



BASTROP BLANCO BURNET CALDWELL FAYETTE HAYS LEE LLANO TRAVIS WILLIAMSON

Capital Area Council of Governments Criminal Justice Advisory Committee (CJAC) Plan Year (PY) 2025 Policy Statement

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

The following policies and procedures are established for the purpose of defining the rules 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.

1.1. Grant applications that will be reviewed include, but are not limited to the following funding opportunities from the Office of the Governor:

- 1.1.a. Criminal Justice Grant Program (CJ-JAG).
- 1.1.b. General Victim Assistance Grant Program (VOCA).
- 1.1.c. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Program (JJ).
- 1.1.d. Truancy Prevention Projects (TP).
- 1.1.e. Violence Against Women Justice and Training Program (VAWA) and,
- 1.1.f. Any additional or unique fund sources that PSO determines appropriate.

1.2. In addition to purposes stated or implied in the CAPCOG Regional Strategic Criminal Justice Plan of Plan Year 2022, this policy statement is intended to further the objective of addressing regional criminal justice needs by encouraging the establishment of beneficial programs and continuing funding for them with the goal of progressing them toward self-sufficiency.


1.3. CAPCOG recognizes that some programs provide the benefit of providing core services to the region, and that long-term funding of those programs, and the agencies who operate them, may be considered differently than those programs not providing core services.

1.4. It is the intent of CAPCOG, to the extent that is reasonable, to use all funding that is allocated to the CAPCOG region for funding programs within the region and has therefore developed this policy to encourage doing that.

SECTION 2. COMPLIANCE WITH ADMINISTRATIVE RULES AND REGULATIONS

2.1. 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 Information regarding the TAC and the OOG rules can be accessed on the website of the Texas Secretary of State, at the link or QR code below.

[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)



2.2. 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>



SECTION 3. POLICY DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

3.1. The following terms, as used in this policy, shall have the meanings indicated.

- 3.1.a. Applicant - the agency/organization requesting grant funds from the Office of Governor's Public Safety Office.
- 3.1.b. Application - an online form that is completed by a potential grantee in eGrants in response to a request for a specific funding opportunity from the Office of Governor for a project or activity. It also refers to the content that is provided in the form along with

any required documents that is subject to this policy and being considered for funding by the PSO.

- 3.1.c. Awarded Project Amount – the total awarded amount from the Office of the Governor’s Public Safety Office not including matching contributions.
- 3.1.d. CAPCOG Region - the 10-county CAPCOG area which includes the following counties Bastrop; Blanco; Burnet; Caldwell; Fayette; Hays; Lee; Llano; Travis; and Williamson.
- 3.1.e. Conflict of Interest – as defined in Section 9 of this policy, a condition that may affect CAPCOG staff, CJAC members, or Executive Committee members from participating in review and processing of applications.
- 3.1.f. Continuation Project – a project that is the subject of an Application and was funded in any previous plan year having the same Applicant, serving essentially the same target group, and having a similar scope of work regarding the area served, the personnel proposed, and services offered as determined by the CJAC.
- 3.1.g. Criminal Justice Advisory Committee (CJAC) - a volunteer committee comprised of a multi-disciplinary representation of members from the region. 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 review.
- 3.1.h. eGrants – the online grant management system used by Public Safety Office programs used by applicants to register for an account, submit and certify applications, and manage any grants awarded. Located at egrants.gov.texas.gov.
- 3.1.i. Executive Committee – CAPCOG’s governing body.
- 3.1.j. Fourth Year Project – a Continuation Project for which Plan Year 2022 is the first year it received funding.
- 3.1.k. Local Government - political subdivisions of the State of Texas, including but not limited to counties, municipalities, cities, towns, utility districts, housing agencies, school districts, and similar public entities.
- 3.1.l. New Project – a project that is the subject of an Application that does not meet the criteria to be considered a Continuation Project.
- 3.1.m. Progressed Project - a Continuation Project that first received funding in Plan Year 2021 or an earlier plan year.
- 3.1.n. Project Summary Sheet- a form created by CAPCOG, which includes several questions about an Application and is used to help the CJAC during its review and scoring of applications.
- 3.1.o. Project - the subject of a grant application with a proposed set of objectives that will be performed by the applicant should grant funding be awarded.

