

## **Grant Monitoring Standards and Guidelines for Hiring and Redeployment**

---

### V. COPS Compliance Definitions & Conditions





## V. COPS Compliance Definitions & Conditions

---

The eight primary compliance categories of the COPS Hiring and MORE grant programs are:

- A) Community Policing
- B) Retention
- C) Allowable Costs
- D) Source and Amount of Matching Funds
- E) Supplanting
- F) Reporting
- G) Training: Special Condition CIS Grant
- H) Timesavings for Redeployment\*

This section defines the eight categories and provides the accompanying conditions that are required to be in compliance with the COPS Hiring and MORE grants. Each category also includes examples to further clarify special conditions or calculations.

\*It is important to note that the Timesavings for Redeployment category pertains to the MORE Grant Program only.

### A. Community Policing

#### DEFINITION

Community policing is a philosophy that promotes and supports organizational strategies to address the causes, and reduce the fear of, crime and social disorder. This is achieved through problem-solving tactics and community-police partnerships. It enhances police professionalism by providing officers with the skills, technology, and motivation to act innovatively to solve community crime-related problems.

The community policing approach requires the police and citizenry to join as partners in the course of both identifying and effectively addressing the causes of crime and disorder. The focus of the police is not only on enforcement, but also on emphasizing the need for crime prevention and for proactively addressing the root causes of crime and disorder. The community is actively engaged in collaborating on prevention and problem-solving activities with a goal of reducing victimization and fear of crime.



## CONDITIONS

The COPS Office maintains that local agencies are best suited to determine their community crime-related problems and the policing activities that will solve them. Police, community members, and other public and private entities work together to address the underlying problems that contribute to crime and disorder by identifying and analyzing problems, developing suitable responses, and assessing the effectiveness of these responses. Acceptable community policing activities are unique to each local community and must be addressed on an individual basis through the community policing plan submitted to and approved by the COPS Office.

**Required Number of Community Policing Officers.** Under COPS Hiring grants, every grant-funded officer position (or an equal number of veteran officer positions) is required to initiate or enhance community policing. For example, a COPS Universal Hiring Program grantee with 10 COPS grant-funded officers must deploy 10 officers (COPS-funded or veteran officers) to initiate or enhance community policing through the approved community policing plan. This does not mean that every hour of the officers' time must be spent in a specific community policing "activity," but it does mean that the grantee must show the required number of officers initiating or enhancing community policing above the pre-award number. In addition to increasing the number of officers involved in community policing by the number of officers awarded, there must also be an increase in community policing activity by the grantee from pre-award community policing activities.

**Community Policing Activity Approval.** The COPS Office is responsible for reviewing and approving the community policing plans that are identified in grant applications. Grantees are not required to implement every community policing activity identified on the approved plan to demonstrate compliance. Instead, the plan may often identify a broad range of possible community policing activities, with the grantee implementing particular community policing strategies from the approved plan on an as-needed basis throughout the life of the grant.

**Changes to Community Policing Plans.** Any significant changes to the community policing plan identified in the grant application must be submitted in writing to the COPS Office for approval. Changes are "significant" if they deviate from the range of possible community policing activities identified and approved in the grantee's original community policing plan.



**Career Law Enforcement Officer.** Hiring grants allow for payment of approved entry-level salaries and benefits for the hiring or rehiring of additional sworn career law enforcement officer positions. A "sworn career law enforcement officer" is a person hired on a permanent basis who is authorized by law or by a State or local public agency to engage in, or oversee, the prevention, detection, or investigation of violations of criminal laws. Grant funds allow for the hiring of new, additional officers over and above the number of sworn officers that an agency would fund with State, local or BIA funds in the absence of the grant. Law enforcement agencies may enhance their community policing by deploying the new, additional COPS-funded officers into community policing or by deploying an equal number of veteran officers into community policing (and then back-filling the veteran officers' positions with the newly hired, additional COPS-funded officers).

