



The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is seeking applicants for its Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Title II Formula Grants Program. This program furthers DOJ's mission by providing funding to the states to develop programs to address juvenile delinquency and improve the juvenile justice system.

OJJDP FY 2011 Title II Formula Grants Program

Eligibility

Only the agency that the chief executive (i.e., the governor) of each state designates is eligible to apply for these funds. Applicants that do not meet this criterion are ineligible to apply under this solicitation. (See "Eligibility," page 3.)

Deadline

Registration with [OJP's Grant Management System \(GMS\)](#) is required prior to application submission. The deadline to register in GMS is 8:00 p.m., Eastern Time, on March 11, 2011, and the deadline to apply for funding under this announcement is 8:00 p.m., Eastern Time, on March 31, 2011. See "How to Apply," page 6, for details.

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the GMS Support Hotline at 1-888-549-9901, option 3, or via e-mail to GMSHelpDesk@usdoj.gov. The GMS Support Hotline hours of operation are Monday-Friday, 6:00 a.m. to midnight Eastern Time, except for federal holidays.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, call your OJJDP State Representative at 202-305-9005 or Lawrence Fiedler, Formula Grants Program Manager, at 202-514-8822 or e-mail him at lawrence.fiedler@usdoj.gov.

Release Date: January 13, 2011

CONTENTS

Overview.....	3
Deadlines: Registration and Application.....	3
Eligibility.....	3
Program-Specific Information.....	3
Performance Measures.....	5
Notice of New Post-Award Reporting Requirements.....	6
How to Apply.....	6
What an Is Expected to Include	8
Standard Form-424.....	8
Program Narrative.....	9
Budget and Budget Narrative.....	21
Additional Requirements	23
Appendix A: Application Checklist.....	25
Appendix B: Distribution of Formula Grants by State (FY 2009).....	26
Appendix C: Indian Tribe Pass-Through by State (FY 2009).....	27
Appendix D: Formula Grant Program Areas.....	29
Appendix E: Pass-through Waiver Requirements.....	32
Appendix F: Sample Budget Detail Worksheet.....	33
Appendix G: Instruction To Complete the SAG Membership Table (with Sample Roster).....	34
Appendix H: Rural Removal Exemption Certification Form.....	37
Appendix I: Contributing Mechanisms to DMC.....	38
Appendix J: Sample Relative Rate Index (RRI) Analysis and Tracking Sheet.....	40

OJJDP FY 2011 Title II Formula Grants Program (CFDA #16.540)

Overview

The Formula Grants Program is authorized under Sections 221–223 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP Act) of 1974, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 5631–5633. To simplify the Formula grants application process, Congress revised the 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 to this objective, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) implemented a 3-year program planning cycle beginning with its 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 2011 Title II Formula Grants application and the FY 2011 plan update.

Deadlines: Registration and Application

Applicants must register with GMS prior to submitting an application. The deadline to register in GMS is 8:00 p.m., Eastern Time, on March 11, 2011, and the deadline to apply for funding under this announcement is 8:00 p.m., Eastern Time, on March 31, 2011. See “How to Apply,” page 6, for details.

Eligibility

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

Program-Specific Information

This program supports state and local efforts to plan, establish, operate, coordinate, and evaluate projects directly or through grants and contracts with public and private agencies for the development of more effective education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs in the area of juvenile delinquency and programs to improve the juvenile justice system.

OJJDP encourages states, contingent on their demonstration of compliance with each of the core requirements of the JJDP Act, to focus their Formula Grants resources on programs that target their serious and violent juvenile offender population. States should give priority consideration to the following Formula Grant program areas: aftercare/reentry, gangs, school safety programs, and serious crime.

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The program’s goal is to improve juvenile justice systems by increasing the availability and types of prevention and intervention programs and juvenile justice system improvements. The

objective of the program is to support both state and local efforts in the above areas. State grantees will submit annual performance measurement-based progress reports.

Evidence-based Programs or Practices

OJP considers programs and practices to be evidence-based when their effectiveness has been demonstrated by causal evidence, generally obtained through outcome evaluations. Causal evidence documents a relationship between an activity or intervention (including technology) and its intended outcome, including measuring the direction and size of a change, and the extent to which a change may be attributed to the activity or intervention. Causal evidence depends on the use of scientific methods to rule out, to the extent possible, alternative explanations for the documented change. The strength of causal evidence, based on the factors described above, will influence the degree to which OJP considers a program or practice to be evidence-based.

Amount and Length of Awards

Awards are for a 3-year project and budget period from October 1, 2010, to September 30, 2013. Applicants should use FY 2010 state allocations, as provided in Appendix B, for planning purposes. OJJDP will notify states about FY 2011 state allocations in accordance with the Act appropriating funds for FY 2011.

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

Budget Information

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver: With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, federal funds may not be used to pay total cash compensation (salary plus bonuses) to any employee of the award recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the federal government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year. (The 2011 salary table for SES employees is available at www.opm.gov/oca/11table/indexSES.asp.) Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a higher rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.)

The limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award may be waived on an individual basis at the discretion of the Assistant Attorney General for OJP. Applicants who wish to request a waiver must include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of their applications. Unless applicants submit a waiver request and justification, they should anticipate that OJP will request that they adjust and resubmit their budget. The justification should include: the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of the service being provided, the individual's specific knowledge of the program or project being undertaken with award funds, and a statement explaining that the individual's salary is commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work that is to be done

Match Requirement.

Pursuant to Section 222(c) of the JJDP Act, States may use no more than 10 percent of the Formula Grant allocation for planning and administration, as described in the Act. If a State chooses to use funds in this manner, it must indicate that choice in the State Plan and in its attached budget. States must match any amount expended or obligated by the State for such purposes, in an amount equal to the amount of federal funds so expended or obligated. States must identify the source of the match and how match funds will be used in its attached budget. (See Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative information beginning on page 21.) States may satisfy this match requirement with either cash or in-kind services.

Performance Measures

To assist the Department in fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work. Any award recipient will be required, post award, to provide the data requested in the “Data Grantee Provides” column so that OJP can calculate values for the “Performance Measures” column. Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
<p>Program objectives will depend upon the specific project funded.</p> <p>Examples of objectives may include decrease of delinquent behaviors and increase of pro-social behaviors.</p>	<p>These will differ, depending on the specific program goals and objectives. Examples follow.</p> <p>Percentage of program youth who complete program requirements.</p> <p>Number of program youth who re-offend.</p> <p>Percentage of program youth who exhibit desired change in targeted behaviors (depends on specific behavior targeted and might include substance use, school attendance, antisocial behavior, family relationships, etc.).</p>	<p>OJJDP has developed an online reporting system for state grantees or their subgrantees to submit subgrantee data electronically.</p> <p>Number of program youth who have successfully fulfilled all program obligations and requirements compared with total number of program youth.</p> <p>Number of program youth who re-offend (are arrested) compared with total number of program youth.</p> <p>Number of program youth who exhibit desired change in targeted behaviors (depends on specific behavior targeted and might include substance use, school attendance, antisocial behavior, family relationships, etc.) compared with total number of program youth.</p>

Submission of performance measures data is not required for the application. Instead, applicants should discuss in their application their proposed methods for collecting data for performance measures. Refer to the section “What an Application is Expected to Include,” page 8, for additional information.

