



Executive Committee Meeting | Agenda

10:00 a.m. Wednesday, December 14, 2022
Hilton Austin Airport
9515 Hotel Drive
Austin, Texas 78719

Mayor Brandt Rydell, City of Taylor, **Chair**
Judge James Oakley, Burnet County, **First Vice Chair**
Mayor Lew White, City of Lockhart, **Second Vice Chair**
Commissioner Debbie Ingalsbe, Hays County, **Secretary**
Mayor Jane Hughson, City of San Marcos, **Parliamentarian**
Judge Paul Pape, Bastrop County, **Immediate Past Chair**
Council Member Mackenzie Kelly, City of Austin
Mayor Connie Schroeder, City of Bastrop
Council Member Kevin Hight, City of Bee Caves
Judge Brett Bray, Blanco County
Commissioner Joe Don Dockery, Burnet County
Judge Hoppy Haden, Caldwell County
Judge Joe Weber, Fayette County
Council Member Ron Garland, City of Georgetown

Council Member Esmeralda Mattke Longoria, City of Leander
Commissioner Steven Knobloch, Lee County
Judge Ron Cunningham, Llano County
Mayor Pro Tem Doug Weiss, City of Pflugerville
Council Member Matthew Baker, City of Round Rock
Council Member Janice Bruno, City of Smithville
Commissioner Ann Howard, Travis County
Commissioner Brigid Shea, Travis County
Commissioner Russ Boles, Williamson County
Commissioner Cynthia Long, Williamson County
Representative John Cyrier
Representative Celia Israel
Representative Terry Wilson
Representative Erin Zwiener

1. **Call to Order and opening remarks by the Chair**
2. **Consider Approving Minutes for the November 9, 2022 Meeting**
3. **Consider Adopting the 2023 CAPCOG Homeland Security Grant Program Process Guidance**
Martin Ritchey, Director of Homeland Security
4. **Consider Approving Policy Statement, Scoring Criteria, and Priorities for Criminal Justice Grant Plan Year 2024**
Charles Simon, Director of Regional Planning and Services
5. **Consider Approving Conformance Review Finding for City of Georgetown's New Type V MSW Transfer Station**
Charles Simon, Director of Regional Planning and Services
6. **Consider Approving Appointments to Advisory Committees**
Deborah Brea, Executive Assistant
7. **Staff Reports**
Betty Voights, Executive Director
8. **Adjourn**

A closed executive session may be held on any of the above agenda items when legally justified pursuant to Subchapter D of the Texas Open Meetings Act (Texas Government Code Chapter 551).



Executive Committee | Summary Minutes

10 a.m. Wednesday, Nov. 9, 2022
6800 Bureson Road
Building 310, Suite 165
Austin, Texas 78744

Present (18)

Mayor Brandt Rydell, City of Taylor, **Chair**
Judge James Oakley, Burnet County, **1st Vice Chair**
Mayor Lew White, City of Lockhart, **2nd Vice Chair**
Commissioner Debbie Ingalsbe, Hays County, **Secretary**
Mayor Jane Hughson, City of San Marcos,
Parliamentarian
Judge Paul Pape, Bastrop County, **Immediate Past Chair**
Mayor Connie Schroeder, City of Bastrop
Judge Brett Bray, Blanco County
Commissioner Joe Don Dockery, Burnet County

Judge Joe Weber, Fayette County
Council Member Ron Garland, City of Georgetown
Commissioner Steven Knobloch, Lee County
Judge Ron Cunningham, Llano County
Mayor Pro Tem Doug Weiss, City of Pflugerville
Council Member Matthew Baker, City of Round Rock
Council Member Janice Bruno, City of Smithville
Commissioner Russ Boles, Williamson County
Commissioner Cynthia Long, Williamson County

Absent (10)

Council Member Mackenzie Kelly, City of Austin
Council Member Kevin Hight, City of Bee Cave
Judge Hoppy Haden, Caldwell County
Council Member Esme Mattke Longoria, City of Leander
Commissioner Ann Howard, Travis County

Commissioner Brigid Shea, Travis County
Representative John Cyrier
Representative Celia Israel
Representative Terry Wilson
Representative Erin Zwiener

1. **Call to Order and opening remarks by the Chair**

Mayor Rydell called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. and congratulated everyone who won their November 8 elections. He led the pledge of allegiance to the national and state flags.

2. **Consider Approving Minutes for the October 12, 2022 Meeting**

Mayor Rydell asked for approval of the Oct. 12, 2022 meeting minutes. Commissioner Ingalsbe made a motion to approve the minutes. Judge Oakley seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

3. **Consider Accepting the Quarterly Investment Report**

Silvia Alvarado, Director of Finance

Ms. Alvarado asked the board to accept the quarterly report for the period ending in Sept. 30, 2022. She said CAPCOG's investments are in TexPool, and they earned \$162,132 for the quarter. The market interest rate during the quarter was about 2.048 percent. She said for comparison that U.S. Treasury notes earned about 3.96 percent in interest.

Commissioner Long made a motion to approve the Quarterly Investment Report. Mayor Hughson seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

4. **Consider Approving Contract with Eastern Research Group for Emissions Inventory Development and Assistance**

Charles Simon, Director of Regional Planning and Services

Mr. Simon said CAPCOG received one proposal to do seven tasks in a project to update mine and quarry equipment emission inventories, which was from Eastern Research Group. He noted CAPCOG has previously worked with the company, and it performed well. He said tasks one through five of the project were required portions of the project's proposal and related to developing the mine and quarry's

equipment emissions inventories of ground level ozone and would be paid for using TCEQ Rider 7 grant funds, while task six and seven are options to be considered by the board and the Clean Air Coalition. Task six would plan for the refinement of nonpoint mine and quarry particulate matter emissions estimates and would use CAPCOG's local air quality work plan monies if the option was approved. Task seven would be to assist with other emissions inventories and could make use of the state funding. Mr. Simon also noted that the tasks would only study the quarries in the five county MSA — Bastrop, Caldwell, Hays, Travis and Williamson.

Judge Oakley said Burnet County has many of the region's quarries and questioned how the emission inventories could impact change in air pollution. Commissioner Long questioned if the project was leaving Burnet County out would it be missing bigger picture activities that impact air pollution. Deputy Executive Director Andrew Hoekzema, formerly the Regional Planning and Services director, said task six could develop a project to scope a future study that could look at particulate matter inventories in either the five MSA counties or the entire region. He noted the state's inventories are out of date and the data collected could better support funding the replacement of equipment through Texas Emissions Reduction Plan grants and planning measures.

Council Member Mark Baker, who is the Clean Air Coalition chair, said he thought the project would be beneficial locally and by the state as more data is always more helpful. He also mentioned the Clean Air Coalition would likely approve options six and seven.

Judge Pape made a motion to approve the contract with Eastern Research Group for the emission inventory development and assistance with the optional tasks if recommended by the Clean Air Coalition. Commissioner Dockery seconded the motion. The motion passed with Judge Webber voting against the contract.

5. Consider Adopting the 2023 CAPCOG Homeland Security Strategic Plan Implementation Plan (HSSP-IP)
Martin Ritchey, Director of Homeland Security

Mr. Ritchey said that HSSP-IP is an annually adopted plan that provides the regional framework for homeland security priorities. He said last year the federal government made changes to its priorities, so this year's plan addresses those changes and includes priorities from the state. Such changes included priorities such as enhancing cyber security, combating domestic violence extremism, enhancing election security, addressing cascading supply chain and critical infrastructure failure and more. Mr. Ritchey stated the regional priorities were determined through several meetings with various groups of stakeholders and were approved by CAPCOG's Homeland Security Task Force.

Commissioner Dockery made a motion to adopt the 2023 CAPCOG HSSP-IP. Mayor Schroeder seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

6. Consider Adopting the 2023 CAPCOG Integrated Preparedness Plan (IPP)
Martin Ritchey, Director of Homeland Security

Mr. Ritchey said the IPP is a multiyear training and exercise plan developed with the help of stakeholders to look at homeland security and emergency management training needs for the region over the next two to three years. He mentioned that the plan outlines training related to the 2023 regional exercise which involves a major mock cybersecurity event that also effects the operations of hard targets and requires a multi-agency and jurisdictional response. Mr. Ritchey also said the plan states training should be offered at locations throughout the region.

Commissioner Dockery made a motion to adopt the 2023 CAPCOG IPP. Commissioner Ingalsbe seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

7. Consider Approving CAPABLE Grant Contract Amounts and Vendor Selection Process
Patty Bordie, Director of Aging Services

Ms. Bordie said CAPCOG is entering its fourth year of offering the CAPABLE Program, and it procures the vendors through a direct purchase service methodology which lets the program be flexible and timely for the consumer. As the program is growing, it needs to expand CAPCOG’s vendor pool, and this item aligns the purchasing method with CAPCOG’s policies. She said the process and contracts set specific amounts on the rates and not to exceed amounts for each vendor, so CAPCOG wouldn’t need to come to the board with an individual vendor agreement. They also help reassign vendors and bring on new vendors as needed. She asked the board to set the program’s total cost not to exceed \$160,000, but the vendors individually are not likely to exceed \$25,000.

Commissioner Ingalsbe made a motion to approve the CAPABLE grant contract amounts and vendor selection process. Mayor White seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

8. Consider Approving Appointments to Advisory Committees

Deborah Brea, Executive Assistant

Ms. Brea said there is recommendation from Travis County to have Major William Pool serve as an alternate for Cpt. Thomas Szimanski on the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee (CJAC). Ms. Voights reminded the board that the CJAC is the only committee that allows proxies or alternates because grant prioritization happens across several consecutive days. She also noted that the committee has a lot of rules to follow, and its members and alternates must go through an orientation before the prioritization process.

Council Member Wiess made a motion to appoint Major Pool as an alternate to the CJAC. Council Member Baker seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

9. Staff Reports

Betty Voights, Executive Director

Ms. Voights said the CJAC recently met to begin working on its policy statement regarding how it will manage the application process and she wanted to mention that staff is still working under the assumptions the board’s goal is to stretch funding across as many projects as possible including decreasing percentage of award amounts based on how many years the project has been funded by the program grants. Also, she said staff understood that grants are meant to get a new project off the ground but not to permanently sustain them. She added there are projects that are funded routinely which may represent core services; she asked the officers two years ago whether core services should be carved out for continuous funding, but there was no decision to do so.

Judge Pape asked for a spread sheet of each of the grants that have been awarded for the last five years, so the board can get a feel of how decreasing awards could affect projects. Mayor Schroeder said it seems counter productive to end a good project because additional funding isn’t available elsewhere. Mayor Pro Tem Weiss said the diminishing number may work for local government because they could be better suited to absorb project costs into their budgets over time, but nonprofits don’t share the same luxury.

10. Adjourn

Mayor Rydell adjourned the meeting at 10:52 a.m.