**COPS in Schools (CIS) School Resource Officer (SRO).** The COPS in Schools Grant Program provides an incentive for law enforcement agencies to build working relationships with schools to use community policing efforts to combat school violence. The CIS grant program allows for the hiring of new, additional sworn officers at entry-level salaries to serve as School Resource Officers, over and above the number of sworn officers that an agency would fund with State, local or BIA funds in the absence of the grant (including other School Resource Officers). Please note that your agency may choose to deploy an equal number of veteran locally-funded officers into the schools to fulfill this requirement, while using the COPS grant funds to hire new, additional officers to "backfill" the resulting vacancy.

The COPS statute defines a "School Resource Officer" as a career law enforcement officer, with sworn authority, deployed in community oriented policing and assigned by the employing police department or agency to work in collaboration with schools and community-based organizations to:

- a. address crime and disorder problems, gangs, and drug activities affecting or occurring in or around an elementary or secondary school;
- b. develop or expand crime prevention efforts for students;
- c. educate likely school-age victims in crime prevention and safety;
- d. develop or expand community justice initiatives for students;
- e. train students in conflict resolution, restorative justice, and crime awareness;
- f. assist in the identification of physical changes in the environment that may reduce crime in or around the school;
- g. assist in developing school policy that addresses crime; and
- h. recommend procedural changes.



The agency implements the community policing activities as approved in the CIS application, focusing on SRO duties and related community policing strategies. The SRO must spend a minimum of 75% of time in and around the schools working on youth-related activities. There must be an increase in community policing activities that are being performed by CIS-funded SROs from the pre-grant activities, as well as a corresponding increase in the number of officers deployed into the partner school(s) as SROs.

**MORE Grants Support Community Policing.** Community policing activities that are supported by MORE grants adhere to the same criteria as the Hiring grants. Sworn officers are redeployed to enhance community policing activities as a result of timesavings achieved through the use of technology, equipment, overtime, or civilian support services that are funded by MORE grants. Again, as with the community policing requirement of the UHP grant, not every hour of redeployment is required to be spent in a specific community policing activity, nor must every community policing activity identified in the community policing plan be conducted.

**Examples of Hiring and MORE Community Policing Activities.** Agencies have a variety of community policing activities and programs. The COPS Office reviews activities approved in the grant application's community policing plan. The following are just a few examples of community policing programs:

- **Crime Prevention Efforts**  
Examples: Youth programs; anti-drug programs; regular meetings with community groups to discuss crime; and anti-violence programs.
- **Problem-Solving Activities**  
Examples: Identifying crime problems with members of the community and other government agencies (e.g., probation office, prosecutor and courts); identifying crime problems by looking at crime trends; identifying top problems by analyzing repeat calls for service; preventing crime by focusing on conditions that lead to crime (e.g., abandoned buildings and cars); building on information systems to enhance crime analysis capabilities; regularly surveying community members to assist in identifying and prioritizing crime problems; locating offices or stations within neighborhoods; and providing community policing training to citizens.



Examples: Working with citizens to identify and address community crime problems; using computer systems to collect and analyze information, particularly repeat calls for service; coordinating specific problem-solving projects to address problems on their beats; working with other public agencies to solve disorder problems (e.g., trash collection, public works agencies to solve lighting problems); and mapping crime problems.

- Community Partnerships

Examples: Meeting with community members to learn more about the nature of specific problems; and involving community members in selecting responses to problems and determining measures of success.

Examples: Participating in neighborhood watch programs, citizen volunteer programs, citizen advisory groups to the law enforcement agency; citizen patrols within the community; and anti-drug or anti-violence programs.

Examples: Participating with community organization working groups and/or special programs for schools and other interest groups which enhance crime prevention. Program examples are: Private Security, Drug and Alcohol Resistance Education (DARE), Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT), Triad, School Resource Officer (SRO).

- Other Agency Partnerships

Examples: Juvenile justice services; probation; social services; parole; city and county departments; sanitation services; school system; elected officials; private security and other public service providers.