- 3.1.p. Regional Budget Estimate (RBE) - an annual notification of fund availability CAPCOG receives from the PSO. The RBE identifies the estimated amount of funds being reserved for each grant program under which the region receives a funding allocation from the PSO.
- 3.1.q. Second Year Project – a Continuation Project for which Plan Year 2024 is the first year it received funding.
- 3.1.r. Third Year Project – a Continuation Project for which Plan Year 2023 is the first year it received funding.

3.2. When used in this policy statement, the phrases indicated below have the meaning as described for each.

- 3.2.a. Received funding – a Project or Application was awarded funding by the PSO, regardless if the Project or Application received a funding recommendation from the CAPCOG Executive Committee or the CJAC, or if the funding was used by the Applicant.
- 3.2.b. When referring to actions during the application, review, scoring, or funding recommendation process, the term CAPCOG may refer to either the CAPCOG staff, the CJAC, the Executive Committee, or any combination of these.

SECTION 4. ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINES FOR CAPCOG REGION

- 4.1. To be eligible to participate in CAPCOG’s application review and prioritization process, the Applicant must provide services within the CAPCOG Region.
- 4.2. Agencies within the CAPCOG Region may expand their service area outside of the CAPCOG Region; however, CAPCOG will only consider Applications for Projects that will provide services within the CAPCOG Region.
- 4.3. Agencies headquartered outside of the CAPCOG Region may submit a grant Application for CAPCOG review and prioritization if the requested funding will be used to provide services within the CAPCOG Region.
- 4.4. Agencies that receive direct allocations from the PSO for service programs 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.*)

SECTION 5. REGIONAL PRIORITIES

- 5.1. Priorities for PY 2025 include the following activities, based on feedback from stakeholders collected through a region-wide online survey and endorsed by the CJAC and Executive Committee:
 - 5.1.a. Violence Prevention (Juvenile Justice and School-based system)
 - 5.1.b. Training for Law Enforcement (Criminal Justice System)
 - 5.1.c. Counseling/Therapy Services (Mental Health/Substance Abuse Treatment)
 - 5.1.d. Crisis Services (Victims of Crime)

5.2. These priorities update the priorities listed in the CAPCOG Regional Strategic Criminal Justice Plan of Plan Year 2022.

5.3. CAPCOG will evaluate Applications on the extent to which they advance these priorities.

SECTION 6. APPLICATION

6.1. Office of the Governor Application Process

6.1.a. To be considered for funding, grant Applications must be submitted directly to the PSO via eGrants by the designated deadline (**Actual Deadline Date**). eGrants will not accept late application submissions.

6.1.b. All Office of the Governor funding opportunities are located on the eGrants website. The Office of the Governor criminal justice grant funding announcements include eligibility requirements set by the Office of the Governor. Please refer to information at the link or QR code below to review applicant eligibility requirements. <https://egrants.gov.texas.gov/>

6.1.c. The PSO will screen all Applications to ensure that they meet the requirements included in the funding announcement. Eligible local and regional applications will be forwarded by PSO to CAPCOG.

6.1.d. PSO will make the final determination as to which funding source is most appropriate for each application.

6.2. Application Limitations

6.2.a. Applicants are limited to three (3) Applications per funding source.

6.2.b. Any Applicant that submits more than three Applications in a single fund source will receive a score of zero and a funding recommendation of \$0.00 for all Applications in excess of three submitted Applications as determined by the date and time that the Application was submitted. Applications in excess of three for an Applicant in a single fund source will not be forwarded to the CJAC for scoring or a funding recommendation and will not present to the CJAC.

6.2.c. Applicants with multiple Applications in a fund source must indicate the project preference by indicating which of their applications is primary, secondary, and tertiary on the Project Summary Sheets.