Commissioner Debbie Ingalsbe, Secretary
Executive Committee
Capital Area Council of Governments

Date

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

MEETING DATE: December 14, 2022

AGENDA ITEM: #3 Consider Adopting the 2023 CAPCOG Homeland Security Grant Program Process Guidance

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ITEM:

Each year the Homeland Security staff and the Homeland Security Task Force review and revise the CAPCOG Homeland Security Grant Program Process Guidance. The Guidance is the framework for establishing Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) application priorities and applicant expectations.

This year’s review and revisions to the Guidance reflect changes in the Homeland Security Grant Program requirements made by the Office of the Governor (OOG) Public Safety Office (PSO), Homeland Security Grant Division (HSGD). These changes include specific investment areas from The Department of Homeland Security. Projects outside of the investment areas or not documented within the approved plans are likely to be ranked very low or not be accepted by the OOG.

Prior to submission for Executive Committee review, the Guidance was vetted and approved by the Homeland Security Task Force during their November 3, 2022, meeting.

THIS ITEM REPRESENTS A:

- checkboxes for New issue, project, or purchase; Routine, regularly scheduled item (checked); Follow-up to previously discussed item; Special item requested by board member; Other

PRIMARY CONTACT/STAFF MEMBER: Martin Ritchey, Director, Homeland Security

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

Total estimated cost: N/A

Source of Funds: N/A

- Is item already included in fiscal year budget? (checked) Yes () No
Does item represent a new expenditure? () Yes (checked) No
Does item represent a pass-through purchase? () Yes (checked) No
If so, for what city/county/etc.? _____

PROCUREMENT: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED:

Consider adoption of the 2023 CAPCOG Homeland Security Grant Program Process Guidance

BACK-UP DOCUMENTS ATTACHED:

- 1. 2023 CAPCOG Regional Grant Review Process Guidance Summary of Changes
2. 2023 CAPCOG Homeland Security Grant Program Process Guidance (includes 2023 SHSP Grant Worksheet)

BACK-UP DOCUMENTS NOT ATTACHED (to be sent prior to meeting or will be a handout at the meeting): None

2023 CAPCOG Regional Grant Review Process Guidance

Summary of Changes

Overall:

- The grant year was changed from 2022 to 2023 throughout the document
- Substantive changes were made via track changes
- Formatting and grammatical changes were made throughout the document
- Added relevant acronyms and definitions
- Changed document footer to reflect grant year (will revise to reflect CAPCOG Executive Committee adoption date in final copy)

Program Requirements (Section II):

- The *Homeland Security Strategic Plan – Implementation Plan* (HSSP-IP) was referenced
- Changes were made to reflect changes in State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSP) priority areas and related percentages of funding:
 - *Addressing Emergent Threats* was deleted
 - *Enhancing Community Preparedness and Resilience* was added
 - *Enhancing Election Security* was added
- Notation was added that the Investment priority areas are subject to change

Eligibility (section III):

- The *Homeland Security Strategic Plan – Implementation Plan* (HSSP-IP) was referenced
- Text for the disposition completeness percentage of arrest charges was revised to reflect the most current information from the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS)
- Revised requirement from *Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS)* to reflect current requirement for *Unique Entity ID* and replaced the included link
- Added 12-hour time to operational period to reflect current FEMA guidelines

Project Submission and Approval Process (Section IV):

- Updated planned completion dates and deadlines, where applicable
- Added clarifying information for projects that include Management and Administration (M&A) costs
- Added clarifying information related to prioritizing sustainment projects

Performance Period and Closeout (Section V):

- No changes

Capital Area Council of Governments 202~~32~~ State Homeland Security Program Regional Grant Review Process Guidance

I. General Information

Texas uses a regional approach for the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP), providing an allocation through each Council of Governments (COG) for regional projects, subject to approval by the State. The allocation to the Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) includes amounts for the State Homeland Security Program (SHSP). Specific use of SHSP funds is approved by the CAPCOG Executive Committee and awarded by the State for the selected regional projects.

II. Program Requirements

- A. The SHSP is a core assistance program that provides funds to build and/or maintain capabilities at the state- and regional- levels. It is used to implement the goals and objectives included in *State Homeland Security Strategic Plan*, initiatives derived from gap identification in the *CAPCOG Stakeholder Preparedness Review (SPR)*, [the Homeland Security Strategic Plan – Implementation Plan \(HSSP-IP\)](#), and target capabilities in the *CAPCOG Regional Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA)*.
- B. Activities implemented under the SHSP must support efforts to build, sustain, and deliver the capabilities necessary to prevent, prepare for, protect against, and respond to acts of terrorism. However, many capabilities that support terrorism preparedness simultaneously support preparedness for other hazards. Grantees may demonstrate this dual use to qualify for any activities implemented under this program that are not solely focused on terrorism preparedness.
- C. *Law Enforcement Activities*: It is anticipated that the requirement that at least 25% of the regional allocation for SHSP programs must be spent on law enforcement activities will be continued in 202~~32~~.
- D. DHS/FEMA continuously evaluates the national risk profile and sets priorities that help ensure appropriate allocation of scarce security dollars. In assessing the national risk profile for 202~~32~~, [six five](#) priority areas attracted the most concern and were determined that they should be addressed by allocating specific percentages of HSGP funds to each of these [six five](#) areas, for a total of [3042](#) percent. The [six five](#) areas and the allocated percentage are proposed for each priority area in order to obtain a full allocation of HSGP funds:

1. Enhancing the protection of soft targets/crowded places – 3%

2. Enhancing information and intelligence sharing – 3%

3. Combating domestic violent extremism – 3%

4. Enhancing cybersecurity – no minimum percent

5. Enhancing community preparedness and resilience – 3%

6. Enhancing election security – no minimum percent

~~1. Enhance cybersecurity – 7.5 percent~~

~~2. Combat Domestic Violent Extremism – 7.5 percent~~

~~3. Enhance the protection of soft targets/crowded places – 5 percent~~

~~4. Enhance information and intelligence sharing and cooperation with federal agencies, including DHS – 5 percent~~

~~5. Address emerging threats – 5 percent.~~

- E. It is anticipated that the requirement to fund those ~~six~~five priority areas at the assigned amount will be continued in this fiscal year's allocation. Investment priority areas are subject to change when the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) is published.
- F. The designated State Administrative Agency (SAA) for administering the Homeland Security Grant Program in Texas is the Office of the Governor (OOG) Public Safety Office (PSO), Homeland Security Grant Division (HSGD).
- G. In 2018, FEMA established the annual requirement of completing the *National Cyber Security Review (NCSR)*, a cybersecurity assessment in order to receive funding under the SHSP. Jurisdictions receiving funding through the SHSP must complete the NCSR during the time frame designated by FEMA and submit the certificate of submission to both the OOG and to the Homeland Security Division of CAPCOG. Jurisdictions that fail to complete the assessment will not be eligible for future SHSP funding through the grant cycle. The NCSR must be completed between October 1st and December 31st each year before the grant award and through its completion. NCSR is accessible through the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center (MS-ISAC) web portal. The OOG/FEMA will defund any program not in compliance.

III. Eligibility

- A. According to current State of Texas guidelines, potential sub-recipients for SHSP grant funds include state agencies, regional councils of governments, units of local government, nonprofit organizations, universities or colleges, and Native American tribes.
- B. Eligible applicants may submit projects that are consistent with the applicable state or regional *Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA)*, ~~as well as~~ the *CAPCOG Stakeholder Preparedness Review (SPR)*, and the *Homeland Security Strategic Plan – Implementation Plan (HSSP-IP)*. Applicants must also meet the following eligibility requirements:
1. Grantees are required to maintain adoption and implementation of the *National Incident Management System (NIMS)*.
 2. Grantees must use standardized resource management concepts for resource typing, credentialing, and an inventory to facilitate the effective identification, dispatch, deployment, tracking and recovery of resources.
 3. Cities and counties must have a current emergency management plan or be a legally established member of an inter-jurisdictional emergency management program with a plan on file with the Texas Division of Emergency Management (TDEM). Plans must be maintained throughout the entire grant performance period and must be at least at the Intermediate Level. If you have questions concerning your emergency management plan preparedness level, contact your city or county emergency management coordinator (EMC) or the Homeland Security Division of the CAPCOG. For questions concerning plan deficiencies, contact TDEM at tdem.plans@tdem.texas.gov.
 - ~~4. In order for an applicant to be eligible, the county (or counties) in which the applicant is located must have a 90 percent average on both adult and juvenile criminal history dispositions reported to the Texas Department of Public Safety for calendar years 2016 through 2022. This requirement must be met by August 1, 2022.~~
 4. Entities receiving funds must be located in a county that has an average of 90% or above on both adult and juvenile dispositions entered into the computerized criminal history database maintained by the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) as directed in the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure, Chapter 60. This disposition completeness percentage is defined as the percentage of arrest charges a county reports to DPS for which a disposition has been subsequently reported and entered into the computerized criminal history system.

5. Eligible applicants operating a law enforcement agency must be current on reporting Part I violent crime data to the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) for inclusion in the annual Uniform Crime Report (UCR). To be considered eligible for funding, applicants must have submitted a full twelve months of accurate data to DPS for the most recent calendar year.
6. Eligible applicants must have a Unique Entity ID Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number assigned to its agency. To request a Unique Entity ID/DUNS number, go to GSAFSD Tier 0 Knowledge Base - How can I view my Unique Entity ID? <http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform/displayHomePage.do>.
7. Eligible applicants must be registered in the federal *System for Award Management* (SAM) database located at <https://www.sam.gov/> and maintain an active registration throughout the grant period.
8. Eligible applicants must be compliant with the requirements of the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)-compliant.
9. Eligible applicants must attend the grant workshop outlining CAPCOG grant requirements.
10. Eligible new applicants must attend eGrants training provided by the Office of the Governor.
11. Eligible applicants MUST have a physical location within the 10-county CAPCOG region and participate in regional programs.
12. Eligible applicants must demonstrate the capacity to support and maintain their project's ability to act in a regional capacity. Regional capacity includes deployment, supplying, and staffing for the first 12-hour operational period within the CAPCOG region and to participate in annual CAPCOG exercises.

IV. Project Submission and Approval Process

A. Step 1: CAPCOG Executive Committee approves the 202~~32~~ Homeland Security Grant Program Regional Grant Review Process Guidance

1. Upon recommendation of the CAPCOG Homeland Security Task Force (HSTF), the CAPCOG Executive Committee will approve the 202~~32~~ Homeland Security Grant Program Regional Grant Review Process Guidance.
2. Planned completion date: ~~November~~December 14~~0~~, 202~~2~~1

B. Step 2: CAPCOG announces the approval of the 202~~32~~ Homeland Security Grant Program Regional Grant Process

- a. Following Executive Committee approval of the 202~~32~~ Homeland Security Grant Program Regional Grant Review Process Guidance, a copy of

the process document will be posted on the CAPCOG website and a link to the posting will be e-mailed to all counties and cities within the CAPCOG region.

- b. This notification is intended to:
 - a. Identify requirements and deadlines for submission of applications for 202~~32~~ SHSP funding; and
 - b. Invite interested jurisdictions to participate in the mandatory grant application workshops ~~that~~which will be scheduled for December 202~~2~~4.