- Patrol

Examples: Targeted geographic patrol, foot patrol, bike patrol or mounted patrol; making door-to-door contact with citizens and businesses; meeting with community leaders and groups to learn more about crime problems and jointly develop crime prevention plans; using business cards, cellular phones or beepers to maintain contact with citizens regarding public safety concerns; and working in schools or other public agencies to teach crime prevention.



- **Evidence of Community Policing Philosophy**  
Integrating community policing into a traditional policing environment is an evolutionary process. The COPS grant award is an aid to this evolutionary process and, therefore, the evaluation of community policing activities is unique to each local agency.

Evidence that law enforcement agencies are incorporating a community policing philosophy is witnessed through three core elements: 1) police organizational elements; 2) tactical elements; and 3) external elements. Agencies may be anywhere on the continuum of incorporating community policing into their operation; therefore, a variety of activities are acceptable.

### **1. Police organizational elements**

- a. Philosophy adopted organization-wide. Department-wide adoption of community policing is evidenced by the integration of the philosophy into mission statements, policies and procedures, performance evaluations and hiring, promotional practices, training programs, and other systems and activities that define organizational culture and activities.
- b. Decentralized decision making and accountability. In community policing, individual line officers are given the authority to solve problems and make operational decisions concerning their roles, both individually and collectively. Leadership is required and rewarded at every level, with managers, supervisors and officers held accountable for decisions and the effects of their efforts at solving problems and reducing crime and disorder within the community.
- c. Fixed geographic accountability and generalist responsibilities. In community policing, the majority of staffing, command, deployment and tactical decision-making is geographically based. Appropriate personnel are assigned to fixed geographic areas for extended periods of time in order to foster communication and partnerships between individual officers and their community. These personnel are accountable for reducing crime and disorder within their assigned area.

d. Utilization of Volunteer Resources. Community policing encourages the use of non-law enforcement resources within a law enforcement agency. The law enforcement organization educates the public about ways that they can work in partnership with the organization and its members to further community policing, and provides an effective means for citizen input. Volunteer efforts can help to free up officer time, and allow sworn personnel to be more proactive and prevention oriented.

## 2. Tactical elements

- a. Enforcement of laws. Community policing complements the use of proven and established law enforcement strategies, becoming one of many tools available to officers that can be collectively employed to prevent and combat crime.
- b. Proactive, crime-prevention oriented. Under community policing, the focus of the police is not only on enforcement, but also emphasizes the need for crime prevention and for proactively addressing the root causes of crime and disorder. The community is actively engaged in collaborating on prevention and problem-solving activities with a goal of reducing victimization and fear of crime.
- c. Problem solving. Police, community members, and other public and private entities work together to address the underlying problems that contribute to crime and disorder by identifying and analyzing problems, developing suitable responses, and assessing the effectiveness of these responses. While enforcement is an integral part of policing, problem solving relies more on preventing crime through deterring offenders, protecting likely victims, and making crime locations less conducive to problems.

## 3. External elements

- a. Public involvement and community partnerships. In community policing, citizens as well as private security are viewed by the police as partners who share responsibility for identifying priorities, and developing and implementing responses. Accurate surveying of customer needs and priorities is one way to determine the problems that drive police services, and give the public ownership of the problem-solving process.



b. Government and other agency partnerships. Under community policing, other government agencies are called upon and recognized for their ability to respond to and address crime and social disorder issues. The support and leadership of elected officials, as well as the coordination of the police department at all levels, are vital to the success of these efforts.

## B. Retention

### DEFINITION

COPS Hiring and MORE grantees are required to retain the additional grant-funded officer positions (for Hiring grants) and/or the additional equipment, technology, or civilians and resulting officer timesavings (for MORE grants) for one full local budget cycle following the expiration of the respective COPS grant implementation period (e.g., the 36-month funding period per additional officer position under the Hiring grants and the 12-month redeployment period under the MORE grants). During the active grant periods, prior to the actual retention period, grantees may be required to demonstrate how they are planning to meet this retention requirement.