Project Evaluations

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

Research, for the purposes of human subjects protections for OJP-funded programs, is defined as, “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.” 28 C.F.R. § 46.102(d). For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research, see the decision tree on the “Research and the Protection of Human Subjects” section of the OJP “Other Requirements for OJP Applications” Web page (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm). Applicants whose proposals may involve a research or statistical component also should review the “Confidentiality” section on that Web page.

For more information about OJJDP performance measures, see www.ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/grantees/pm/index.html.

Notice of New Post-Award Reporting Requirements

Applicants should anticipate that all recipients (other than individuals) of awards of \$25,000 or more under this solicitation, consistent with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA), will be required to report award information on any first-tier subawards totaling \$25,000 or more, and, in certain cases, to report information on the names and total compensation of the five most highly compensated executives of the recipient and first-tier subrecipients. Each applicant entity must ensure that it has the necessary processes and systems in place to comply with the reporting requirements should it receive funding. Reports regarding subawards will be made through the FFATA Subaward Reporting System, found at www.fsrs.gov.

Applicants should anticipate that no subaward of an award made under this solicitation may be made to a subrecipient (other than an individual) unless the potential subrecipient acquires and provides a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.

How To Apply

Applications should be submitted through [GMS](#), a Web-based, data-driven system for the application, award, and management of OJP grants. Applicants must register in GMS for each specific funding opportunity and should begin the process immediately to meet the GMS registration deadline, especially if this is the first time they are using the system. Complete instructions on how to register and submit an application in GMS can be found at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/gmscbt/. Applicants who experience technical difficulties during this process

should e-mail GMSHelpDesk@usdoj.gov or call 1-888-549-9901 (option 3), Monday–Friday, 6:00 a.m. to midnight Eastern Time, except federal holidays. OJJDP recommends that applicants register as early as possible to avoid delays in submitting their applications by the deadline.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

- 1. Acquire a DUNS number.** A DUNS number is required to submit an application in GMS. OMB requires that all applicants for federal funds (other than individuals, who are exempt from this requirement) include a DUNS number in their applications for a new award or renewal of an existing award. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and tracking entities receiving federal funds. The identifier is used to validate address and point of contact information for federal assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. The DUNS number will be used throughout the grant life cycle. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Obtain a DUNS number by calling 1–866–705–5711 or by applying online at www.dnb.com.
- 2. Acquire or Renew Registration with the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) Database.** OJP requires that all applicants (other than individuals) for federal financial assistance maintain current registrations in the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database. An applicant must be registered in the CCR to successfully register in Grants.gov. The CCR database is the repository for standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. Organizations that have previously submitted applications via Grants.gov are already registered with CCR. However, applicants must update or renew their CCR registration annually to maintain an active status. Information about CCR registration procedures can be accessed at www.ccr.gov.
- 3. Acquire a GMS Username and Password.** A new user must select the “First Time User” link under the sign-in box of the GMS home page to create a GMS profile. For more information on how to register in GMS, go to www.ojp.usdoj.gov/gmscbt/.
- 4. Verify the CCR registration in GMS.** OJP requests that all applicants verify their CCR registration in GMS. Once logged into GMS, click the “CCR Claim” link on the left side of the default screen. Click the submit button to verify the CCR registration.
- 5. Search for the Funding Opportunity on GMS.** After logging into GMS or completing the GMS profile for username and password, go to the “Funding Opportunities” link on the left side of the page. Select OJJDP and the OJJDP FY 2011 Title II Formula Grants Program.
- 6. Select the “Apply Online” Button To Register.** The search results from step 5 will display the solicitation title along with the registration and application deadlines for this funding opportunity. Select the “Apply Online” button in the “Action” column to register for this solicitation and create an application in the system.
- 7. Follow GMS Directions To Submit an Application.** Once submitted, GMS will display a confirmation screen stating the submission was successful. Note: In some instances, an applicant must wait for GMS approval before submitting an application. OJJDP urges applicants to submit the application at least 72 hours prior to the due date of the application.

GMS does not accept executable file types as application attachments. These disallowed file types include, but are not limited to, the following extensions: “.com,” “.bat,” “.exe,” “.vbs,” “.cfg,” “.dat,” “.db,” “.dbf,” “.dll,” “.ini,” “.log,” “.ora,” “.sys,” and “.zip.”

GMS Technical Issues

Applicants who experience unforeseen GMS technical issues that prevent them from submitting their applications by the deadline must contact OJJDP staff within 24 hours after the deadline and request approval to submit the application. At that time, OJJDP staff will instruct the applicant to submit specific information detailing the technical difficulties. The applicant must e-mail a description of the technical difficulties, a timeline of their submission efforts, the complete grant application, their DUNS number, and GMS Help Desk tracking numbers they have received. After OJJDP reviews the information and contacts the GMS Help Desk to validate the technical issues, OJP will contact the applicant to inform them whether their request has been approved or denied. If OJP cannot validate the technical issues reported, the application will be rejected as untimely.

To ensure a fair competition for limited discretionary funds, the following conditions are not valid reasons to permit late submissions: (1) failure to begin the registration process in sufficient time, (2) failure to follow GMS instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its Web site, (3) failure to follow all of the instructions in the OJP solicitation, and (4) technical issues experienced with the applicant's computer or information technology environment.

Notifications regarding known technical problems with GMS, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP funding Web page, www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/solicitations.htm.

What an Application Is Expected To Include

This section describes what an application should include and sets out a number of elements. Applicants should anticipate that if they fail to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may negatively affect the review of their application and, should OJJDP decide to make an award, it may result in OJJDP including special conditions that preclude access to or use of award funds pending satisfaction of the conditions.

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

Information To Complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)

The SF-424 is a standard form required for use as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications, applications, and related information. Grants.gov and GMS take information from the applicant's profile to populate the fields on this form. When selecting "type of applicant," if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select "For-Profit Organization" or "Small Business" (as applicable). Instructions on completing the SF-424 are available at www07.grants.gov/assets/SF424Instructions.pdf.

Project Abstract

Applicants must include a project abstract as the first page of their program narrative. It must not exceed 200 words and briefly describe the project's purpose, identify the population to be served, and summarize the activities that the applicant will implement to achieve the project's goals and objectives. These goals and objectives must focus on short-term and intermediate

outcomes. The abstract must describe how the applicant will measure progress toward these goals.

Program Narrative (Attachment 1)

This attachment should include updates to the 2009 to 2011 Comprehensive 3-Year Plan. Where states have changed, modified, or updated components of their FY 2010 3-year plan, they must provide sufficient information and data to explain the changes. If they have no changes, applicants should enter the heading and simply state that they have no changes.