C. Step 3: CAPCOG completes the regional THIRA, SPR, and THSSP-IP

1. CAPCOG Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA)

- a. The THIRA follows a three-step process, as described in FEMA's *Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 201, Third Edition*:
 - 1) Identify the Threats and Hazards of Concern. Based on a combination of past experience, forecasting, expert judgment, and other available resources, the region identifies a list of the threats and hazards of primary concern to the area.
 - 2) Give the Threats and Hazards Context. The Region describes the threats and hazards of concern, showing how they may affect the community.
 - 3) Establish Capability Targets. The Region assesses each threat and hazard in context to develop a specific capability target for each relevant core capability. The capability target defines success for the capability.
- b. The THIRA helps the region determine what is needed to prepare for, what resources are required to respond, and what current gaps exist in capability. Communities in the region can use this information to help them efficiently build and sustain preparedness capabilities.
- c. THIRA planned submission date: ~~October~~November 3~~1~~0, 202~~2~~4

2. CAPCOG Stakeholder Preparedness Review (SPR)

- a. The SPR is a three-step process described in the FEMA *Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 201, Third Edition*:
 - 1) Assess Capabilities. Assess and describe the region's current capabilities.
 - 2) Identify and Address Gaps. Describe the capability gaps and the approached the region will take to address the gaps.
 - 3) Describe Impacts of Funding Sources. Assess the impact of relevant funding sources on the capabilities identified in the THIRA.
- b. For each core capability, the Region analyzes their ability to achieve the desired outcome in each of five elements: planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercises.
- c. The Region provides context for their assessment by rating the priority they place on each core capability and describing their capability gaps and recent advances.
- d. Together, the CAPCOG THIRA and SPR help communities determine what they need to prepare for and what the regional gaps are. Communities can use this information to help them build and sustain preparedness capabilities. These identified resource gaps will provide the basis, along with the *CAPCOG Homeland Security Strategic Plan – Implementation Plan*, for identifying and prioritizing projects for 20212 SHSP funding.
- e. SPR planned submission date: ~~November~~ October 31st, 202~~2~~4

3. CAPCOG's Homeland Security Strategic Plan Implementation Plan (HSSP-IP)

- a. The document outlines how the jurisdictions and agencies within CAPCOG plan to implement the *Texas Homeland Security Strategic Plan 2021-2025*. The Implementation Plan further develops the THIRA/SPR capability targets and existing gaps by identifying current and proposed activities and their measurable objectives that align the region's priorities with the State's priorities and ultimately synchronizes homeland security activities across the State.

4. HSSP-IP planned submission date: ~~November~~ December 30th, 202~~2~~4

D. Step 4: CAPCOG aligns projects with Regional and Department of Homeland Security Investment Areas

1. Anticipated investment areas and impact on overall funding – Investment Justifications (IJ's) must support all applications:
2. The *CAPCOG Homeland Security Task Force Strategic Planning Guide* identified several areas where collaboration is needed to address regional risks and hazards identified in the THIRA, SPR, and HSSP-IP, as well as the State's priorities identified by the Office of the Governor, Public Safety Division. Projects submitted under the 202~~32~~ State Homeland Security Program should seek to build regional capacity in the following areas:
 - a. Planning
 - 1) Mitigation
 - 2) Wildland Fire Response Planning
 - 3) Auto/Mutual Aid / Regional Assistance Plan
 - 4) Medical Preparedness (Pre-hospital, hospital, surge, mass casualty, bioterrorism)
 - 5) Flood Forecasting
 - b. Technology and Communications
 - 1) CAD Data Sharing Efforts
 - 2) EOC Data Sharing Efforts
 - 3) Regional 911 Regional Notification System
 - 4) Regional Data Network Interoperability and WebEOC
 - 5) Emerging New Technologies and Best Practices
 - c. Response Coordination
 - 1) Regional Equipment Standardization Planning (RESET /LESET)
 - 2) Public Safety Unmanned Aerial Systems Team (PSURT)
 - d. Recovery and Resiliency
 - 1) Pre- and Post-Disaster Mitigation
 - e. Training and Outreach
 - 1) Public Information Coordination
 - 2) Training and Exercises
 - 3) Elected Official Briefings on Regional Strategies
 - 4) Regional Wildfire Protection Plan

- 5) Flood Forecasting Initiative(s)

f. CAPCOG Regional Interoperability Communications Committee

CAPCOG Regional Cyber Task Force

- 1) Cyber Protection / Ransom Ware

3. ~~In addition to~~~~Along with~~ the Homeland Security/FEMA investment areas, the following priorities were identified by the state for 202~~2~~~~4~~ and are expected to remain in effect for 202~~3~~~~2~~.

a. Regional Fusion Centers

- 1) Funding support for a recognized fusion center (please refer to <http://www.dhs.gov/fusion-center-locations-and-contact-information>).
- 2) Must directly align to and reference any capability gaps identified during the center's most recent individual Fusion Center Assessment Report.
- 3) Facilitating the implementation of plans and procedures to work in conjunction with the Texas Joint Crime Information Center and achieve and maintain baseline capabilities for Major Urban Area Fusion Centers.
- 4) Implementing suspicious activity reporting tools for CAPCOG Region Fusion Center and providing training in every county.
- 5) Urban Areas Security Initiative jurisdictions that are no longer separately funded will be allowed to submit a request for the Regionally Recognized Fusion Center in their jurisdiction directly to HSGD.

b. Intelligence and Information Sharing (Non-Fusion Center requests)

- 1) Enabling interdiction and disruption of terrorist activity through enhanced understanding and recognition of pre-operational activity and other crimes that may be precursors or indicators of terrorist activity.
- 2) Reporting suspicious activity.
- 3) Implementing or sustaining public information and warning systems to relay information regarding terrorism threats.

c. Special Response Teams and First Responder Capabilities (including Border Security capabilities)

- 1) Detecting chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosives (CBRNE) or weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

- 2) Sustaining and enhancing tactical teams including HAZMAT response and decontamination, Urban Search and Rescue, and SWAT.
 - 3) Sustaining equipment needs, including personal protective equipment, WMD pharmaceuticals, calibration and maintenance for WMD-related detection and identification systems, and closely related investments to update or sustain current equipment.
 - 4) Sustaining and enhancing border security detection, prevention, and response capabilities.
 - 5) Planning, training, exercises, and equipment to enhance interdiction capabilities against border security threats.
- d. State and Regional Planning
- 1) Developing state and regional risk and preparedness assessments.
 - 2) Core capability development planning, to include typing and tracking of equipment and special response teams.
 - 3) Planning and execution of training and exercises focused on terrorism prevention, protection, and response.
 - 4) Multi-jurisdictional operational planning to include plans for regional operational coordination of terrorism prevention, protection, and response capabilities.
 - 5) Maintaining or updating Emergency Operations Plans, consistent with guidance in the *Comprehensive Preparedness Guide (CPG) 101, Version.3.0* and the whole community approach to security and emergency management
 - 6) Planning and implementation of initiatives to enhance the Citizen Corps Program and other community resilience initiatives.
 - 7) Planning for continuity of operations.
- e. Operational Coordination
- 1) Establishing and maintaining a unified and coordinated operational structure and process that integrates critical stakeholders.
 - 2) Implementing WebEOC and other situational awareness and decision support tools.
 - 3) Conducting or participating in incident management training and/or exercises.
- f. Critical Infrastructure
- 1) Identifying critical infrastructure, collecting and maintaining data, and prioritizing critical infrastructure assets, clusters, and systems.
 - 2) Assessing critical infrastructure vulnerabilities and interdependencies, particularly those involving multiple sites and/or sectors.

- 3) Planning, training, exercises, equipment, and modeling enabling responsible jurisdictions to mitigate threats to and vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure facilities, assets, networks, and systems.
 - 4) Analyzing critical infrastructure threats and information sharing with private sector partners.
 - 5) Enhancing public awareness education and communications and increasing reporting of suspicious activities related to critical infrastructure.
- g. All capabilities being built or sustained must have a clear linkage to one or more of the Core Capabilities in the *National Preparedness Goal*.
- h. Many capabilities which support terrorism preparedness simultaneously support preparedness for other hazards. Grantees may demonstrate this dual-use quality for any activities implemented under this program.
- i. Activities implemented under SHSP must support terrorism preparedness by building or sustaining capabilities that relate to the prevention of, protection from, mitigation of, response to, and recovery from terrorism.
- j. Projects submitted with Management and Administration (M&A) costs must contain a detailed budget along with the hours associated with management of the project.
- i.k. Routine sustainment projects may lose priority due to lower funding levels or need to achieve predetermined targets.

E. Step 5: CAPCOG conducts 2022 SHSP workshop

1. Attendance at this workshop is required for all applicants submitting projects to be prioritized for 202~~32~~ SHSP funding through CAPCOG. Projects submitted by applicants not represented at this workshop will not be considered for funding.
2. At this workshop, potential applicants will receive an explanation of:
 - a. Who can apply.
 - a.b. _____ ~~and~~ Wwhat activities are eligible,
 - b.c. _____ Requirements for problem statement with supporting data, goal statement, project activity explanations, current and target output and outcome measures, and budget categories & line items,
 - e.d. _____ Applicable rules, regulations, eligibility requirements, and certifications required for each funding opportunity,
 - d.e. _____ State strategies or funding priorities identified by the OOG,

e.f. Threats, hazards, and capability gaps identified through the regional THIRA, SPR, and other assessments related to homeland security issues, as applicable,

f.g. Local policies or procedures that affect CAPCOG's prioritization process,

g.h. Process for creating, submitting, and certifying applications to the OOG; and important grant deadlines,

h.i. The project period for each funding opportunity as stated in the *Request for Applications (RFA)* issued by the OOG, and

i.j. Any prohibitions stated in the RFA issued by the OOG.

3. Planned date: Workshops will take place in December of 202~~2~~⁴ for all applicants.

F. Step 6: Applicants submit project applications via eGrants and project worksheet to the COG

1. Project applications must be submitted using the eGrants web-based application.
2. Project worksheets must be submitted to CAPCOG and are available on CAPCOG website.
3. As time allows, CAPCOG Homeland Security staff will assist with submission process upon request prior to close of the CAPCOG application period.
4. Key Dates:
 - a. eGrants Application Period opens **December 14, 202~~2~~⁴**.
 - b. Applicants must submit the completed application to eGrants no later than **5:00 PM CST on January 31, 202~~3~~²**.
 - c. Applicants submit completed project worksheet to CAPCOG no later than **5:00 PM CST on January. 31, 20~~3~~²**.
 - d. The last date for the Applicant Certifying Official to certify application in eGrants is **5:00 PM CST on February 28, 202~~3~~²**.