Retention planning documentation must be submitted with the Hiring grant application, beginning with applications submitted after June 16, 1998, and with the MORE '98 grant program. For prior grantees that were not required to submit retention planning documentation with the grant application, the COPS Office may require evidence of retention planning efforts during the active grant periods.

Under the Hiring programs, retention is defined as using local funds to continue employing the additional officer position(s) awarded under the COPS grant for one full local budget cycle at the conclusion of the 36-month funding period for each position. The additional positions must be retained over and above all locally-funded sworn officer positions that would exist in the absence of the grant. Retention therefore may not be achieved by absorbing COPS officers into locally-funded vacancies through attrition.

Similarly, under the MORE program, retention is defined as retaining the required level of officer timesavings for one full local budget cycle by using local funds to continue implementing the funded equipment or technology, or continue employing the additional civilian position(s) awarded, over and above all locally-funded civilian positions that would exist in the absence of the grant.



## CONDITIONS

Hiring grantees must retain the additional federally funded positions at the conclusion of the 36-month Hiring grant funding period with State or local funding for at least one full local budget cycle.<sup>1,2</sup>

MORE grantees must retain the federally funded technology/equipment and/or civilians and the resulting redeployment once the required level of redeployment has been met with State or local funding for one full local budget cycle.<sup>3</sup>

During the active grant period, Hiring and MORE grantees may be required to demonstrate that they are planning to meet this retention requirement. Evidence of retention planning documentation may come in three forms: 1) a written retention plan, 2) supporting evidence of retention planning; or 3) retention certification.

Planning evidence may consist of memoranda, minutes of meetings, budget documents, and other planning documents produced during the grant period that demonstrate that the grantee is seeking sources of State or local funds to retain the additional officer positions, civilian positions, or equipment and technology (i.e., through upgrades or maintenance funding), as applicable. Grantees may be required to produce evidence of their progress in implementing their retention plans during any monitoring or audit activities. Additionally, grantees are required to answer questions in the Department Annual Reports and MORE Progress Reports regarding retention plans.

**The Retention Plan.** Retention plans submitted to the COPS Office must include these two elements:

1. Document co-signed by Law Enforcement Executive (Chief/Sheriff/Director of Public Safety, etc.) and Government Executive (Mayor/City Manager/Chairman of County Commission, etc.) that identifies:
  - The proposed source of funding for the position(s) and technology or equipment;
  - Identification of the grant(s) covered by the retention plan; and/or
  - The number of positions and/or level of redeployment planned to be retained.

<sup>1</sup> The Phase I grant conditions did not include a retention requirement.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix A for a definition of the Hiring grant funding period.

<sup>3</sup> Similarly, MORE '95 overtime grantees were required to plan to continue the sworn officer overtime activities funded under the grant award.



2. Documentation, including but not limited to: local council minutes; inter-office memoranda; local government officials' memoranda and/or future budget projections that demonstrate intent to retain the COPS-funded positions and for level of redeployment with State or local funds at the conclusion of the grant period. For example:
  - Documents that demonstrate an intent to add the COPS positions to a request for local funding during local budget negotiations;
  - Documents that demonstrate the jurisdiction's attempts to seek additional law enforcement funding from private sources, including corporate, non-profit, and foundation donations or grants; and/or
  - Documents that demonstrate that the jurisdiction will try to obtain other non-federal funding sources (such as State grants, for example) to support the additional positions.

The COPS Office monitors retention to ensure that the grantee complied with the retention requirement for one full local budget cycle after the conclusion of the Hiring grant funding period for Hiring grants, or after the achievement of the required level of redeployment for MORE grants. This means that grantees must complete the budget cycle in which the grant funding period or redeployment period ends *plus* one full local budget cycle thereafter.