6.2.d. CAPCOG will assign project preference to Applications for which a preference is not indicated on the Project Summary Sheet.

6.3. Application Requirements

6.3.a. In addition to the requirements established by the PSO, this policy establishes several requirements that have consequences to the scoring of an Application. Applicants should review Section 7 of this policy to understand how an Application's scoring can be affected

by these requirements. Applications that do not adhere to one or more of these requirements will still be reviewed by the PSO and are eligible to receive funding but are likely to receive a lower score and a lower funding recommendation from CAPCOG.

- 6.3.b. **Grant Application Workshop-** CAPCOG will conduct a grant application workshop that will be open to all prospective Applicants, at which the provisions of this policy will be reviewed and changes from the Plan Year 2024 policy will be highlighted. Failure of an applicant to attend a grant workshop could adversely affect the scoring and funding recommendation.
- 6.3.c. **Project Summary Sheet-** A Project Summary Sheet, in a form provided by CAPCOG, that should be submitted for each Application that is submitted through eGrants. The Project Summary Sheet includes several questions about the Application and proposed Project and is used to help the CJAC during its review and scoring of applications. Failure of an applicant to submit this form to CAPCOG could adversely affect the scoring and funding recommendation.
- 6.3.d. **Attendance at CJAC Project Presentation Meetings-** A representative of the Applicant who is familiar with the application and the proposed project should attend the presentation meeting conducted by the CJAC at the time that has been assigned for the Application. The Applicant representative will be allotted five minutes to present information about the Application to the CJAC and must be prepared to address questions from the CJAC members. Attendance at the meeting or making a presentation by the Applicant are not required. Failure of an Applicant to present its Application to the CJAC could adversely affect the scoring and funding recommendation.

6.4. CAPCOG Application Review Process

6.4.a. Forwarding Eligible Applications to the CJAC

- 6.4.a.(1) CAPCOG will forward all Applications that are eligible for review to the CJAC. The forwarded Applications will be accompanied by the Project Summary Sheet for the Application and necessary scoring materials.
- 6.4.a.(2) CAPCOG staff will provide to the CJAC a list of the Applications that are not eligible for review stating the appropriate reason the project cannot be reviewed. CAPCOG will send out email correspondence to the Applicant with reasoning as to why the Application will not be reviewed by the CJAC.
- 6.4.a.(3) CAPCOG will evaluate each Application that is eligible for review and will determine the status of each Application as a New Project, First Year Project, Second Year Project, Third Year Project, or a Progressed Project.
- 6.4.a.(4) CAPCOG will indicate the status of each forwarded Application. The CJAC or a subcommittee of the CJAC, may choose to meet prior to the scoring meeting to review the status of Applications and make changes to an Application's status.

6.4.b. Review of Applications by the CJAC

- 6.4.b.(1) CJAC members will individually review the forwarded Applications as soon as they are received and may continue to review them until scoring them.
- 6.4.b.(2) Prior to the scoring meetings, the CJAC may choose to meet to collaborate on the forwarded Applications. Attendance at the meeting by CJAC members is not required and no action will be taken.
- 6.4.c. Applicant Presentation to the CJAC
 - 6.4.c.(1) CAPCOG will determine the schedule for meetings at which Applicants will have the opportunity to present their Applications to the CJAC.
 - 6.4.c.(2) CAPCOG will notify the eligible Applicants to choose a preferred time to present their Application to the CJAC from a list of available times. The times available for presentations and the final presentation schedule is determined by CAPCOG.
 - 6.4.c.(3) Applicants will be notified of their assigned presentation time no later than 5 business days prior to the first day of the presentation meetings.
 - 6.4.c.(4) Applicants who are presenting their Applications must be present and prepared to present at their assigned time.
 - 6.4.c.(5) Applicants will be allowed five minutes to make a presentation to the CJAC. The CJAC, in its sole discretion, may allow more time as long as it does not interfere with the start time for the next scheduled presentation.
 - 6.4.c.(6) The CJAC may allow an Applicant to present earlier than their scheduled time if the Applicant is present and prepared to present and the Applicant that is scheduled to present at that time is not present or has already presented. The CJAC, in its sole discretion, may allow an Applicant to present at a time later than its scheduled time.
 - 6.4.c.(7) The CJAC may choose to conduct one or more additional meetings for presentations after the meetings initially scheduled. Scheduling of presentations during any additional meetings will be determined by the CJAC.
- 6.4.d. Scoring of Applications by the CJAC
 - 6.4.d.(1) CJAC members will consider a variety of factors in scoring the Applications 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.
 - 6.4.d.(2) After each presentation and before the next scheduled presentation, the CJAC members will individually assign scores to the Application using the materials provided