5. All key dates are final. Applications submitted outside that window will not be considered for funding.

G. Step 7: HSTF Committees assign priorities to projects

1. CAPCOG Homeland Security staff will provide a list of project applications indicating which projects have been assigned to each committee.
2. Committee chairs may request that projects be reassigned to another committee.
 - a. Persons cannot participate in prioritizing projects for their jurisdiction.
 - b. Reassignment will require the concurrence of CAPCOG Homeland Security staff and the chairs of the involved committees.
3. Each standing committee of the HSTF will meet to discuss assigned projects within their area of interest and place them in a priority order and Tier by group consensus.
4. The committees will assign each project as follows:
 - a. Projects that align with investment areas identified in section IV.D (Step 4) of this process.
 - b. Projects eligible under HSGP grant program, but do not address any of the regional priorities identified in the CAPCOG THIRA, SPR and IP.
 - c. Projects that are not ranked because the applicant jurisdiction:
 - 1) Did not attend the mandatory SHSP project application workshop
 - 2) Did not meet the requirements of this grant process, or
 - 3) Did not submit a completed project worksheet.
5. Projected completion dates: February 10, 202~~2~~3 to February 20, 202~~2~~3.

H. Step 8. Organize prioritized projects

1. Committee chairs will submit reviewed projects to CAPCOG staff, who will work with an appointed team to prepare the project submittals for the HSTF final review, revision, and ranking meeting.

2. Priorities will be based on consensus informed by the most recent version of the CAPCOG THIRA, SPR and HSSP-IP.
 - a. A review of all projects will be conducted for potential prioritization as outlined in section IV.G.4 above
 - b. Projects from all committees will be prioritized based upon the national investment areas and CAPCOG regional priorities.
3. Anticipated completion date: February, 202~~32~~

I. Step 9: Homeland Security Task Force approves prioritized project list

1. The CAPCOG Homeland Security Task Force will review and may revise the prepared list of 202~~32~~ HSGP projects and will, by a vote of its members, approve a recommendation to the CAPCOG Executive Committee.
2. Planned completion date: March ~~23~~, 202~~32~~

J. Step 10: CAPCOG Executive Committee approves prioritized project list

1. The CAPCOG Executive Committee will review and may revise the prioritized list of 202~~23~~ HSGP projects and will, by a vote of its members, approve a recommendation to the OOG.
2. Planned completion date: March ~~89~~, 202~~32~~.

K. Step 11: Office of the Governor sends potential projects to CAPCOG

1. Following an initial review, the OOG will forward the project applications to CAPCOG for final review and prioritization.
2. Planned completion date: Mid-March 202~~32~~.

L. Step 12: CAPCOG staff reconciles project list and priorities and sends final prioritized list to the Office of the Governor

1. Upon receipt of the list from the OOG of projects that have received preliminary approval, CAPCOG Homeland Security staff will verify project information, including recommended funding amount, assign priorities and return the final list to the OOG.
2. Planned completion date: On or before March 31, 202~~32~~.

M. Step 13: Office of the Governor approves prioritized project list

1. The OOG will review and approve projects for funding.
2. With the assistance of CAPCOG Homeland Security staff members, as determined by the OOG procedures, applicants with projects selected for funding will complete any required activities in eGrants.
3. Based upon the project application, the OOG will designate a performance period for each project.
4. Anticipated completion date: August 202~~3~~².

V. Performance Period and Closeout

A. Responsibilities

1. Sub-recipients of SHSP grant funds are responsible for attending grant workshops, meeting grant deadlines, ordering required equipment, reporting online or to data calls as requested by the State, complying with audits, maintaining records, and all other sub-recipient requirements as specified in the agreement with the State.
2. In addition to regional planning and grant administration duties as required by the State, CAPCOG staff members provide support to the sub-recipients to include informing them of state and federal guidance and deadlines, holding grant workshops, assisting with eligibility requirements, assisting with online reporting, providing liaison with the OOG, compiling information from or for data calls, supporting the HSTF and committees, and coordinating among projects and/or among jurisdictions involved in a project.

B. Reporting on Grant Progress

1. Sub-recipients will report grant progress to the OOG each quarter of the performance period: January, April, July, and October.

C. Unused Funds

1. At any point during the performance period, the sub-recipient may request to use uncommitted funds for another project. This may occur whether these funds remain from costs savings in an initial project or whether needs have changed and the initial project is unnecessary or of a lower priority.
2. Using grant funds for another purpose other than the project initially awarded will require approval of the HSTF and the CAPCOG Executive Committee.

3. Every six months during the performance period CAPCOG may request that uncommitted or unobligated funds be released to CAPCOG for reallocation to other projects in the region. This would not include such funds that are for planned future expenses, such as training or maintenance contracts where the funds cannot yet be obligated.
4. First priority for uncommitted funds will go to the next partial or unfunded project on the project funding list approved for the grant year.
5. For applicants requesting to use funds for a project not previously approved through the grant process:
 - a. If the amount of proposed reallocation request is less than \$1,000, CAPCOG's Director of Homeland Security is authorized to approve the proposed use of the funds.
 - b. If the amount of unused funds is greater than or equal to \$1,000 but less than \$5,000, the HSTF is authorized to approve the proposed use of the funds.
 - c. If the amount of unused funds is greater than or equal to \$5,000, the HSTF shall make a recommendation to the CAPCOG Executive Committee for approval of the proposed use of the funds.



Capital Area Council of Governments 2023~~2~~ SHSP Grant Worksheet

Jurisdiction: Click or tap here to enter text.	Agency / Department: Click or tap here to enter text.	Total Funding Requested: Click or tap here to enter text.
Project Name: Click or tap here to enter text.	Grant Number: Click or tap here to enter text.	Was Project Identified in <input type="checkbox"/> THIRA <input type="checkbox"/> SPR <input type="checkbox"/> HSSP-IP
DHS/FEMA Investment Area [only one allowed]: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cyber Security <input type="checkbox"/> Information & Intelligence Sharing <input type="checkbox"/> Soft Targets/Crowded Places <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Election Security <input type="checkbox"/> Combat Domestic Violent Extremism <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Preparedness & Resilience		
FEMA Core Capability/Capabilities [list all that apply] Click or tap here to enter text.		
Item/Equipment to be acquired: Click or tap here to enter text.		
Summary of Purpose [explanation for review committees]: Click or tap here to enter text.		
Summary of Need [explanation for review committees]: Click or tap here to enter text.		
Sustainment of a regional capability: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If yes, what regional capability? Click or tap here to enter text.	Is proposed project a continuation of a previous grant? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, what year _____
Describe how proposed project meets regional needs: Click or tap here to enter text.		
If proposed grant project amount had to be reduced, does your request scale? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If yes, what changes can be made? Click or tap here to enter text.	Has Project been submitted for other grant: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, what grant(s): Click or tap here to enter text.
Additional information you wish to convey to reviewers: Click or tap here to enter text.		
Technical Contact: Click or tap here to enter text.	Phone: Click or tap here to enter text.	

STOP. DO NOT FILL IN ANY INFORMATION BELOW THIS LINE

FOR CAPCOG NOTES ONLY:

Assigned Review sub-committee:
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Group 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Group 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Group 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Group 4
Notes:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

MEETING DATE: December 14, 2022

AGENDA ITEM: #4 Consider Approving Policy Statement, Scoring Criteria, and Priorities for Criminal Justice Grant Plan Year 2024

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ITEM:

Plan Year 2024 for the Criminal Justice grant program began in October. The events that have already occurred are the two stakeholder meetings and the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee (CJAC) meeting to update the policy statement, priorities, and scoring criteria and score sheet. The CJAC met on November 1 and approved priorities as well as approved changes to the subject documents. The documents must now be reviewed and approved by the Executive Committee. A summary of the changes in those documents is attached.

Priorities selected by the CJAC for the 2024 plan year are based on input from the two stakeholder meetings and discussion at the November 1 CJAC meeting. The priorities will be used by the CJAC when scoring grant applications. Twenty percent of an application's scoring is dependent on how well it addresses one or more of the priorities. For the 2024 plan year, the CJAC chose the same priorities as those for the 2023 plan year. They are:

- Behavioral Health/Mental Health Services/Substance Use
- Community-Based Programs or Services
- Crisis Services
- Law Enforcement
- Crime Prevention

The policy statement establishes the rules and procedure by which criminal justice grant applications will be reviewed and scored by the CJAC. These rules supplement the rules prescribed by the Office of the Governor (OOG). CAPCOG's policy statement is specific regarding the steps of the review process, how applications will be scored, and the establishment of an appeal process.

The scoring criteria document serves as a guide for both applicants and CJAC members. It lists each scoring category, the maximum points that can be earned in each category, and examples of what topics should be considered when preparing or scoring an application. The score sheet accompanies the scoring criteria document and is used by the CJAC members to score each application.

All grant applications are submitted using the form provided by the OOG. CAPCOG also provides a project summary sheet that the applicant must complete and submit directly to CAPCOG. The project summary sheet includes nine questions that are not part of the OOG application form and that address topics the CJAC has asked during the presentation phase of the review process in previous years. Many of the questions in the scoring criteria relate directly to the questions in the project summary sheet.

THIS ITEM REPRESENTS A:

- New issue, project, or purchase
- Routine, regularly scheduled item
- Follow-up to a previously discussed item
- Special item requested by board member
- Other

PRIMARY CONTACT/STAFF MEMBER: Charles Simon, Director of Regional Planning and Services

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

Total estimated cost: NA

Source of Funds: NA

Is item already included in fiscal year budget?

Yes

No

Does item represent a new expenditure?

Yes

No

Does item represent a pass-through purchase?

Yes

No

If so, for what city/county/etc.? n/a

PROCUREMENT: NA

ACTION REQUESTED:

Consider approval of the proposed revised Priorities, Policy Statement, Scoring Criteria and Project Summary Sheet to be used for the Criminal Justice Grant 2024 Plan Year.

BACK-UP DOCUMENTS ATTACHED:

1. Summary of Changes to Criminal Justice Grant Documents for Plan year 2024
2. Proposed Policy Statement – Markup copy
3. Proposed Scoring Criteria
4. Proposed Score Sheets
5. Proposed Project Summary Sheet
6. Memo regarding proposed priorities
7. Criminal Justice Plan Year 2024 Timeline

BACK-UP DOCUMENTS NOT ATTACHED:

None

Summary of Changes to Criminal Justice Grant Documents for Plan year 2024

Policy Statement

Priorities added

The priorities for the current plan year have been added. Priorities were not included in the 2023 plan year policy statement.

Mandatory attendance at workshop

- Applicants are required to attend one of the grant writing workshops that are scheduled for January 10 and 12. The policy states that any applicant that does not attend one of the workshops will receive a score of 0 automatically.

Project Summary Sheet Required

- The project summary sheet is required for each application. The policy states that any applicant that does not attend one of the workshops will receive a score of 0 automatically.

Non-forwarding of Applications with Zero Scores for CJAC Review

- The policy now states that all applications, except those having an automatic score of 0, will be forwarded to the CJAC for scoring.
- The CAPCOG staff will indicate to the CJAC the reasons why an application has a score of 0.

Specify Steps of Review Process

- The policy now includes the specific steps in which the CJAC will review and score applications. The steps are generally:
 - Forward applications to the CJAC
 - The CJAC scores the applications using the Regional Priorities and Application Review sections of the score sheet.
 - The CJAC may conduct a work session to discuss and score applications before the presentation stage.
 - Applicants will give a five-minute presentation to the CJAC regarding the application.
 - The CJAC scores the application using the Project Presentation section of the score sheet.
 - CAPCOG staff tabulates the scores for all applications, presents the results to the CJAC.
 - The CJAC reviews the tabulated scores and recommend funding amounts for each application.