Note that the applicant must provide the required components for the FY 2011 Plan for Compliance with the first three core requirements of the JJDP Act and the state's Compliance Monitoring Plan and Plan for Compliance with the Disproportionate Minority Contact core requirement (see #3, page 10). A response of "no change" to components 3A, B, and C and 4 of the plan is unacceptable. Further, item 6: Program Description, should include those programs that the applicant will support with FY 2011 Formula Grant funds.

1. System Description: Structure and Function of the 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.

2. Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems and Juvenile Justice Needs. States should base this analysis on the system description 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 Problems.¹ As part of the 3-year planning process, Section 223(a)(7)(A) provides for an analysis of juvenile delinquency problems in, and the juvenile delinquency control and delinquency prevention needs (including educational needs) of, the state, (including any geographical area in which an Indian tribe performs law enforcement functions), a description of the services the state will provide, and a description of performance goals and priorities, including a specific statement of the manner in which the state expects the programs to meet the identified juvenile crime problems (including the joining of gangs that commit crimes) and juvenile justice and delinquency prevention needs (including educational needs) of the state;

Section 223(a)(7)(B) contains: (i) a plan for providing needed gender-specific services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency; (ii) a plan for providing needed services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency in rural areas; and (iii) a plan for providing needed mental health services to juveniles in the juvenile justice system, including information on how such plan is being implemented and how such services will be targeted to those juveniles in such system who are in greatest need of such services;

This section should summarize the number and characteristics of youth handled at each stage of the process, from arrest through disposition. Applicants must provide a

¹ Include the extent of disproportionate minority contact (DMC) as displayed by DMC Identification Spreadsheets and their discussion in the DMC Compliance Plan.

minimum of 3 years of recent data for the areas listed below and the most recent data to the extent possible by county, parish, or city. If the requested data are not available, applicants must describe the problem in obtaining the data and plans to improve 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 (a)-(d) 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 (non-petitioned) 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.

B. State 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, and applicants should list and discuss them in order of priority.

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. Applicants should link the problem statements 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 and state advisory group (SAG) allocations (see Appendix D, program areas 23 and 31, respectively), these data-based problem statements and their priority ranking provide the state with the basis for developing its 3-year plan for funding juvenile justice programs.

- 3. Plan for Compliance With the First Three Core Requirements of the JJDP Act and the State's Compliance Monitoring Plan.** Plans should be data based and program specific, including the necessary "who, what, where, how, and when."

The comprehensive 3-year plan must include:

- A. Plan for Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO).** Pursuant to Section 223(a)(11) of the JJDP Act, the state must develop a plan that provides status offenders and nonoffenders are not placed in secure detention or secure correctional facilities except as allowed under the exceptions set forth in Section 223(a)(11)(A).

This plan should include trend analysis of the state's DSO rates in preceding years (i.e. are rates increasing or decreasing and why?). In addition, the plan should discuss the nature of DSO violations the state has typically experienced (e.g. status/nonoffenders in jails or lockups that also meet the definition of secure correctional facilities or secure detention facilities; accused status offenders held in juvenile detention centers for more than 24 hours; incorrect or inappropriate usage of the valid court order exception, etc.). The state's plan for achieving or maintaining compliance with DSO must relate directly to this analysis of violations.

For states currently in compliance with DSO, the plan must provide a strategy for maintaining compliance, including information on how the designated state agency and SAG will work together to address those circumstances in which DSO violations have tended to occur. Also, the plan must address any legislative or other changes that could impact the state's compliance.

For those states not in compliance with DSO, the plan must provide detailed goals, objectives, and action steps for achieving full compliance, including the individual responsible for each step and the date by which it will occur. An overall timetable for achieving compliance is also required. In addition, the strategy should include information on the SAG's proposed involvement. Goals, objectives, and activities must be directly tied to those circumstances in which DSO violations have occurred. Also, the plan must address any legislative or other changes that could impact the state's compliance.

- B. Plan for Separation of Juveniles from Adult Offenders.** Pursuant to Section 223(a)(12) of the JJDP Act, the state must develop a plan that provides juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent and status offenders shall not have contact with an individual who has reached the age of full criminal responsibility under applicable State law and has been arrested and is in custody for or awaiting trial on a criminal charge, or is convicted of a criminal offense.

This plan should include trend analysis of the state's separation rates in preceding years (i.e. are rates increasing or decreasing and why?). In addition, the plan should discuss the nature of separation violations the state has typically experienced (e.g. problems with adult trustees, physical plant issues in older facilities, etc.). The state's plan to achieve or maintain compliance with separation must relate directly to this analysis of violations.

For states currently in compliance with separation, the plan must provide a strategy for maintaining compliance, including information on how the designated state agency and the SAG will work together to address those circumstances in which separation

violations have tended to occur. Also, the plan must address any legislative or other changes that could impact the state's compliance.

For those states not in compliance with separation, the plan must provide detailed goals, objectives, and action steps for achieving full compliance, including the individual responsible for each step and the date by which it will occur. An overall timetable for achieving compliance is also required. In addition, the strategy should include information on the SAG's proposed involvement. Goals, objectives, and activities must be directly tied to those circumstances in which separation violations have occurred. Also, the plan must address any legislative or other changes that could impact the state's compliance.

For any state that utilizes the same staff to serve both adult and juvenile populations in approved collocated juvenile detention facilities, a policy must be in effect requiring 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.

- C. Plan for Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups.** Pursuant to Section 223(a)(13) of the JJDP Act, the state must develop a plan that provides no juvenile shall be detained or confined in any adult jail or lockup, except as OJJDP's Guidance Manual for Monitoring Facilities Under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002 (revised January 2007) allows.

This plan should include trend analysis of the state's jail removal rates in preceding years (i.e. are rates increasing or decreasing and why?). In addition, the plan should discuss the nature of jail removal violations the state has typically experienced (e.g. status offenders held securely in adult facilities, 6-hour rule violations, incorrect or inappropriate usage of the rural exception, etc.). The state's plan to achieve or maintain compliance with jail removal must relate directly to this analysis of violations.

For states currently in compliance with jail removal, the plan must provide a strategy to maintain compliance, including information on how the designated state agency and SAG will work together to address those circumstances in which jail removal violations have tended to occur. Also, the plan must address any legislative or other changes that could impact the state's compliance.

For those states not in compliance with jail removal, the plan must provide detailed goals, objectives, and action steps for achieving full compliance, including the individual responsible for each step and the date by which it will occur. An overall timetable for achieving compliance is also required. In addition, the strategy should include information on the SAG's proposed involvement. Goals, objectives, and activities must be directly tied to those circumstances in which jail removal violations have occurred. Also, the plan must address any legislative or other changes that could impact the state's compliance.

For those states that utilize or seek to utilize the 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 securely for any length of time in an adult jail or lockup. States must receive prior approval from OJJDP to use the rural exception.

All states that have received OJJDP approval to use the rural exception must complete the Rural Removal Exception Certification form (Appendix H) certifying that approved facilities continue to meet the required conditions. The juvenile justice specialist should sign this form, and the state should submit it with its formal grant application.

States may submit requests for newly identified facilities at any time to their OJJDP state representative or to Lawrence Fiedler, Title II Program Manager. OJJDP must approve any use of the rural exception for any new facility prior to utilization.