Grantees that cannot comply with the retention requirement, and wish to request an exemption from the retention requirement, must submit documentation to support mitigating circumstances that prevent retention. The COPS Office will review each situation on a case-by-case basis to determine if there is evidence of sufficient mitigating factors to justify an exemption from the retention requirement. Examples of possible acceptable mitigating circumstances are provided at the end of this section. Those agencies exempted from the retention requirement will be required to wait at least one year before applying for additional COPS funding that contains a retention requirement. The one-year waiting period begins at the end of the applicable grant funding or redeployment period, when the retention requirement would have begun.

Grantees that cannot comply with their retention plan and cannot demonstrate sufficient mitigating circumstances will not be eligible for an exemption from the retention requirement. If a grantee is denied a retention exemption and still is unable to retain, the grantee is in violation of the retention requirement and is subject to sanctions, including a bar period for all new COPS funding with a retention requirement.

---



### **Examples – Retention Planning, Retention Plan, and Mitigating Circumstances**

- Evidence that retention planning efforts occurred throughout the life of the grant may include, but are not limited to:
  - Memoranda, minutes of official meetings or other documentation which demonstrate that the jurisdiction attempted to add the COPS positions to a request for local funding during local budget negotiations
  - Memoranda, minutes of elected official meetings or other documentation which demonstrate that the jurisdiction attempted to obtain other non-federal funding sources (such as State grants, for example) to support the additional positions at the termination of the COPS grant
  - Memoranda, minutes of elected official meetings or other documentation which demonstrate that the jurisdiction attempted to seek additional law enforcement funding from private sources, including corporate, non-profit, and foundation donations or grants
- Example of a Retention Plan. This must be written on agency letterhead and signed by the Government Executive and/or Law Enforcement Executive.

This letter is to indicate that the ABC Police Department has employed three (3) officer positions under the provisions of UHP grant #2001UMWX0000, as well as employed one (1) civilian position under COPS MORE grant #2000CLWX0000. The City of ABC, along with the ABC Police Department, plans to retain these positions and fund them through the City of ABC's general fund. We will retain these four positions for at least one full local budget cycle, ending 9/30/04. Please find attached the City Council minutes supporting the retention plan.

- Mitigating circumstances are those which demonstrate severe financial distress, a natural disaster, or similar factors that significantly impacted a grantee's financial circumstance and prevented retention. Mitigating circumstances may include, but are not limited to, the following situations when documented by the grantee:
  - Jurisdiction has been declared bankrupt by a court of law;
  - Jurisdiction has been placed in receivership, or its functional equivalent, by the State or Federal government;



- Jurisdiction has been declared a financially distressed area by its State or a Federal government agency;
- Budgetary imbalance or expenditure cutbacks resulting in significant reductions in other services provided by the law enforcement agency or significant reduction-in-force of the agency's personnel;
- Extraordinary and unanticipated nonrecurring expenses and/or loss of revenue (including closure or relocation of major employers) resulting in material effect on a jurisdiction's fiscal condition;
- Significant downgrading of a jurisdiction's bond rating for fiscal-related reasons
- Filing for bankruptcy, receivership or similar measure, with the request for relief pending; and
- Location within an area in which a declaration of major disaster has been made pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

**Impact of Failure to Retain on Other Active COPS Grants.** An agency which fails to retain officer positions funded by one COPS grant may also be in violation of the nonsupplanting requirement for an unjustified reduction in baseline officers if the grantee also has other active COPS Hiring grants. For example, a failure to retain one COPS FAST officer position, which otherwise would have been retained with local funding, may result in an unapproved baseline reduction for the active UHP grant, since the retained COPS FAST officer position should have increased the UHP grant baseline by one position. To comply with the nonsupplanting requirement, the grantee must demonstrate that the failure to retain the FAST officer position with State or local funding following grant expiration occurred for reasons unrelated to the UHP grant.