- The final step is the Executive Committee reviewing and approving funding amounts for each application. The Executive Committee will be able to modify funding recommendations at this stage. Any modifications to the CJAC recommendations by the Executive Committee will be noted by CAPCOG staff in the information submitted to the OOG on each grant.

Funding Reduction Formula Expanded

- For all grant categories, local government applicants are limited to funding ratios of 100%, 80%, and 60% for the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years of a project, and 0% funding for any future years of the same project. This requirement does not apply to any non-profit organizations.
 - In PY2023, this formula applied to the Criminal Justice (JAG) and Juvenile Justice and Truancy Prevention programs for both local government applicants and non-profit applicants.
 - The proposed change is to apply the funding reduction formula to all grant categories and only to local government applicants.
-

Scoring Criteria

The scoring criteria (and accompanying score sheet) are now divided into scoring for the written application and for the project presentation. The written application represents 70 percent of the scoring, and the project presentation represents 30 percent.

Project Summary Sheet

Applicants must submit the required project summary sheet directly to CAPCOG no later than the application deadline set by the OOG. The project summary sheet asks the applicant for information that is not included in the application submitted to the OOG to help the CJAC review the application. Questions included in the project summary sheet are those that were asked of applicants in prior year project presentations.

BASTROP BLANCO BURNET CALDWELL FAYETTE HAYS LEE LLANO TRAVIS WILLIAMSON

Capital Area Council of Governments Criminal Justice Advisory Committee (CJAC) Plan Year (PY) 2023-2024 Policy Statement

The following policies and procedures are established for the purpose of defining the rules ~~and regulations~~ that will govern the Capital Area Council of Government's (CAPCOG's) Criminal Justice Advisory Committee (CJAC) application review and prioritization process for designated funding streams controlled by the Public Safety Office's Criminal Justice Division (PSO) of the Office of the Governor (~~OOG~~) that CAPCOG is responsible for reviewing. In addition, these policies and procedures govern the operation of CAPCOG's Criminal Justice Planning as outlined in the Interagency Cooperation Agreement between the PSO and CAPCOG as it relates to CAPCOG's CJAC.

COMPLIANCE WITH ADMINISTRATIVE RULES AND REGULATIONS

All policies, rules, and regulations outlined in this document comply with the Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Title 1, Part 1, Chapter 3, and the state and federal statutes, rules, and regulations adopted by reference in Texas Administrative Code.

1 TAC Part 1, Chapter 3; Applicability, Subchapters A, B, D, E, and F of this chapter applies to all applications for funding and grants submitted to the PSO ~~Office of the Governor~~OOG. Subchapter A covers the general provisions for grant funding. Subchapter B addresses general eligibility and budget rules for grant funding. Subchapter D provides rules detailing the conditions PSO may place on grants. Subchapter E sets out the rules related to administering grants. Subchapter F specifies rules regarding program monitoring and audits. Information regarding the TAC and the ~~Office of the Governor~~OOG' rules can be viewed on the website of the Texas Secretary of State, at:

[http://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac\\$ext.ViewTAC?tac_view=3&ti=1&pt=1](http://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.ViewTAC?tac_view=3&ti=1&pt=1)

All meetings of the CJAC will be held in compliance with the general provisions of the Government Code, Chapter 551. Texas Open Meetings Act, which can be viewed online at:

<http://www.sos.state.tx.us/texreg/index.shtml>

Criminal Justice-related STRATEGIC Planning

CAPCOG's Criminal Justice Strategic Plan includes priorities identified by stakeholders, communities, and agencies in the CAPCOG region, including, non-profit organizations, municipalities, counties, citizens or parents, substance abuse prevention, law enforcement, mental health, prosecution or courts, juvenile justice, education, and/or victim services. While forming this plan, participants identify community problems and resource needs; develop realistic goals, strategies, tasks, and performance measures; collect relevant supporting data; describe potential implementation plans; and, identify existing efforts and resources. Priorities are established based on this information.

GRANT APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY

Criminal justice-related grant solicitations include eligibility requirements set by the Office of the Governor, PSO. Please refer to the eGrants website at the following link to review applicant eligibility requirements:

<https://egrants.gov.texas.gov/>

OFFICIAL GRANT APPLICATION SUBMISSION

- A. Grant applications must be submitted directly to the PSO via the online eGrants web-based system by the PSO designated deadline.
- B. The eGrants system will not accept late application submissions.

CAPCOG Eligibility requirements for applicant participation in the [ejac-CJAC](#) application review and prioritization process

- A. To be considered for participation in CAPCOG's CJAC application review and prioritization process, applications must be certified and submitted through eGrants by the PSO designated deadline.
- B. To be eligible to participate in CAPCOG's CJAC application review and prioritization process, the applicant must provide services within Bastrop; Blanco; Burnet; Caldwell; Fayette; Hays; Lee; Llano; Travis; or, Williamson counties. The 10-county CAPCOG area known as Region 12.
 - 1. Agencies within the CAPCOG region may expand their service area outside of the CAPCOG 10-county region. However, the CJAC will only consider applications for funding that will provide services within Region 12.
 - 2. Funding for areas outside of Region 12 must coordinate with the appropriate COG.
 - 3. Agencies headquartered outside of the CAPCOG 10-county area may submit a grant application for CJAC review and prioritization if the requested funding will be used to provide services within Region 12.
- C. Agencies that receive funds directly from their state association or directly from PSO for basic service programs, must apply directly through their state association or PSO and may not apply for funds that are prioritized by CAPCOG. (Examples include but are not limited to: *Mothers Against Drunk Driving; Crime Stoppers; Children's Advocacy Centers; and, Court Appointed Special Advocates.*)
- D. PSO will make the final determination as to which funding source is most appropriate for each application.

Project and APPLICANT/GRANTEE Status definitions

- A. A current grantee is an agency/organization that is receiving funding through the Office of the Governor, PSO, and implementing a program during the current Plan Year of September 1st through August 31st.
- B. A new applicant is defined as any agency/organization that has never been funded through any funding source or has not been funded through the CAPCOG regional PSO allocation within the past five years for the project for which funding is currently being requested.
- C. A new project is defined as any project that has never been funded through any funding source, has not been funded through the CAPCOG regional PSO allocation within the past five years, or is a currently funded project that has significantly changed the scope of work or target group of the project.
- D. A continuation project is defined as any project that is currently ongoing where the applicant is requesting funds from the same fund source to continue the project for an additional funding cycle.

Plan Year 2024 Priorities

Priorities for PY 2024 include the following activities, based on feedback from stakeholders and endorsed by the CJAC:

- Behavioral Health/Mental Health Services /Substance Abuse
- Community-Based Programs or Services
- Crisis Services
- Law Enforcement
- Crime Prevention

These priorities update the priorities listed in CAPCOG’s PY 2022 Regional Strategic Criminal Justice Plan. CJAC members will assess grant applications on the extent to which they advance these priorities.

Fund Source Information

- A. The grant applications that will be reviewed by the CJAC include, but are not limited to the following funding sources from the Office of the Governor, PSO:
 1. Criminal Justice Program (JAG);
 2. General Victim Assistance Direct Services Program (VOCA);
 3. Juvenile Justice and Truancy Prevention Grant Programs – Juvenile Justice Projects (JJ);
 4. Juvenile Justice and Truancy Prevention Grant Programs – Truancy Prevention Projects (TP);
 5. Residential and Community-Based Services for Victims of the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Youth (CSEY);
 6. Violent Crimes Against Women Criminal Justice and Training Program (VAWA); and,
 7. Any additional or unique fund sources that PSO determines appropriate

7.

B. Requirements for CAPCOG recommended projects **except for CSEY:**

1. Agencies may submit a maximum of 3 applications per fund source.
 - a) Applications will be grouped into three tiers. All applications in Tier 1 will be recommended for funding before any applications in Tier 2 are recommended for funding. All applications

in Tier 2 will be recommended for funding before any applications in Tier 3 are recommended for funding.

- b) All applicants will be allowed one Tier 1 application, one Tier 2 application, and one Tier 3 application.
 - c) Applicants will self-select their Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 applications at submittal and prior to applications being reviewed by the CJAC.
3. Applications must receive a minimum score of 70 to be recommended as a Quality Project for funding consideration by PSO.
 4. Any application from any organization that fails to attend one of CAPCOG's mandatory grant workshops will be assigned an automatic score of 0.
 5. Any application that does not have a corresponding, complete project summary sheet submitted to CAPCOG by the applicable deadline will be assigned an automatic score of 0.
 6. CAPCOG will forward all applications submitted to PSO OOG by OOG's submission deadline to the CJAC for initial scoring except projects that are assigned automatic scores of 0 under #4 or #5 above. CAPCOG staff will also provide a list of any applications that have been assigned a score of 0 and the reason why that score was assigned to the application.
 7. Step 1 of the CJAC review will include CJAC members ~~will~~ reviewing all forwarded applications and project summary sheets, and scoring applications within a timeframe established by CAPCOG staff and assigning preliminary scores in the Regional Priorities and Application Review sections of the Score Sheet, with the maximum score possible of 70 points (except for CSEY). Projects that do not score above 40 points at this step of the process are not eligible to present to the CJAC for further consideration.
 8. As part of Step 1, the CJAC may choose to conduct a private work session to collaborate on the forwarded applications. Attendance at the meeting by CJAC members is not required and no action will be taken.
 9. Step 2 of the CJAC review will involve the applicant providing a 5-minute presentation to the CJAC about their project and answering questions from CJAC members. Following each presentation, CJAC members will assign scores of 0-30 (except CSEY) to the application based on the presentation and will finalize the scores for the Regional Priorities and Application Review sections of the Score Sheet, meaning ~~the total possible points between step 1 and step 2 an application can receive is 100 points. Only CJAC members who scored an application in Step 1 are eligible to score the same application in Step 2.~~
 10. Once Step 1 and Step 2 of the review process ~~scoring by individual members is complete,~~ CAPCOG staff will tabulate scores from all CJAC members, eliminating the highest and lowest scored, and calculating the average from the remaining scores available. CAPCOG staff will then prepare tables showing the scores, priority level of the project, and funding requested for each application within each funding category. Scores are not subject to change at subsequent steps.
 11. For CSEY, CAPCOG uses the scoring mechanism provided by the Governor's office instead of the scoring mechanism CAPCOG has developed for other grant categories. Otherwise, CAPCOG will follow the same process of distributing applications for review, asking CJAC members to provide a preliminary score prior to presentations, and then finalizing scores following presentations.