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 non-secure facilities to ensure that the core protections are met.

States must provide a plan describing how their system for compliance monitoring meets each of the following 10 elements of an adequate compliance monitoring system:

(1) Policy and Procedures. As an attachment to this application, states must provide a copy of their compliance monitoring policy and procedures manual. If this plan is available online, they may, as an alternative, provide a link to where it can be printed or downloaded. If the manual is *not* available in an electronic format, they may provide a hard copy of this document to their state representative.

If the state does not maintain a compliance monitoring policy and procedures manual, they must provide their plan to develop such a document along with an estimated date for completion.

(2) Monitoring Authority. The agency(s) responsible for compliance monitoring should have legal authority to inspect and collect data from all facilities in which juveniles might be placed pursuant to public authority. As an attachment to this application, the state must provide a copy of the legislative statute or executive order that provides the designated state agency with this authority. If this information is included in the above-referenced policies and procedures manual, provide the page or appendix number.

(3) Monitoring Timeline. States must keep an annual calendar denoting when and where compliance monitoring will occur. As an attachment to this application, states must provide a copy of their monitoring timetable. If this information is included in the above-referenced policies and procedures manual, provide the page or appendix number.

(4) Violation Procedures. This section of the plan must 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 this information is included in the policies and procedures manual, provide the page number where it can be found.

- (5) Barriers and Strategies.** Provide a written description of barriers the state faces in implementing an adequate system of compliance monitoring. This description must include strategies the state employs to overcome the barriers. If an up-to-date description of barriers and strategies is included in the policies and procedures manual, provide the page number where it can be found.
- (6) Definition of Terms.** States' definitions for key juvenile and criminal justice terms may differ from those provided in the JJDP Act. It is critical that these differences are identified and addressed in the monitoring process. Provide a discussion of how key state terms differ from those provided in the JJDP Act. If this information is included in the policies and procedures manual, provide the page number where it can be found. In addition, the state must certify that where state definitions differ from federal definitions in the monitoring process, federal definitions will be used in the monitoring process.
- (7) Identification of the Monitoring Universe.** States must identify all facilities in the state that might hold juveniles pursuant to public authority. Every facility that has this potential, regardless of the purpose to house juveniles, comes under the purview of the monitoring requirements. This list may include both public and privately owned or operated facilities. If a detailed description of the state's identification process is included in the policies and procedures manual, provide the page number where it can be found.
- (8) Classification of Monitoring Universe.** States must classify 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. Moreover, classification also includes determining whether a facility is public or private, residential or nonresidential, and whether the population is juvenile only, adult only, or juvenile and adult. If a detailed description of the state's classification process is included in the policies and procedures manual, provide the page number where it can be found.
- (9) Inspection of Facilities.** Inspection of facilities is necessary to ensure an accurate assessment of each facility's classification and record keeping. States must conduct periodic, onsite inspections of all facilities classified as secure detention or correctional facilities, jails, lockups, and other facilities to determine that they comply with Sections 223(a)(11), (12), and (13) of the JJDP Act. If a detailed description of the state's inspection process is included in the policies and procedures manual, provide the page number where it can be found.
- (10) Data Collection and Verification.** States must collect and report data to determine whether facilities in the state comply with the applicable requirements of Sections 223(a)(11), (12), and (13) of the JJDP Act. 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 to verify the reported data. On-site data verification must involve the review of data that a facility self-reports, including a review of the facility's admissions records and/or booking logs. If a detailed description of the state's process for data collection and verification is included in the policies and procedures manual, provide the page number where it can be found.


Although OJJDP holds the designated state agency implementing the Formula Grants program responsible for the compliance monitoring effort and the validity of the annual monitoring report, that agency may contract with a public or private agency to perform the monitoring function. If selecting another agency, the state must identify in its monitoring plan which agency it has authorized and/or tasked to assist in the monitoring functions. This plan should identify the funding amount and the name, address, and telephone number of the contractor. In addition, the plan should include the procedures and activities the state uses to monitor the contractual arrangement.

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

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(22) of the JJDP Act, states and territories must address specific delinquency prevention and system improvement efforts 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. DMC 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 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 to address DMC on an ongoing basis through identification (identify the extent to which DMC exists), assessment (examine and determine the factors that contribute to DMC, if it exists), intervention (develop and implement strategies to reduce DMC), evaluation (evaluate the efficacy of intervention strategies), and monitoring (track changes in DMC trends over time).

All states and territories, except Puerto Rico, 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 the subsequent updates, a plan that complies with the implementation guidelines below. Responses to the 2011 DMC Plan must address the five phases of the DMC Reduction Cycle.



Phase I: Identification. The purpose of the identification phase of a state's DMC effort is to determine whether disproportionality exists and the extent to which it exists. This requires the state to make comparisons between races within targeted jurisdictions. By collecting and examining data on the volumes of occurrence at the major contact/decision points in the juvenile justice system, states and territories can determine whether overrepresentation exists, in which jurisdictions it may exist, and the degree to which it exists at any contact/decision point within the juvenile justice system (See *Disproportionate Minority Contact Technical Assistance Manual, 4th Edition* [2009] for detailed descriptions of the juvenile justice system contact points.).

Additionally, experience with the Relative Rate Index (RRI) process over several years has led OJJDP to create a series of steps in the analysis of index values to drive decision-making within a community. The objective is to identify a small set (maximum of 3 to 5) of contact point/racial group combinations that will be the focus of later assessment, intervention, and evaluation work. In other words, the objective is to select points of focus for the ongoing DMC activity within a community. The five-step process involves:

- A. Updated DMC Identification Spreadsheets (Attachment 2).** OJJDP requires states to enter the most recent available statewide data and at least three targeted jurisdictions with the greatest minority concentrations or, preferably, the localities with focused DMC-reduction efforts into its Web-based DMC Data Entry System at www.ojjdp.dmcdata.org. Export the Relative Rate spreadsheets to GMS and label as "Attachment #2." Identify the jurisdiction when exporting to GMS (example: Attachment #2: Smith County/Township).
- B. DMC Data Discussion.** States must complete the RRI Analysis Tracking Sheet as a component of their data discussion (See a sample sheet in Appendix J).

Provide the following:

- (1) When quantifiable documentation to determine whether DMC exists or changes is unavailable or incomplete, the state must provide a time-limited plan of action to develop and implement a data collection system to track progress in DMC reduction and demonstrate consistent improvement in this area.
- (2) The state must discuss the RRIs obtained, compare the updated data and data obtained in earlier years, and illustrate how the data inform/guide the state's FY 2009-2011 DMC Compliance Plan.
- (3) The state must use the Relative Rate Index Tracking Sheet (see example in Appendix J) to interpret and analyze the values that should drive decision-making, which involves:
 - a. Identifying those statistically significant RRI values with the greatest magnitude, that is, those that reflect the greatest degree of disproportionate contact.
 - b. Identifying those statistically significant RRI values that involve the greatest volume of activity, that is, the largest number of minority youth who potentially may be affected.
- (4) Identifying those RRI values that are statistically significant.