and based on the guidance in this policy and separate scoring guidance materials provided to them.

- 6.4.d.(3) CAPCOG staff will collect the CJAC members' scores for the Application either in written or electronic form as determined by the CJAC and will calculate the Application's overall score using the scoring method prescribed in this policy.
- 6.4.d.(4) A CJAC member may not change the score they assigned for any Application after their score for that Application has been collected by CAPCOG staff or submitted electronically.
- 6.4.d.(5) All scores must be submitted by CJAC members at or before the time that the next presentation begins.
- 6.4.d.(6) Score sheets used by the CJAC will include a multiplier that will be applied to all scores submitted by each CJAC member that will be used:
 - 6.4.d.(6)i For Applications submitted by Local Government Applicants: assign higher priority to New Projects, Second Year Projects, Third Year Projects, and Fourth Year Projects over Progressed Projects, and
 - 6.4.d.(6)ii For all other Applications: assign a higher priority over Applications for Progressed Projects submitted by Local Government Applicants.
- 6.4.d.(7) The member score is the total score submitted by the CJAC member on the materials provided after the multiplier has been applied.
- 6.4.d.(8) When all member scores are submitted or collected, the CAPCOG staff will remove the highest member score and the lowest member score, sum all remaining member scores, and divide by the number of member scores that were summed to determine the application score.
- 6.4.d.(9) The Applications will first be grouped by project preference indicated on the Project Summary Sheet, or in the event that a project preference was not indicated on Project Summary Sheet, by the project preference assigned for the Application by CAPCOG.
 - 6.4.d.(9) i The Applications will then be ordered for each project preference group from highest score to lowest score.
- 6.4.d.(10) Tie Breaker: In the event two or more applications achieve a tie score, the following method will be used to break the tie by applying the rules below, in the order they are listed, until no ties remain.
 - 6.4.d.(10) i New Projects will be placed in order before Applications for Continuation Projects and Progressed Projects.
 - 6.4.d.(10) ii Applications will be sorted in descending order by the year of their first year to receive funding.

6.4.d.(10)iii Applications will be sorted in ascending order by the amount of funding requested, or if a Continuation Project, by the maximum funding recommendation amount indicated in Section 8.1.

6.4.d.(10)iv The existence of a tie is evaluated after each rule is applied and the next rule is applied only if a tie remains.

6.4.e. Recommendation of Funding by the CJAC

- (1) After all presentations for a funding category have completed, the CJAC will determine the method to use when recommending funding for each Application. The CJAC may adopt one or more formulas to determine the recommended funding for an Application based on its score, determine the funding recommendation based on discussion among the CJAC members and voting on a proposed score, or a combination of methods.
- (2) Regardless of the method chosen by the CJAC to recommend funding for applications, the limitations described in Section 8 of this policy apply.
- (3) Within 5 business days after the CJAC has made funding recommendations for all funding categories, all Applicants will be notified of the scoring, ranking, and funding recommendations of all Applications within the same funding category as their Application.