12. Step 3 of the CJAC review for all categories other than CSEY will involve a review of the final scores and ranking of the applications and recommendations on funding amounts for each application that scored a minimum of 70 points. CJAC will consider a variety of factors in making this recommendation, including (but not limited to) cost-effectiveness, overall funding availability, regional priorities, identified gaps in services or resources, geographic distributions, the inherent value of the project's impact, whether the project has the potential to be a model program, whether delaying the project would have a significant negative impact on the area proposed to be served, and any additional factors relevant to a specific request for applications. The CJAC will also materially rely on the applicant's responses on the project summary sheet on what the impact of a 10% reduction in funding would be on the project in evaluating funding recommendations. Since the CSEY category does not include a funding recommendation, this part of the process does not apply to CSEY.
13. For all grant categories, local government applicants are limited to funding ratios of 100%, 80%, and 60% for the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years of a project, and 0% funding for any future years of the same project. This requirement does not apply to any non-profit organizations.
- 3-14. The final step of CAPCOG's process is Executive Committee review and approval of final funding recommendations. The Executive Committee reserves the right to modify funding recommendations made by the CJAC based on the factors outlined in the Texas Administrative Code and this Policy Statement. Any modifications to the CJAC recommendations by the Executive Committee will be noted by CAPCOG staff in the information submitted to PSO on each grant.
- ~~4. For each application, an applicant is required to provide CAPCOG the minimum funding amount required to conduct the proposed project before being reviewed by the CJAC.~~

Fund Specific requirements

A. Criminal Justice Program (JAG)

- ~~1. This is a competitive grant that requires the submission of a new application to the Office of the Governor, PSO through the eGrants web-based system each year funding is desired.~~
- ~~2. A three year funding maximum, provided that funding is available, and the third year funding request amount does not fall below \$10,000.~~
- ~~3. Decreasing Fund Ratio: The first year's award is the 100% mark, with a second year's request eligible for 80% of the first year's award amount, and a third year's request eligible for 60% of the first year's award amount.~~
- ~~4. Required Match: None~~
- ~~5. Equipment Only Funding Requests: Applicants requesting funding only for equipment and no programmatic services, will be considered a "one-time" only applicant and will not be eligible for the Decreasing Fund Ratio for subsequent years.~~
- ~~6. CAPCOG priorities for Criminal Justice Program funded projects are as follows:

 - ~~i. Multi-jurisdictional/multi-county projects with a focus on regional impact; and,~~
 - ~~ii. Existing projects that can be completed with a one-time grant.~~~~

B. General Victim Assistance Direct Services Program (VOCA)

1. ~~This is a competitive grant that requires the submission of a new application to the Office of the Governor, PSO through the eGrants web based system annually for the first two years funding is desired and biennially after that.~~
2. ~~Required Match: Grantees, other than Native American Tribes, may be required to provide matching funds of at least twenty percent (20%) of total project expenditures. This requirement may be met through cash and/or in-kind contributions.~~
3. ~~An exception will be made for agencies providing domestic violence, sexual assault, and children's advocacy services. These agencies will be allowed to submit 3 applications to provide services to adults and 3 applications to provide services to children for a maximum of 6 applications. These agencies may designate one application to provide services to adults and one application to provide services for children to each funding tier identified in Fund Source Information (C).~~
4. ~~Total agency/applicant requests cannot equal more than 50% of the applicant/agency's current total operating budget.~~
5. ~~First-time VOCA applicants (an agency/applicant that has never been awarded VOCA funding before, OR, have not received VOCA funding within the last five years) are limited to submitting one application.~~
6. ~~Agencies that receive VOCA grant money from their statewide affiliate agencies are not eligible to apply for VOCA funding that is allocated to Region 12 through the CAPCOG CJAC Application Review Process. These agencies include but are not limited to: Texas Children's Advocacy Centers; Mother Against Drunk Driving; Legal Aid Society; Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA); and, Texas Department of Public Safety.~~

~~C. **Juvenile Justice and Truancy Prevention Grant Programs — Juvenile Justice Projects (JJ)**~~

1. ~~This is a competitive grant that requires the submission of a new application to the Office of the Governor, PSO through the eGrants web based system each year funding is desired.~~
2. ~~A three-year funding maximum, provided that funding is available, and the third-year funding request amount does not fall below \$10,000.~~
3. ~~Decreasing Fund Ratio: The first year's award is the 100% mark, with a second year's request eligible for 80% of the first year's award amount, and a third year's request eligible for 60% of the first year's award amount.~~
4. ~~Required Match: None~~

~~D. **Juvenile Justice and Truancy Prevention Grant Programs — Truancy Prevention Projects (TP)**~~

1. ~~This is a competitive grant that requires the submission of a new application to the Office of the Governor, PSO through the eGrants web based system each year funding is desired.~~
2. ~~Required Match: None~~

~~E. **Residential and Community-Based Services for Victims of the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Youth (CESY)**~~

1. ~~This is a competitive grant that requires the submission of a new application to the Office of the Governor, PSO through the eGrants web based system each year funding is desired.~~
2. ~~Required Match: Grantees, other than Native American Tribes, may be required to provide matching funds of at least twenty percent (20%) of total project expenditures. This requirement may be met through cash and/or in-kind contributions.~~

- ~~3. CJAC scoring criteria for applications to this program will be provided by PSO.~~
- ~~4. CAPCOG will not prioritize applications to this fund source and instead will just score them and provide comments to PSO.~~

~~F. **Violence Against Women Criminal Justice and Training Program (VAWA)**~~

- ~~1. This is a competitive grant that requires the submission of a new application to the Office of the Governor, PSO through the eGrants web-based system each year funding is desired.~~
- ~~2. There is no limit to the number of years of funding, provided funds are available and an application receives qualifying scores from the CJAC~~
- ~~3. Required Match: Grantees, other than Native American tribes and non-profit, non-governmental victim service providers, must provide matching funds of at least thirty percent (30%) of total project expenditures. This requirement may be met through cash and/or in-kind contributions.~~

~~G. **Any additional or unique fund sources that PSO determines appropriate**~~

- ~~1. Information for fund sources not listed above will be posted on the CAPCOG website:
www.capcog.org/what-we-do/funding-grants/criminal-justice/~~

~~H. **Requirements for the fund sources listed above are subject to change at any time per instruction from the Office of the Governor, PSO. Grant's applicants will be notified of any fund source changes via email notification and postings on the CAPCOG website:**~~

~~www.capcog.org/what-we-do/funding-grants/criminal-justice/~~

CAPCOG MANDATORY application workshops, Technical Assistance, Review, and Addendum

~~A.~~ CAPCOG will schedule and hold grant application workshops to review grant application requests for applications developed by the Office of the Governor, PSO. To be considered for participation in CAPCOG's CJAC application review and prioritization process, a representative of the applying organization is required to attend a grant application workshop.

~~B.~~ Failure of an applicant agency/organization to attend the mandatory application workshop will deem the application ineligible for CJAC review and prioritization, which will result in a score of "0" and no recommendation for funding consideration.

~~A.C.~~ CAPCOG will maintain a website and post all reference materials here: www.capcog.org/what-we-do/funding-grants/criminal-justice/

~~B.D.~~ CAPCOG staff will provide current grantees, potential applicants, and others with CAPCOG's criminal justice priorities, a copy of the CJAC application review and prioritization scoring instrument, the criteria used in the scoring of applications, and other relevant materials, including relevant policies, procedures, and bylaws, during the grant application workshop or by request.

~~C.E.~~ In addition to the CAPCOG-facilitated grant application workshops, applicants may request grant-related technical assistance before the applicant's submission of the certified application to PSO.

~~D.F.~~ CAPCOG staff will answer questions for both current grantees and new applicants via email consultation as much as is practical, as well as in-person upon request.

~~E.G.~~ The Office of the Governor, PSO staff will provide technical assistance on the operation of the eGrants web-based application.

~~F. CAPCOG requires applications to be submitted for review by CAPCOG staff at least one week before the application deadline set by PSO. Applicants must receive confirmation from CAPCOG of a completed review before submitting and certifying an application. During this review CAPCOG will check:~~

~~a. Identifying Information;~~

~~b. Target Areas Information; and,~~

~~c. Other areas of the application identified by PSO or CAPCOG.~~

~~G.H. _____~~ To be considered for participation in CAPCOG's CJAC application review and prioritization process, applicants are required to submit a Project Summary Sheet created to help the CJAC during their review and scoring of applications ~~no more than two weeks after the application period closes due to CAPCOG by the close date of the RFA.~~ The Project Summary Sheet will ask for:

~~a. Data and information to help the CJAC review applications that is not included in the application submitted and certified in eGrants; and,~~

~~H.I.~~ Applicants must be prepared to discuss reductions to areas of their budget during the CJAC's project review process by either a percent reduction of the total amount or identifying specific items in the budget that can be reduced or deleted.

~~a~~ Attendance requirements for CJAC review and prioritization meetings

A. Attendance at CJAC application review and prioritization meetings is always mandatory for both new and current grant applicants.

1. A representative from each applicant organization shall attend the prioritization meeting.

2. A representative of the applicant agency/organization will be allowed a five (5) minute presentation of the application and shall have the opportunity to answer any questions posed by the CJAC members.

B. Failure of an applicant agency/organization to attend the CJAC application review and prioritization meeting will deem the application ineligible for CJAC review and prioritization, which will result in a score of "0" and no recommendation for funding consideration.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CJAC)

A. The CJAC is a volunteer committee comprised of a multi-disciplinary representation of members from the region per the requirements of the Office of the Governor, PSO. These discipline areas include non-profit organizations, municipalities, counties, citizens or parents, substance abuse prevention, education, juvenile justice, law enforcement, mental health, prosecution or courts, and victim services. CJAC members are appointed by CAPCOG's Executive Committee.

B. The primary responsibility of the CJAC is to review criminal justice-related grant applications from throughout the region, score and prioritize applications, and provide funding recommendations, based on a standardized application review and prioritization process and a standardized score sheet, to CAPCOG's Executive Committee for approval to submit the prioritization lists to the Office of the Governor, PSO.

C. To avoid a conflict of interest, members of the CAPCOG's governing body, CJAC members, and CAPCOG staff must abstain from voting, cannot present to the CJAC, and must leave the room* for the review and

scoring of any application during the prioritization process if the member, planner, or an individual related to the member or planner within the third degree of consanguinity or within the second degree by affinity:

1. is employed by the applicant agency and works for the unit or division that would administer the grant, if awarded; or,
 2. serves on any board that oversees the unit or division that would administer the grant if awarded; or,
 3. owns or controls any interest in a business entity or other non-governmental organization that benefits, directly or indirectly, from activities with the applicant agency; or,
 4. receives any funds, or a substantial amount of tangible goods or services, from the applicant agency as a result of the grant, if awarded.
- D. At the beginning of each prioritization meeting, the CJAC Chair shall request members to identify any possible conflict of interest when scoring applications.
1. If a member must abstain from reviewing, voting, commenting, presenting, or taking any action on any grant application, the member must also abstain from voting, on any competing applications within that funding source during the prioritization process.
 2. Members will clearly state their abstention from voting on certain applications and will not speak on behalf of or in support of an applicant.
 3. Members shall write, "ABSTAIN" on the score sheet of each application they do not score due to a conflict of interest.

* In a virtual setting, **leave the room** means a member must exit the meeting platform. CAPCOG staff will communicate with the member about when they can return to the meeting.