- c. If applicable, comparing the RRI values noted in step 2 or 3 with the range of RRI values nationally (Note: See the National DMC Databook at <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/dmcd/index.html>).
- d. Examining the local context for each of the RRI values identified in steps 1–4 to consider which jurisdictions may be the more feasible target populations for activities designed to reduce DMC.

Phase II: Assessment/Diagnosis. When a state or territory identifies that DMC exists, it must undertake an assessment. States should also undertake targeted assessments when they note significant changes in the RRIs at particular contact/decision points, or after they implement significant changes in laws, procedures, and policies within the juvenile justice system that may negatively impact DMC. A DMC assessment is a comprehensive analysis utilizing advanced research methodologies to identify the contributing factors and examine minority over-representation and explain differences at all contact stages of the juvenile justice system. It should also include recommendations for specific intervention strategies.

Provide the following:

- A. A brief summary of the findings of the statewide DMC assessment published from 2005 to 2009 and any contributing mechanisms identified (See Appendix I for examples of major mechanisms contributing to DMC).
- B. If a statewide DMC assessment has not been conducted or completed, provide a time-limited plan for completing this assessment and/or any technical assistance needed.

Phase III: Intervention. Each state's DMC Compliance Plan shall, where DMC has been demonstrated and contributing factors determined, provide an intervention plan for reduction. The state shall base the plan on the results of the identification data and assessment findings. It should also target comprehensive prevention programming and system improvement efforts to communities where DMC is most prominent and those contact stages of the system where major disproportionate rates occur. Ultimately, the intervention efforts should address any individual, family, community, systemic (juvenile justice, education, etc.), and related laws and policies that may contribute to DMC.

Provide the following:

- A. **Progress Made in FY 2010:** Discuss the status of each of the planned activities in the FY 2010 DMC Compliance Plan. States with significant local DMC-reduction efforts should complete this section for each individual locality.

(1) Which activities have been implemented? Discuss specific progress made.

(2) Which activities were not implemented? Discuss the reason that prevented implementation and plans to overcome these obstacles.

- B. **DMC Reduction Plan for FY 2009-2011:**

(1) Include specific activities of data collection; data system improvement; programmatic and systems improvement; intervention, evaluation, and monitoring strategies.

- (2) Specify the timeline (i.e., FY 2009, FY 2010, and FY 2011, funding amount, and funding source(s) designated to conduct each of the planned activities).
- (3) Include planned Formula Grant-supported activities under the "Program Descriptions" section below with the amount budgeted and required descriptions of goals, objectives, and performance measures selected to document the output and outcomes of these activities.

Phase IV: Evaluation. 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, activities, and selected performance measures. Some states have conducted formal process and/or outcome evaluations of DMC activities.

If applicable, include a brief summary of findings of any formal process or outcome evaluation related to DMC activities (i.e. those that contain a specific research methodology to evaluate the program's effectiveness).

If no formal process or outcome evaluation has been conducted, write "Not applicable."

Phase V: Monitoring. States and their selected localities shall monitor and track DMC trends over time to identify emerging critical issues and to determine whether there has been progress. The ultimate question that jurisdictions must answer is: Has DMC been reduced? Whether such a change is directly attributable to specific DMC efforts is a secondary issue that requires a specific evaluation study.

Provide the following:

- A. Include a description of how the state will monitor and track DMC trends over time.
 - B. Include a description of how the state will monitor any delinquency prevention and systems improvement activities implemented to reduce DMC.
 - C. Indicate who will monitor these activities. If this is a DMC coordinator, indicate if the position is full or part-time.
 - D. Provide a timeline of current and/or future monitoring 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 D).
- A. **Reducing Probation Officer Caseloads.** 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 Juvenile Courts.** Pursuant to Section 223(a)(26) of the JJDP Act, the state shall, to the maximum extent practicable, implement a system to ensure that each juvenile court shall have access to and be

aware of the public child welfare records (including child protective services records) generated within its jurisdiction for each juvenile before the court.

- C. Establishing Policies and Systems To Incorporate 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 when 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).

Disaster Preparedness Plan

States that have completed a disaster preparedness plan detailing how juveniles in secure and non-secure placements are handled during a disaster, should attach a copy of the plan with the application. OJJDP strongly encourages states that have not started or completed such a plan to complete one by the time of the next Title II Formula Grants Program 3-Year Plan due date of March 31, 2012.

- 6. Collecting and Sharing Juvenile Justice Information.** To better understand the difficulties state agencies that administer the Formula Grants Program encounter in collecting and sharing juvenile justice information, OJJDP requests that they provide the following information in their FY 2011 Formula Grants application:
- A.** Describe the state's process for gathering juvenile justice information and data across state agencies—i.e. state departments of education and welfare, mental health services, local law enforcement—and how the state makes this information available across agencies and incorporates the data into its comprehensive 3-year plan and annual plan updates.
 - B.** Identify specific barriers the state encounters with the sharing of juvenile information on at-risk youth among state agencies, including local law enforcement, i.e. where state statute, regulation, or policy prohibits the sharing of this information.

States are to direct sufficient resources to accomplish this effort and increase the capacity to implement new or improve existing juvenile justice information sharing systems.

- 7. Statement of the Problem/Program Narrative.** In addressing the state's priority juvenile justice needs, as identified in response to 2B, page 10, applicants must include descriptions of the programs they will support with FY 2011 Formula Grant funds. Programs are groups of projects with common or similar or goals. Address each item below for each program:
- A. Program Area Code and Title.** Use only OJJDP's codes and titles available in Appendix D. Applicants should bear in mind that some program area codes have been changed and that a 35th program area, Strategic Community Action Planning, has been added and use the correct code in the application.

- B. Program Goals.** Provide a broad statement that conveys, in general terms, the program's intent to change, reduce, or eliminate the problem described. Goals identify the program's intended short-and long-term results.
- C. 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.
- D. Activities and Services.** 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.
- E. Performance Measures.** Represent the data and 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. Beginning with the October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007, data collection period, states must collect and report data on the mandatory performance measures for each applicable program area. Although not required, states may collect and report on non-mandatory measures if they choose.

The aforementioned performance measures are to be reported on-line via the Data Collection Technical Assistance Tool (DC-TAT). For more information on performance measures and DC-TAT, see www.ojjdp-dctat.org/.

- F. 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 Funds (\$)	Total (\$)
2009			
2010			
2011			

- G. SMART.** All applicants must register with OJJDP's Socioeconomic Mapping and Resource Topography (SMART) system at smart.qismapping.info. Applicants must demonstrate that they have queried the SMART system to determine program placement in a community facing significant need. Maps and reports generated that support the problem identified in this section should be submitted as attachments to the application. If the SMART system does not provide the most recent data or information to validate the problem, additional data points (e.g., local incidents of crime or community resources), as identified by the applicant, may be submitted instead. Instructions specific to the FY 2011 solicitations will be posted on the home page of the SMART site. For questions about the SMART system, contact Dennis Mondoro at 202-514-3913 or dennis.mondoro@usdoj.gov.

