate.
 - To attend local conferences and workshops, as appropriate.
 - To monitor contracts with providers throughout the state.

Appendix I: Instructions to Complete the State Advisory Group Membership Table (with Sample Roster)

The State Advisory Group (SAG) Membership Table was designed to simplify state reporting requirements. The state should select the designator listed below that best describes each member's qualifications and experience. A sample table has been placed at the end of this appendix, on page 34.

Column 1 (Name)

List the names of each SAG member beginning with the chairperson and, if applicable, place an asterisk (*) after each of those SAG members who are also members of the State Supervisory Board.

Column 2 (Represents)

Select the item from the following list that most closely identifies each member's qualification:

- A. Locally elected official representing general purpose local government.
- B. Representative of law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies, including:
 - 1. Juvenile and family court judges.
 - 2. Prosecutors.
 - 3. Counsel for children and youth.
 - 4. Probation workers.
- C. Representatives of public agencies concerned with delinquency prevention or treatment:
 - 1. Welfare.
 - 2. Social services.
 - 3. Mental health.
 - 4. Education.
 - 5. Special education.
 - 6. Recreation.

7. Youth services.

- D. Representatives of private nonprofit organizations, including persons concerned with:
1. Family preservation and strengthening.
 2. Parent groups and parent self-help groups.
 3. Youth development.
 4. Delinquency prevention and treatment.
 5. Neglected or dependent children.
 6. Quality of juvenile justice.
 7. Education.
 8. Social services for children.
- E. Volunteers who work with juvenile justice.
- F. Youth workers involved with programs that are alternatives to confinement, including organized recreation activities.
- G. Persons with special experience and competence in addressing problems related to school violence and vandalism and alternatives to suspension and expulsion.
- H. Persons with special experience and competence in addressing problems related to learning disabilities, emotional difficulties, child abuse and neglect, and youth violence.

Column 3 (Full-Time Government)

If the person is a full-time government employee, place an "X" in this column.

Column 4 (Youth Member)

If the person was younger than 24 at the time of appointment, place an "X" in this column.

Column 5 (Date of Appointment)

Provide the date the member was appointed to the SAG.

Column 6 (Residence)

Provide the member's residential or preferred mailing address.

Sample State Advisory Group Membership Roster*

	Name	Represents	Full-Time Government	Youth Member	Date of Appointment	Residence
1	Jane Smith, Chair	D, F			June 1997	Harlem
2	Jane Smith	C	X		June 1997	Helena
3	Jane Smith	E		X	June 2001	Missoula
4	Jane Smith	A	X		June 1997	Great Falls
5	Jane Smith	B	X		June 1998	Great Falls
6	Jane Smith	E		X	June 2001	Missoula
7	Jane Smith	E		X	June 2001	Bozeman
8	Jane Smith	B	X		June 1998	Helena
9	Jane Smith	C	X		June 1998	Helena
10	Jane Smith	D			June 1997	Bozeman
11	Jane Smith	B	X		June 1999	Butte
12	Jane Smith	A, C	X		June 1999	Kalispell
13	Jane Smith	A, D			June 2000	Great Falls
14	Jane Smith	D			June 1997	Billings
15	Jane Smith	C	X		June 2000	Helena
16	Jane Smith	B		X	June 2000	Billings
17	Jane Smith	C	X		June 2001	Helena
18	Jane Smith	D, F			June 2001	Missoula
19	Jane Smith	C	X		June 2000	East Helena
20	Jane Smith	F		X	June 2001	Bozeman

Source: Modified from Montana's FY 2002 Formula Grants application.

The SAG serves as the supervisory or advisory board. (Check one.)

*List the Chair first.