CJAC Application review and prioritization process

A. CJAC Application Review

1. The CJAC will review and score eligible applications at the CJAC application review and prioritization meetings for each of the PSO designated fund sources.
2. An approved application score sheet will be used to evaluate each application submitted for review. This score sheet is the product of a cumulative effort of the Office of the Governor, PSO, and CAPCOG.
 - a. A minimum score benchmark may be imposed during the application scoring process.
 - b. Applications that do not meet an imposed minimum score will not be recommended for funding consideration.
3. The CJAC **must** consider the following factors when scoring and prioritizing applications:
 - a. Any state strategies identified by PSO;
 - b. Priorities identified within the region resulting from the strategic planning process;
 - c. Eligibility, reasonableness, and cost-effectiveness of the proposed project; and,
 - d. Current CAPCOG policies and bylaws.
4. The CJAC **may** consider estimated funding levels when scoring and prioritizing applications.
5. CAPCOG staff will tabulate all applicant scores and create a prioritization list ranking each application from highest to lowest score.

- a. The highest and lowest score of each application will be eliminated, and an average of the remaining scores will serve as the score of record.
 - b. The tabulation of scores for an application is based on the number of members eligible to vote.
 - c. In the event of a tie score when the projects are totaled, staff will delete the next highest and lowest scores until the tie is broken.
 - d. Projects will be placed on the priority list in the order of the tiebreaker score.
6. The proposed prioritization list will be provided to the CJAC for review, comment, and possible changes to the list order.
 7. Post-CJAC review, the proposed prioritization list will be sent out to the applicants.
 8. CAPCOG staff will then submit the proposed prioritization list to the CAPCOG Executive Committee.
- B. Application Recommendations Submitted to the Office of the Governor, PSO for Funding Consideration
1. CAPCOG's governing board, the Executive Committee, must review and approve the CJAC prioritization list of applications recommended for funding consideration before it is submitted to the Office of the Governor, PSO.
 2. There is no commitment or obligation on the part of CAPCOG, the CJAC, or CAPCOG's Executive Committee to recommend any application for funding consideration.
 3. All funding decisions are made at the sole discretion of the Office of the Governor, PSO.

~~capcog~~-CAPCOG Appeals Process for Grant Applicants

- A. The only cause for an appeal that CAPCOG will consider is an alleged scoring error made during the prioritization process that prevents the applicant from achieving a score that allows their application to be submitted to the Office of the Governor, PSO for funding consideration.
 1. Applicants wishing to appeal an alleged scoring error must complete the following:
 - a. Applicants must submit written notification, signed by the applicant's authorized official, of their intent to appeal, to CAPCOG's Executive Director and the sitting CJAC Chair at least 24-hours before the CAPCOG Executive Committee's scheduled meeting where the CJAC priority list of applications recommended for funding consideration will be approved.
 - b. The Appellant must demonstrate that the error caused the application (or a portion of the application) to receive a low score that prevented the application from being recommended to PSO for funding consideration.
 2. Letters and phone calls of support will NOT be considered as part of the official appeal process.
 3. Upon receipt of all requested documentation supporting the appeal, the Executive Director may place the appeal on the agenda for the next available meeting of the Executive Committee.
 4. The Chair, Vice Chair, or designated representative from the CJAC will be present at the Executive Committee meeting that includes the appeal agenda item.
 5. The decision of the Executive Committee will be the final action concerning all appeals.
 6. The CJAC members will receive a copy of the written appeal, notification of the Executive Committee meeting of which the appeal has been placed on the agenda and will be notified of the action taken by the Executive Committee regarding the appeal.

B. The Office of the Governor, PSO does not have an appeals process for grant applicants. All PSO funding decisions are made at the sole discretion of the Office of the Governor and are final.

[Revised by Vote DecNovember 149, 2022](#)

~~Revised by Vote December 8, 2021~~

~~Revised by Vote October 14, 2020~~

~~Revised by Vote October 9, 2019~~

~~Revised By Vote October 10, 2018~~

~~Revised By Vote December 13, 2017~~

~~Revised By Resolution November 9, 2016~~

~~Revised By Resolution December 9, 2015~~

~~Revised By Resolution February 11, 2015~~

~~Revised By Resolution October 8, 2014~~

~~Revised By Resolution December 11, 2013~~

~~Revised By Resolution December 9, 2012~~

~~Revised By Resolution November 9, 2011~~

~~Revised By Resolution November 10, 2010~~

~~Revised By Resolution December 9, 2009~~

~~Revised By Resolution June 10, 2009~~

~~Revised By Resolution January 14, 2009~~

~~Revised By Resolution November 12, 2008~~

~~Revised By Resolution December 12, 2007~~

~~Revised By Resolution March 14, 2007~~

~~Revised By Resolution November 9, 2005~~

~~Revised By Resolution on December 8, 2004~~

~~Revised by Resolution on November 10, 2004~~

~~Revised by Resolution on November 12, 2003~~

~~Revised by Resolution on September 26, 2002~~

~~Revised by Resolution on March 23, 2000~~

~~Revised by Resolution on September 19, 2000~~

~~Adopted by Resolution on October 19, 1999~~



Capital Area Council of Governments

6800 Burleson Road, Building 310, Suite 165

Austin, Texas 78744-2306

Ph: 512-916-6000 Fax: 512-916-6001

www.capcog.org

BASTROP BLANCO BURNET CALDWELL FAYETTE HAYS LEE LLANO TRAVIS WILLIAMSON

Plan Year 2024 Criminal Justice Grant Application Scoring Criteria and Guidance

Each question in the Regional Priorities, Application Review, and Project Presentation sections of the Score Sheet indicate a maximum score available for each. CAJC members are advised to indicate a score for each question in the range from 0 to the maximum points allowed based on the extent to which the application addresses the question and by using the guidance provided in this document.

Regional Priorities (20 points maximum)

To what extent does the project address 1 or more of the top 5 criminal justice priorities and/or gaps in services or resources identified during the planning process? (Behavioral Health/Mental Health Services/Substance Use, Community Based Services, Crisis Services, Crime Prevention, or Law Enforcement) (20 points maximum)

- CJAC members should reference the Project Activities Information portion of the application summary when awarding these points.
- The top 5 priorities are:
 - Mental Health Services
 - Community Based Services
 - Crisis Services
 - Crime Prevention
 - Law Enforcement
- Points should be awarded based on the portion of a project that falls under one or more of these priorities

Application Review (50 points maximum)

To what degree is the budget cost effective, adequate, and reasonable for meeting the goals of the project? (10 points maximum)

CJAC Members should reference the Budget Information in the application summary when awarding these points. Also, please consider the questions below.

- Does the budget include all items necessary to complete the project?
- How cost effective are the items identified in the project budget?
- Has the applicant provided a clear explanation for how all items in the project budget will be used in the execution of the project?

- Has the applicant budgeted correctly for the proposed project?

How well has the applicant identified an evidence-based approach to addressing the problem and outlined activities that will be conducted during the project? (10 points maximum)

CJAC Members should reference the Approach and Activities, and Evidence-Based Practices narratives in the application summary when awarding these points. Also, please consider the questions below.

- Is it easy to understand what the project does by reading the Approach and Activities narrative in the application summary?
- Will the approach outlined here have a meaningful impact on the problem?
- Is there a justifiable and clear reason given for choosing the approach?
- Is a reasonable timeline for all relevant aspects of the project identified by the applicant?
- Are the methods, approaches, and activities identified evidence-based?
- Is the evidence cited? Is the citation used reputable and knowledgeable?
- Does the applicant demonstrate an understanding of the target population's needs?

How well does the applicant use supporting data and provide a sound plan for collecting data to measure outcomes in order to evaluate project performance and to be a model program? (10 points maximum)

CJAC Members should reference the Supporting Data and Problem Statement narratives as well as the Performance Management, and Data Management narratives in the application summary when awarding these points. Also, please consider the questions below.

- Has the applicant cited and used verifiable and trustworthy data sources?
- Is the data used "right sized" for the project? Does it use local or regional data to support the existence of the problem?
- Does the data used clearly support the problem statement?
- In the target group(s) identified in the number, geographic area, and demographic makeup? Is there data supporting these claims?
- Are there clearly defined ways to measure the project's success?
- Have goals and measurable objectives been identified? Are specific outcome and output measures defined?
- How well are the goals and objectives tied to the problem?
- Has the baseline and the expected change resulting from the project been identified?
- Does the applicant have sound methods for reviewing project performance?
- Are the methods used to analyze performance data explained clearly?
- Does the applicant use the information from project performance reviews to make decisions about the project?
- How well does the applicant outline how performance data is collected, tracked, and maintained? Does the applicant identify any software or tools to be used?

How well does the project support a regionally-integrated criminal justice system that provides inherent value? (10 points maximum)

CJAC Members should reference the Project Abstract, Problem Statement, and Capacity & Capabilities narratives in the application summary when awarding these points. Also, please consider the questions below:

- Is the root problem and need clearly defined?
- Does the identified problem fall within the jurisdiction and responsibilities of the applicant?
- Is the problem supported by evidence, either statistical or anecdotal?
- Has the applicant identified a problem that is not just the lack of the proposed project?

- Does the Problem Statement make a compelling case for the existence of and need to solve the problem?
- Does the problem statement identify the people that will be served?
- Is the target group identified in number, geographic area, and demographic makeup? Is there data supporting these claims?
- Have special characteristics of the targeted population been identified?
- Does the applicant demonstrate an understanding of the target population's needs?

How capable is the applicant in executing the project identified in the application and completing any required reporting? (10 points maximum)

CJAC Members should reference the Capabilities & Capacity, Approach & Activities, and Performance Management narratives in the application summary when awarding these points. Also, please consider the questions below.

- Has the applicant provided sufficient information about their organizational qualifications and performance history to confidently ensure the project is feasible?
- Has the applicant provided enough information to indicate it has the capacity to handle all the work required for successful completion of the project, including all reporting that is required by CJD?
- Does the applicant identify personnel who are sufficiently qualified and experienced to add value and increase the likelihood of success for the project?
- Are the proposed activities tied to personnel qualification in a way that shows a reasoned connection between the two?

**Project Presentation
(30 points maximum)**

To what extent did the applicant's presentation clearly articulate the project in the written application? (10 points maximum)

To what extent does the project create a significant impact on the community? (10 points maximum)

To what extent is the project sustainable with a reduction in funding this year or in the event that funding is not available in subsequent year? (10 points maximum)

Capital Area Council of Governments PY 2024 CJAC Application Score Sheet

For a more detailed explanation of what to consider for each question, please refer to the Scoring Criteria and Guidance Document.