- 8. SAG Membership.** Pursuant to Section 223(a)(3)(A) of the JJDP Act, the state advisory group 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 G for detailed membership instructions and a sample membership table).
- 9. Formula Grants Program Staff.** The state must include in its application an organizational chart of the agency designated to implement the Formula Grants Program; a list of the other programs that the designated agency or division administers; 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.
- 10. Performance Measures Data.** Submission of performance measures data is not required for the application. Performance measures are included as an alert that OJJDP will require successful applicants to submit specific data as part of their reporting requirements. For the application, applicants should indicate an understanding of these requirements and discuss how they will gather the required data, should they receive funding (See Appendix D).

Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative (Attachment 3)

Applicants should provide a budget that: (1) is complete, allowable, and cost effective in relation to the proposed activities; (2) shows the cost calculations demonstrating how the applicant arrived at the total amount requested; and (3) provides a brief supporting narrative to link costs with project activities. Applicants must submit a budget that includes both a detailed worksheet itemizing all costs and a narrative explaining and justifying each budget item.

Applicants should explain how they calculated fringe benefits, how they estimated travel costs, why they must purchase particular items of equipment or supplies, and how they calculated overhead or indirect costs (if applicable). The budget narrative should justify the specific items listed in the budget detail worksheet (particularly supplies, travel, and equipment) and demonstrate that all costs are reasonable.

Section 223(a)(5) of the JJDP Act, as amended, states “unless the provisions of this paragraph are waived at the discretion of the Administrator for any State in which the services for delinquent or other youth are organized primarily on a statewide basis, provide that at least 66 2/3 per centum of funds received by the state under section 222, reduced by the percentage (if any) specified by the state under the authority of paragraph (25) and excluding funds made available to the state advisory group under section 222, shall be expended:

- A. Through programs of units of local government or combinations thereof, to the extent such programs are consistent with the State plan;
- B. Through programs of local private agencies, to the extent such programs are consistent with the State plan, except that direct funding of any local private agency by a State shall be

permitted only if such agency requests such funding after it has applied for and been denied funding by any unit of local government or combination thereof; and

- C. To provide funds for programs of Indian tribes that perform law enforcement functions (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior) and that agree to attempt to comply with the requirements specified in paragraphs (11), (12), and (13) applicable to the detention and confinement of juveniles, an amount that bears the same ratio to the aggregate amount to be expended through programs referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) as the population under 18 years of age in the geographical areas in which such tribes perform such functions bears to the State population under 18 years of age.”

1. Budget Detail Worksheet

This attachment should include the amount the state has budgeted for each program area it has identified to receive FY 2011 Formula Grant funds. Funds allocated for planning and administration and match requirement, the SAG and the American Indian tribal pass-through (where applicable) are required line items (see sample worksheet, Appendix F). The budget worksheet must present a complete and detailed itemization of all proposed costs.

- A. 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 Grants 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.
- B. SAG Allocation.** For planning and budget purposes, states may make as much as \$30,000 of their annual allocations available to assist the SAG (based on FY 2010 figures in accordance with Section 222(d) of the JJDP Act). OJJDP will notify the states of the actual FY 2011 SAG allocation once it receives its final appropriation.
- C. State Allocations and Program Areas.** OJJDP will notify each state of its respective formula allocation following enactment of the FY 2011 Appropriations Bill. Until that time, states should use their FY 2010 funding levels for planning purposes. As Section 223(c) of the JJDP Act requires, OJJDP will reduce a state’s FY 2011 allocation by 20 percent for each of the core requirements for which the state was found to be not in compliance in FY 2010. States that were determined to be not in compliance with one or more core requirements in FY 2010 should plan their FY 2011 expenditures using the correctly reduced amounts from their FY 2010 allocations. See Appendix B for FY 2010 distribution of Formula Grants by state and Appendix D for Formula Grant program areas.
- D. Indian Tribe Pass-through.** The required amount of the American Indian pass-through represents the minimum dollars a state must pass through to tribes that perform law enforcement functions. (See Appendix C for FY 2010 amounts.) Although this amount is based on a statutory formula, in many instances, it may be insufficient 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 its Tribal Youth Program.

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.

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/forms/budget_detail.pdf. If the budget is submitted in a different format, the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet should be included. For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the OJP Financial Guide at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/financialguide/index.htm.

2. Budget Narrative

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

Subgrant Award Assurances. 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. Applicants should describe the process that the state will use to assure the implementation of the preceding requirements of the subgrant award process.

To enable local subgrantees to implement evidence-based juvenile justice programs, OJJDP has developed the Model Programs Guide and database, a searchable Web resource containing information on the full range of evidence-based juvenile justice programs, from delinquency prevention and intervention to reentry (see www.dsgonline.com/mpg2.5/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. OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for awarding grants. OJJDP reviews the application to make sure that the information presented is reasonable, understandable, measurable, and achievable, as well as consistent with basic minimum program or legislative requirements as stated in the solicitation (including, but not limited to, requirements as to timeliness, proper format, and responsiveness to the scope of the solicitation).

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, the Assistant Attorney General will make all final grant award decisions.

Additional Requirements

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

- Civil Rights Compliance
- Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations
- Confidentiality
- Research and the Protection of Human Subjects
- Anti-Lobbying Act
- Financial and Government Audit Requirements
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- DOJ Information Technology Standards (if applicable)
- Single Point of Contact Review
- Non-Supplanting of State or Local Funds
- Criminal Penalty for False Statements
- Compliance with Office of Justice Programs Financial Guide
- Suspension or Termination of Funding
- Nonprofit Organizations
- For-profit Organizations
- Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)
- Rights in Intellectual Property
- Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) of 2006
- Awards in Excess of \$5,000,000 – Federal Taxes Certification Requirement
- Active CCR Registration.

Appendix A: Application Checklist

OJJDP FY 2010 Title II Formula Grants Program

Applicants should submit all applications electronically through OJP's GMS.

- Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)** is generated by completing the Overview, Applicant Information, and Project Information screens in GMS. (see page 8)
- Program Narrative (Attachment #1)** must address all 10 required items. (see page 9)
- Other Attachment (Attachment #2)** must include updated DMC Relative Rate Index spreadsheets. (see page 16)
- Budget Detail Worksheet (Attachment #3)** must include a worksheet that identifies and a narrative that justifies all proposed costs (see page 22 and Appendix F)

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

Deadlines

- Applicants must register on GMS by March 11, 2011.
- Applicants must submit completed applications by 8 p.m. ET March 31, 2011.