6.4.f. Review of Applications by the Executive Committee and Funding Recommendation to the Public Safety Office

- 6.4.f.(1) Prior to the deadline date for CAPCOG to submit scoring, ranking, and funding recommendations to PSO, the CAPCOG Executive Committee will review the scoring and ranking of the Applications from the CJAC and the funding recommendations for each at one of its regularly scheduled meetings, or if it deems necessary, at a specially called meeting.
- 6.4.f.(2) The Executive Committee will vote on funding recommendations for all Applications prior to the deadline date for CAPCOG to submit scoring, ranking, and funding recommendations to PSO. The Executive Committee may make funding recommendations that are consistent with the CJAC recommendation or may make different funding recommendations as it deems appropriate.
- 6.4.f.(3) Unless otherwise provided by this policy, the Executive Committee cannot change the scoring or ranking of Applications.
- 6.4.f.(4) The Executive Committee may specify or give guidance to include any notes or additional information to the PSO for Applications or for an entire grant category.

6.4.g. Appeals to Suspected Scoring Errors Process

- 6.4.g.(1) Any Applicant of an Application that was scored and received a funding recommendation from the CJAC may appeal the score that the Application received if the Applicant believes that an error was made in calculating the Application's score or in implementing the scoring or tie breaker methods of this policy. An Applicant may not submit a request for an appeal for any other purpose.

- 6.4.g.(2) Requests for an appeal must be submitted to CAPCOG’s Criminal Justice Liaison: Karina Trevino at ktrevino@capcog.org no later than five business days prior to the Executive Committee meeting at which the priority list of Applications will be recommended for funding. The request must include a statement describing the reason for the appeal, including what the Applicant believes to be the error made in scoring signed by the authorized official as designated by the PSO. Supporting documentation may be included.
- 6.4.g.(3) If a request for an appeal is received, the CJAC members will receive a copy of the written appeal and the Chair, Vice Chair, or designated representative from the CJAC will be invited to attend the Executive Committee meeting at which the priority list of Applications will be recommended for funding.
- 6.4.g.(4) The request for the appeal and the supporting material will be provided to the Executive Committee at the same time as materials for the priority list of Applications and funding recommendations.
- 6.4.g.(5) The Executive Committee, after considering the request for appeal, may change the Application’s score and priority ranking and the ranking of other Applications that may be affected by the Application’s revised score.
- 6.4.g.(6) The Executive Committee may choose to, but is not obligated to, discuss the appeal, hear testimony from the appellant, or change the score and ranking of the subject Application based on the information provided.
- 6.4.g.(7) The decision of the Executive Committee will be the final action concerning all appeals. The CJAC members will be notified of the result of the appeal.

SECTION 7. SCORING CRITERIA

7.1. An Application’s score is composed of scores from two parts: Objective Score and Discretionary Score

7.2. The **Objective Score** has two components which are all dependent upon the Applicant’s performance during application process or submittal of materials. The score for each objective score component is determined by CAPCOG staff. Objective scores are all (earned if the applicant complied with the requirements of the component) or nothing (assigned if the Applicant did not comply with the requirements of the component). Partial objective scores will not be assigned to any Application.

7.2.a. The objective score for each Application, a description of each, and the values of the components are:

0 or 10 Points for Grant Application Workshop Attendance- CAPCOG will schedule and hold a grant Application workshop to discuss funding opportunities provided by the PSO. If a representative of the applying organization attends a grant application workshop all of the organization’s Applications receive 10 points. If an applying organization does not have a representative attend a grant application workshop, all of that organization’s

Applications will receive zero points for the grant application workshop attendance component.

0 or 10 Points for Submission of Project Summary Sheets- Applicants are to complete and submit a Project Summary Sheet. If a Project Summary Sheet has been submitted for an Application, the Application will receive 10 points. If a Project Summary Sheet has not been submitted for an Application, the Application will receive zero points for the submission of Project Summary Sheet component.

7.3. The Discretionary Score has three components. Which are all dependent upon the Applicant's performance in regard to regional priorities and the written Application submitted to eGrants.

7.3.a. The discretionary score for each Application, a description of each, and the values of the components are:

0-10 Points for Regional Priorities - All Applications that are forwarded to the CJAC for scoring will be eligible to receive up to 10 points as determined by the scoring of the individual CJAC members and the method of calculating application scores established in this policy.