Funding Opportunity:		Date:	
Applicant Agency:			
Project Title:			
Application Number:		Amount Requested:	\$
NOTE: If you have a conflict of interest you must abstain from scoring or commenting on this and any other application for this funding opportunity.			
Regional Priorities (20 points)		Maximum Points Allowed	Score
To what extent does the project address 1 or more of the top 5 criminal justice priorities and/or gaps in services or resources identified during the planning process? (Behavioral Health/Mental Health Services/Substance Abuse, Community Based Services, Crisis Services, Crime Prevention, or Law Enforcement)		20	
Application Review (50 points)			
To what degree is the budget cost effective, adequate, and reasonable for meeting the goals of the project?		10	
How well has the applicant identified an evidence based approach to addressing the problem and outlined activities that will be conducted during the project?		10	
How well does the applicant use supporting data and provide a sound plan for collecting data to measure outcomes in order to evaluate project performance and to be a model program?		10	
How well does the project support a regionally-integrated criminal justice system that provides inherent value?		10	
How capable is the applicant in executing the project identified in the application and completing any required reporting?		10	
Project Presentation (30 points)			
To what extent did the applicant's presentation clearly articulate the project in the written application?		10	
To what extent does the project create a significant impact on the community?		10	
To what extent is the project sustainable with a reduction in funding this year or in the event that funding is not available in subsequent year?		10	
		Total Score (not to exceed 100):	

Printed Name of CJAC Member

Signature of CJAC Member



CAPCOG Application Review – Project Summary Sheet

**“This should be no more than 2 pages in length
(back and front)”**

Organization Name:

eGrants Application Identification Number:

Fund Source Requested: [VOCA/VAWA/JAG/TP/JJ/CSE]

Project Title:

Requested Amount:

Percent of Agency Budget:

1. Does the project have other components or is part of another project that the CJAC would want to know about?
2. List the amount, total budget percentages and provider agencies providing other sources of funding for the project proposed.
3. If continuation, indicate results-based impact measures provided in application last year.
4. If multi-jurisdictional, list other cities and counties served.
5. Are services provided through temporary or permanent facilities?
6. What are your long-term plans for funding?
7. What would the impact of a reduction in funding be on this project?
8. What is the demographic breakdown of your clientele served or proposed to be served?
 - a. [White/Black/Latino/Asian/etc.]
9. What is the demographic breakdown of your staff?
 - a. [EEOC]



Capital Area Council of Governments

6800 Burleson Road, Building 310, Suite 165

Austin, Texas 78744-2306

Ph: 512-916-6000 Fax: 512-916-6001

www.capcog.org

BASTROP BLANCO BURNET CALDWELL FAYETTE HAYS LEE LLANO TRAVIS WILLIAMSON

CAPCOG Plan Year 2024 Criminal Justice Priorities

December 14, 2022

The CJAC reviewed the input from stakeholders regarding which activities should be selected as priorities for Plan Year 2024, and after much consideration and discussion about the types of programs and activities that are include in each, the CJAC chose the activities listed below as the priority activities. The priorities are presented for the Executive Committee's consideration and are to be placed into the Criminal Justice Strategic Plan to guide scoring and ranking applications for funding.

- **Behavioral Health/Mental Health Services/Substance Use**
- **Community-Based Programs or Services**
- **Crisis Services**
- **Law Enforcement**
- **Crime Prevention**

The priority activities were chosen based upon input from stakeholders at meetings held in-person on October 14 and virtually on October 17. Stakeholders represent organizations – government and non-profit – that have submitted applications for funding in previous plan years or anticipate submitting an application this year.

The priority activities selected this year are the same priority activities that were selected for Plan Year 2023. The selected activities represent seven of the eight highest rated by the stakeholders at the meetings held in October.



6800 Burleson Road, Building 310, Suite 165
 Austin, Texas 78744-2306
 Ph: 512-916-6000 Fax: 512-916-6001
www.capcog.org

BASTROP BLANCO BURNET CALDWELL FAYETTE HAYS LEE LLANO TRAVIS WILLIAMSON

Criminal Justice Division Grant Timeline, Plan Year 2024

Date(s)	Activity
Thursday, October 13, 2022 10–11:30 a.m.	In-person stakeholder meeting <i>Online registration</i>
Friday, October 14, 2022 10 a.m.–noon	Virtual stakeholder meeting <i>Online registration</i>
Monday - Friday, October 17-21, 2022	Additional stakeholder meeting(s) <u>if necessary</u>
Tuesday, November 1, 2022 10 –11:30 a.m.	CAPCOG Criminal Justice Advisory Committee to review and update CJ policy statement, priorities, and score sheet
Monday–Friday, December 12-16, 2022	OOG expected to publish RFAs
Wednesday, December 14, 2022	CAPCOG Executive Committee to consider priorities and Criminal Justice Policy Statement
Friday, December 16, 2022	Criminal Justice Policy Statement posted online and distributed via email
Tuesday, January 10, 2023 OR Thursday, January 12, 2023	(MUST ATTEND ONE) In-person mandatory grant writing workshop <i>Online registration</i>
	(MUST ATTEND ONE) Virtual mandatory grant writing workshop <i>Online registration</i>
Monday-Friday February 6-10, 2023	Anticipated due date for applications to be submitted to OOG; due date for submitting application summaries to CAPCOG
Monday-Friday February 13-17, 2023	<i>Eligible</i> applications sent to Criminal Justice Advisory Committee members to begin reviewing
Friday, March 3, 2023	Due date for CJAC members to turn in score sheets due by 5 p.m.
Friday, March 10, 2023	Finalized grant application presentation schedule and CJAC meeting agenda and distribute to applicants; only applications with a score of at least 40 out of 70 will be invited to present
Monday-Friday March 20-24, 2023	CJAC presentation meetings and funding recommendation meeting
Wednesday, April 12, 2023	CAPCOG Executive Committee considers scoring, ranking, and funding recommendations
Wednesday, April 26, 2023	Deadline for notifying applicants of prioritization results (14 calendar days after COG’s decision)

Bolded items are meetings in which applicants should or must attend or deadlines for applicants.

This timeline will be amended as times and dates get finalized or are updated by the Office of the Governor (OOG). Please check <https://www.capcog.org/what-we-do/funding-grants/criminal-justice/> for updates.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

MEETING DATE: December 14, 2022

AGENDA ITEM: #5 Consider Approving Conformance Review Finding for City of Georgetown's New Type V MSW Transfer Station

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ITEM:

The City of Georgetown Type V Municipal Solid Waste Transfer Station – a registration tier municipal solid waste (MSW) transfer station, located in Williamson County, at 250 W L Walden Dr. in Georgetown, has submitted an application to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) for a newly constructed Type V MSW Transfer Station. CAPCOG's Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC), at its September 30, 2022, meeting formed a subcommittee to conduct a conformance review of the application against the goals and objectives identified in CAPCOG's Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). The Subcommittee members are:

- Richard McHale, City of Austin
- Jack Ranney, Individual with HHW Expertise

The subcommittee met virtually on November 8, 2022, and found no issues of concern with the application.

At its November 30, 2022, meeting, the SWAC recommended that the Executive Committee find that the application meets the goals and objectives of the RSWMP with a recommendation that the application be granted by the TCEQ.

Under state law, all solid waste management activities are required to "conform" to a RSWMP approved by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ). Each council of government (COG) is charged with conducting reviews of MSW permit applications to assess conformance and make recommendations to TCEQ.

Under CAPCOG's approved procedures for conformance reviews, CAPCOG's Executive Committee is charged with making one of five potential conformance review findings:

1. The permit or registration **conforms** to the RSWMP and CAPCOG recommends **approval** of the permit or registration; or
2. The permit or registration **conforms** to the RSWMP and CAPCOG recommends **approval with specific conditions**; or
3. The permit or registration **does not conform** to the RSWMP and CAPCOG recommends **denial** of the permit or registration; or
4. The permit or registration **does not conform** to the RSWMP and CAPCOG recommends **withholding approval** until specific deficiencies are corrected; or
5. CAPCOG **lacks specific information** to make a qualified conformance determination.

THIS ITEM REPRESENTS A:

- New issue, project, or purchase
- Routine, regularly scheduled item
- Follow-up to a previously discussed item
- Special item requested by board member
- Other

PRIMARY CONTACT/STAFF MEMBER: Charles Simon, Director of Regional Planning and Services

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

Total estimated cost: NA

Source of Funds: NA

Is item already included in fiscal year budget?

Yes

No

Does item represent a new expenditure?

Yes

No

Does item represent a pass-through purchase?

Yes

No

If so, for what city/county/etc.? n/a

PROCUREMENT: NA

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approve SWAC's recommendation on conformance finding that the City of Georgetown's New Type V MSW Transfer Station conforms to the goals and objectives of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan with a recommendation for approval of the application by the TCEQ.

BACK-UP DOCUMENTS ATTACHED:

None

BACK-UP DOCUMENTS NOT ATTACHED:

None

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

MEETING DATE: December 14, 2022

AGENDA ITEM: #6 Consider Approving Appointments to Advisory Committees

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ITEM:

This is the monthly item for filling positions on our Advisory Committees; please let us know if our staff can assist in identifying interested persons to serve. It is presumed that both city and county representatives will collaborate when making appointments.

THIS ITEM REPRESENTS A:

- New issue, project, or purchase
- Routine, regularly scheduled item
- Follow-up to a previously discussed item
- Special item requested by board member
- Other

PRIMARY CONTACT/STAFF MEMBER: **Deborah Brea, Executive Assistant**

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

Total estimated cost: N/A

Source of Funds: N/A

Is item already included in fiscal year budget? Yes No

Does item represent a new expenditure? Yes No

Does item represent a pass-through purchase? Yes No

If so, for what city/county/etc.? _____

PROCUREMENT: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approve any advisory committee recommendations.

BACK-UP DOCUMENTS ATTACHED:

1. Summary memo with recommended appointments and vacancies

BACK-UP DOCUMENTS NOT ATTACHED (to be sent prior to meeting or will be a handout at the meeting):

1. Executive Committee attendance roster
2. Advisory Committee attendance rosters



6800 Burleson Road, Building 310, Suite 165
Austin, Texas 78744-2306
6800 Burleson Road, Building 310, Suite 165
Austin, Texas 78744-2306
Ph: 512-916-6000 Fax: 512-916-6001
www.capcog.org

BASTROP BLANCO BURNET CALDWELL FAYETTE HAYS LEE LLANO TRAVIS WILLIAMSON

MEMORANDUM
November 28, 2022

TO: Executive Committee Members

FROM: Deborah Brea, Executive Assistant

RE: Advisory Committee Recommendations

This memo identifies current recommendations to CAPCOG Advisory Committees and serves as a reminder of vacancies that still need to be filled. Please see the Attendance Rosters for the Requirements & Responsibilities. For questions, please contact the Advisory Committee staff liaison.

Blanco County

- The Aging Advisory Council (AAC) has a representative vacancy.

Burnet County

- The Aging Advisory Council (AAC) has a representative vacancy.
- The Criminal Justice Advisory Committee (CJAC) has a representative vacancy.

City of Austin

- The Aging Advisory Council (AAC) has two representative vacancies.
- The Criminal Justice Advisory Committee (CJAC) has a representative vacancy.
- The Geographic Information Systems Planning Council (GISPC) has two representative vacancies

Law Enforcement Education Committee (LEEC)

- One citizen representative vacancy

Williamson County

- The Aging Advisory Council (AAC) has a representative vacancy.