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

Appendix B: Distribution of Formula Grants by State (FY 2010)

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS
Distribution of Juvenile Justice Formula Grants by State - FY 2010

<u>STATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
ALABAMA	835,000	NEVADA	600,000
ALASKA	600,000	NEW HAMPSHIRE	600,000
ARIZONA	1,271,000	NEW JERSEY	1,524,000
ARKANSAS	600,000	NEW MEXICO	600,000
CALIFORNIA	6,970,000	NEW YORK	3,281,000
COLORADO	898,000	NORTH CAROLINA	1,670,000
CONNECTICUT	606,462	NORTH DAKOTA	600,000
DELAWARE	600,000	OHIO	2,032,000
DIST OF COLUMBIA	600,000	OKLAHOMA	674,000
FLORIDA	2,980,000	OREGON	646,000
GEORGIA	1,897,000	PENNSYLVANIA	2,056,000
HAWAII	600,000	RHODE ISLAND	600,000
IDAHO	600,000	SOUTH CAROLINA	794,000
ILLINOIS	2,366,000	SOUTH DAKOTA	600,000
INDIANA	1,179,000	TENNESSEE	1,101,000
IOWA	600,000	TEXAS	5,006,000
KANSAS	600,000	UTAH	632,000
KENTUCKY	750,000	VERMONT	600,000
LOUISIANA	825,000	VIRGINIA	1,357,000
MAINE	600,000	WASHINGTON	1,147,000
MARYLAND	998,000	WEST VIRGINIA	600,000
MASSACHUSETTS	1,062,000	WISCONSIN	978,000
MICHIGAN	1,779,000	WYOMING	600,000
MINNESOTA	934,000	AMERICAN SAMOA	100,000
MISSISSIPPI	600,000	GUAM	100,000
MISSOURI	1,058,000	PUERTO RICO	731,000
MONTANA	600,000	NO. MARIANA ISLANDS	100,000
NEBRASKA	600,000	VIRGIN ISLANDS	<u>100,000</u>
		TOTAL	63,037,462

Population figures based on July 1, 2008 Bureau of Census Data for States and Puerto Rico. Population estimates for the other US Territories, namely American Samoa, Guam, North Marianna Islands, and the Virgin Islands were taken from the International Data Base located on the US Census Bureau website [<http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/idb/region.php>].

3/31/2010

Appendix C: Indian Tribe Pass-Through by State (FY 2010)

State	Total Juvenile Population*	Juvenile American Indian Population	FY 2010 Formula Grant Allocation	Total State American Pass-through
Alabama	1,121,877	196	\$835,000	\$94
Alaska	179,876	14,009	\$600,000	\$29,592
Arizona	1,707,221	114,899	\$1,271,000	\$55,676
Arkansas	700,537	0	\$600,000	\$0
California	9,364,530	6,228	\$6,970,000	\$3,077
Colorado	1,207,135	1,853	\$898,000	\$888
Connecticut	812,213	1,022	\$606,462	\$484
Delaware	205,646	0	\$600,000	\$0
District of Columbia	113,720	0	\$600,000	\$0
Florida	4,004,271	2,018	\$2,980,000	\$991
Georgia	2,531,609	0	\$1,897,000	\$0
Hawaii	285,694	0	\$600,000	\$0
Idaho	412,640	4,582	\$600,000	\$4,219
Illinois	3,199,159	0	\$2,366,000	\$0
Indiana	1,586,518	0	\$1,179,000	\$0
Iowa	711,403	0	\$600,000	\$0
Kansas	700,485	3,936	\$600,000	\$2,150
Kentucky	1,003,973	0	\$750,000	\$0
Louisiana	1,107,973	723	\$825,000	\$346
Maine	274,867	775	\$600,000	\$1,071
Maryland	1,358,797	0	\$998,000	\$0
Massachusetts	1,427,033	105	\$1,062,000	\$51
Michigan	2,390,198	8,283	\$1,779,000	\$4,040
Minnesota	1,254,644	12,864	\$934,000	\$6,179
Mississippi	768,704	2,129	\$600,000	\$1,638
Missouri	1,424,830	0	\$1,58,000	\$0
Montana	220,358	16,562	\$600,000	\$28,557
Nebraska	446,995	965	\$600,000	\$820
Nevada	667,801	2,173	\$600,000	\$2,488
New Hampshire	298,186	0	\$600,000	\$0
New Jersey	2,063,789	0	\$ 1,524,000	\$0
New Mexico	502,450	14,854	\$ 600,000	\$11,233
New York	4,408,016	2,535	\$3,281,000	\$1,246
North Carolina	2,243,677	4,657	\$ 1,670,000	\$2,269
North Dakota	143,048	12,522	\$ 600,000	\$33,261
Ohio	2,751,874	0	\$2,032,000	\$0
Oklahoma	906,035	155,920	\$ 674,000	\$73,877
Oregon	867,575	17,002	\$ 646,000	\$8,047
Pennsylvania	2,786,719	0	\$2,056,000	\$0
Rhode Island	228,540	591	\$ 600,000	\$983
South Carolina	1,059,917	0	\$ 794,000	\$0
South Dakota	198,309	33,464	\$600,000	\$64,117
Tennessee	1,471,486	0	\$1,101,000	\$0
Texas	6,725,771	521	\$5,006,000	\$257
Utah	849,635	1,050	\$600,000	\$496
Vermont	131,353	0	\$600,000	\$0

State	Total Juvenile Population*	Juvenile American Indian Population	FY 2009 Formula Grant Allocation	Total State Native American Pass-through
Virginia	1,826,179	0	\$1,357,000	\$0
Washington	1,541,175	35,873	\$1,147,000	\$17,332
West Virginia	387,381	0	\$600,000	\$0
Wisconsin	1,314,412	8,852	\$978,000	\$4,256
Wyoming	125,365	6,823	\$600,000	\$0
American Samoa	25,999	0	\$100,000	\$0
Guam	57,196	0	\$100,000	\$0
Puerto Rico	1,002,944	0	\$731,000	\$0
North Mariana Islands	29,831	0	\$100,000	\$0
Virgin Islands	27,936	0	\$100,000	\$0
Total	\$75,045,639	\$415,278	\$63,037,462	\$330,395

* Based upon FY 2010 State Advisory Group Allocation of \$30,000

Appendix D: Formula Grant Program Areas

1. **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.
2. **Alternatives to Detention.** Alternative services provided to a juvenile offender in the community as an alternative to confinement.
3. **Child Abuse and Neglect Programs.** Programs that provide treatment to juvenile victims of child abuse or neglect and to their families to reduce the likelihood that such juvenile offenders will commit subsequent violations of law.
4. **Children of Incarcerated Parents.** Services to prevent delinquency or treat delinquent juveniles who are the children of incarcerated parents.
5. **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.
6. **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.
7. **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.
8. **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.
9. **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 non-serious 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 system-wide 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. **Indian Tribe Programs.** Programs to address juvenile justice and delinquency prevention issues for Indian Tribes and Alaska Natives.
23. **Planning and Administration.** Activities related to state plan development, other reawarded 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 or 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.
35. **Strategic Community Action Planning.** Programs and activities that bring together committed community leaders and residents to identify and access existing local resources for the development of a multifaceted response to juvenile justice issues.