0 - 50 Points for Written Application – All Applications that are forwarded to the CJAC for scoring will be eligible to receive up to 50 points for the written application component of the discretionary score as determined by the scoring by individual CJAC members and the method of calculating application scores established in this policy. The score sheets that will be used by the CJAC to assign scores to an Application may divide the written application component into subcomponents that are scored independently and total 50 points.

0 - 20 Points for Project Presentations - All Applications that are forwarded to the CJAC for scoring will be eligible to receive up to 20 points for the project presentation component of the discretionary score as determined by the scoring by individual CJAC members and the method of calculating application scores established in this policy. The score sheets that will be used by the CJAC to assign scores to an Application may divide the project presentation component into subcomponents that are scored independently and total 20 points.

SECTION 8. CJAC FUNDING RECOMMENDATION LIMITATIONS

8.1. Except for the exception mentioned below, Continuation Projects submitted by Local Government Applicants are limited to receive a funding recommendation from the CJAC in an amount no greater than the amounts indicated below depending on the Continuation Project's first year of funding for all funding categories.

8.1.a. Second Year Projects: 80% of amount awarded by PSO for the Project's first year of funding.

8.1.b. Third Year Projects: 60% of amount awarded by PSO for the Project's first year of funding.

8.1.c. Fourth Year Projects: 40% of amount awarded by PSO for the Project's first year of funding.

- 8.2. Except for the exception mentioned below, Progressed Projects submitted by Local Government Applicants will receive a funding recommendation of \$0.00 from the CJAC.
- 8.3. Except for the exception mentioned below, Applications that receive a total final score less than 70 points will receive a funding recommendation of \$0.00 from the CJAC.
- 8.4. Except for the exception mentioned below, Applications that are in excess of an Applicant's three permitted Applications for a fund source will receive a funding recommendation of \$0.00 from the CJAC.
- 8.5. The CJAC may not recommend funding in an amount greater than the amount requested by the Applicant.
- 8.6. If the total value of the CJAC funding recommendation for Applications in a funding category is less than the RBE for that category, the CJAC may recommend funding for applications in an amount greater than the amount allowed by Sections 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 above.

SECTION 9. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

- 9.1 To avoid a conflict of interest, members of the CAPCOG's Executive Committee, CJAC members, and CAPCOG staff must abstain from voting and comment on discussion regarding the application and all other applications in the same funding category.
- 9.2 Potential Conflicts of Interest include the member or an individual related to the member within the third degree of consanguinity or within the second degree by affinity:
 - 9.2.a. Is employed by the Applicant agency and works for the unit or division that would administer the grant, if awarded; or,
 - 9.2.b. Serves on any board that oversees the unit or division that would administer the grant if awarded; or,
 - 9.2.c. 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
 - 9.2.d. Receives any funds, or a substantial amount of tangible goods or services, from the Applicant agency as a result of the grant, if awarded.
- 9.3. If a member must abstain from reviewing, voting, commenting, 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.
- 9.4. Members will clearly state their abstention from voting on certain Applications and will not speak on behalf of or in support of an Applicant.
- 9.5. If CAPCOG learns that any inappropriate actions occurred during the scoring or prioritization of PSO criminal justice projects, CAPCOG will notify the PSO of the concerns.

SECTION 10. CAPCOG TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

- 10.1. CAPCOG will maintain a website and post all reference materials here: www.capcog.org/what-we-do/funding-grants/criminal-justice/.
- 10.2. 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. For more information, please contact CAPCOG's Criminal Justice Liaison: Karina Trevino at ktrevino@capcog.org.
- 10.3. 10.3 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.
- 10.4. 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. For more information, please contact CAPCOG's Criminal Justice Liaison: Karina Trevino at ktrevino@capcog.org
- 10.5. The Office of the Governor, PSO staff will provide technical assistance with the operation of the eGrants web-based application.