Appendix E: Pass-Through Waiver Requirements

1. Section 223(a)(5) of the JJDP Act, as amended, requires states to pass-through 66 2/3 per centum of funds that the state receives under Section 222 unless waived at the discretion of the Administrator.
2. The request for waiver should be attached to the state's Title II application in the form of a letter to Jeff Slowikowski, OJJDP Acting Administrator, who will review requests for exceptions to this waiver; however, the state must meet the following criteria prior to review or approval:
 - a. Demonstration, by comparing state and local expenditures for the proceeding fiscal year, of how the state bears the primary financial burden for juvenile justice services provided in each of the authorized purpose areas.
 - b. Demonstration of consultation with units of local government in the state, either directly or through organizations representing such units, regarding the proposed waiver.
 - c. Demonstration of consultation with other state agencies that bear the primary financial burden for juvenile justice.
 - d. The approval of the state advisory group.
3. For further information or clarification, contact your OJJDP State Representative.

Appendix F: Sample Budget Detail Worksheet

OJJDP FY 2011 Title II Formula Grants Program

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

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 local conferences and workshops, as appropriate.
 - to monitor contracts with providers throughout the state.

If a state is out of compliance with one or more of the core requirements of the JJDP Act, OJJDP will reduce its award by 20 percent for each requirement with which the state fails to comply. Planning and administration is computed on the new amount of the award. After subtracting planning and administration and SAG funding, the state must use 50 percent of the remaining amount to achieve compliance. The state may use the remaining funds for other programming.

Appendix G: Instructions to Complete the SAG 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 roster is at the end of this appendix.

Column 1 (Name)

List the names of each SAG member beginning with the chair and place an asterisk (*) after any of those 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 years old 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.

Appendix H: Rural Removal Exception Certification Form

RURAL REMOVAL EXCEPTION CERTIFICATION

The State/Territory of _____ certifies that all facilities that OJJDP has approved for use of the Rural Removal Exception continue to meet the statutory conditions of the JJDP Act including:

- _____ the state compliance monitor has determined that the facility(s) meets or exceeds sight and sound separation standards;
- _____ the state has a policy in effect that requires individuals who work with both juveniles and adult inmates in colocated facilities to be trained and certified to work with juveniles;
- _____ the facility(s) is/are located outside a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget) and has no existing acceptable alternative placement available;
- _____ the facility(s) is/are located where conditions of distance to be traveled or the lack of highway, road, or transportation do not allow for court appearances within 48 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) so that a brief (not to exceed 48 hours) delay is excusable; **or**
- _____ the facility/(s) is/are located where conditions of safety exist (such as severely adverse, life-threatening weather conditions that do not allow for reasonably safe travel), in which case the time for an appearance may be delayed until 24 hours after the time that such conditions allow for reasonably safe travel.

Juvenile Justice Specialist

Appendix I: Contributing Mechanisms to DMC

Mechanism	Definition
Seasonal Mobility	Occurs when a community has an influx of juveniles during a particular season, frequently either a holiday season (spring break) or a vacation season (summer break).
Attractive Nuisance	Applied to a number of commercial or entertainment areas, particularly in urban settings. For example, a shopping mall or entertainment facility may be located in a suburban community or an urban neighborhood that has lower proportions of minority residents but draws youth from across an urban area.
Immigration-and Migration-Related Mobility	May have an impact on communities to create higher levels of DMC, particularly where policies of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services are a major concern.
Institutional Effects	May occur when a jurisdiction provides residential or detention capacity for a number of other jurisdictions. For example, if a county operates a regional detention facility, then it might appear that its volume of detention activity is higher than in surrounding counties, and if the county includes these nonresident youth in its RRI calculation, it might create erroneous results.
Indirect effects	Reflects economic status, education, location, and a host of risk factors associated with delinquent behavior, among other factors, that are linked with race and ethnicity. These factors are related to delinquent activity or contact within the justice system.
Specific risk factors	Are correlated with race or ethnicity, may lead to differential offending issues. Risk factors such as poor school performance or living in disorganized neighborhoods are more likely to occur to minority youth, putting them at a greater risk of system involvement.
Programming Access/Eligibility	For example, access to some forms of behavioral health or substance use treatment is often contingent on medical insurance coverage. That coverage is, in turn, often contingent on economic circumstances, which places many minority families at a disadvantage in obtaining such services.
Decisionmaking Factors	For example, a number of studies have indicated that juvenile justice decisionmakers respond differently to youth from an "intact" two-parent family setting than to youth from a single-parent home.
Access	May be limited by geography, hours of operation, or other means. For example, if a program is located in an area of a community that is not accessible through public transportation, the unintended outcome may be that only families who have access to private automobiles may participate.
Eligibility	May be used in many programs to define a set of youth most likely to benefit from the program or to exclude those youth that program leaders believe will likely disrupt the program or otherwise be less likely to benefit from the program resources.
Implementation	For example, the physical tone of a facility may be inviting or discouraging, may indicate an appreciation of multiple cultures, or may be sterile and institutional.

Effectiveness	The capability to achieve intended outcomes. Many prevention or treatment programs have been developed initially with a particular group of youth in mind, often white youth.
Differential Processing or Inappropriate Decisionmaking Criteria	An issue in determining program eligibility, implementing diversion programs, and selecting alternative decision outcomes.
Justice by geography	The concept that youth in general, and minority youth in particular, may be processed or handled differently in one jurisdiction than in another within the same state.
Legislation, Policies, and Legal Factors	Policies enacted through legislation or through administrative action may sometimes contain elements that create a disadvantage for minority youth
Simple Accumulation	There may be a higher rate of arrest for minority youth, followed by a lower rate of diversion, higher rates of formal processing as delinquent, etc.
Impacts On Later Decisions	Another example where race and ethnicity may work indirectly through factors that influence decisionmaking is the impact of earlier stages on later stages of the justice system, such as the impact of pre-adjudicatory detention.

Appendix J: Sample Relative Rate Index (RRI) Analysis and Tracking Sheet

State: Any State, USA County: Smith	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other/ Mixed	All Minorities
2. Juvenile Arrests	S,M,V,C,C	S, M,V,C	S, M,C,C	S,M,C	S, M,C,C	S,M,V,C	S, M,V,C,C
3. Referrals to Juvenile Court	S,M,V,C	S,M,V,C	S,M,V	S,M,V,C	S,M	S,V,C	S,M,V
4. Cases Diverted	S,M,V	S,M,V,C	M,C,C	S,M,C,C	S,M,V,C	S,M	S,V,C
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	S,M,V	S,M,V	S,M	S,V,C	S,M	S,M,V	S,M,V
6. Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)	S,M,V,C	S,M,V, C	S,M,V	S,M,V	S,M	S,M	S,M,V,C
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	S,M,V	S,V,C	S,M,C	S,M,V	S,M,V,C	S,M,V	S,M,V,C
8. Cases resulting Probation Placement	S,M,V	S,M,V,C	S,M,V,C	S,M,V	S	S	S,V,C
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	S,M,V	S,M,V	S,M,V	S,M,V,C	S,M,V,C	S,M,V	S,M,V,C
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	S,M,V	S,V,C	S	S	S,M	S,M,V	S,M,V

Key: **S**= Statistically Significant **M**=Magnitude of RRI **V**=Volume of Activity
C=Comparative with other jurisdictions* **C**=Contextual Considerations