### C. Allowable Costs

#### DEFINITION

Allowable costs are those costs that a particular COPS program will fund, as specified by the requirements of the grant. The requirements include: the approved budget; the financial clearance memorandum; and the applicable Uniform Administrative Requirements. The financial clearance memorandum limits the amount that may be charged for each category. However, the COPS Office reserves the ability to reprogram the grantee budget upon request. The costs should be reasonable in nature and permissible under the specific grant conditions.

Allowable costs are different for Hiring grants and MORE grants.



### **Hiring Grants**

For Hiring grants, allowable costs encompass the entry-level salaries (including specifically approved benefits and cost-of-living increases as specified and approved in the grant award) for three years (36 months) for newly hired, additional sworn entry-level, lateral-transfer, or rehired officers. Allowable salaries and benefits must be based on the grantee's standard entry-level salary/benefit package, regardless of the experience of the individual officers hired (although grantees may pay any extra costs with local funds), in addition to any required local match.

- Under Phase I, AHEAD, FAST, and UHP, up to 75% of an entry-level salary, with a \$75,000 limit over the three-year grant period, will be paid by federal funds. Local funding must pay the remaining portion of the salary through the required local match.
- The CIS Program does not require a local match, providing federal funds for entry-level salary and benefits up to \$125,000 per position over the three-year grant period. Any costs above this amount will be paid with local funding.

### **MORE Grants**

For MORE civilian grants, allowable costs encompass the salaries, including approved benefits, for civilian hires during the life of the grant, including renewal periods if applicable. [Unlike the COPS Hiring grants, the MORE civilian program is not based on entry-level salary and benefits, but may reflect the actual (approved) salary and benefit costs for the funded civilian positions.] For MORE equipment and technology grants, the allowable costs of approved items are also identified in the award. In addition, the MORE '95 Grant Program allowed for certain overtime costs of officers.

MORE funds will pay up to 75% of the approved allowable costs, with the remaining portion of the costs paid with local funding.

### **CONDITIONS**

Allowable costs are different for Hiring and MORE grant awards.

### **Hiring Grants**

If the award is for a full-time Hiring grant, funding allows for hiring new, additional full-time sworn officers at the grantee's standard entry-level salary and approved benefit rate. However, grantees may pay any higher than entry-level salary and benefit amounts to individual officers using local funds in addition to the required local match. Alternatively, with prior written approval from the COPS Office, a grantee may promote a part-time officer to the full-time COPS grant-



funded position, as long as the grantee replaces the part-time vacant position with a newly hired officer using local funding before expending COPS grant funds on the new full-time position. The newly hired, additional COPS-funded sworn officers may be deployed to fulfill the community policing functions of the grant, or the department alternatively may redeploy one veteran officer for each new hire to community policing activities.

If the award is for a part-time Hiring grant, the salary costs, including approved benefits, are only allowable if grant funds are used to pay for a newly hired part-time officer, not to increase the hours of the currently employed part-time officer(s). Part-time hours are defined by the grantee in the application and approved by the COPS budget memorandum.

For both full-time and part-time grant awards, it is acceptable for grantees to recruit and hire non-sworn officers with COPS grant monies as long as the individual will promptly become a sworn officer through the standard training and swearing-in procedures required by the grantee's State or local law. Grant funds may be used to pay the non-sworn recruit's salary and benefits during that training period if this is the grantee's standard practice for all locally-funded officers as well.

The determination of allowable costs for Hiring grants is based on the grantee's standard salary and benefits for entry-level sworn officer positions (though some particular benefits offered by the grantee may not be included as allowable costs by the COPS program). If the officer hired to fill the position is not entry level, the grant funding still cannot pay for more than 75% of the portion of the salary and benefits of a position that is entry level. The grantee may pay the additional costs with local funds in addition to the required local match. The approved COPS budget and financial clearance memorandum will specify the approved allowable federal costs and the recipient's required local match.

#### **MORE Grants**

If the award is for a MORE grant, funding allows for the payment of support resources, including the salaries and approved benefits of civilian personnel, technology and equipment, and overtime (MORE '95 only) for sworn officers engaging in community policing activities. The allowable costs must directly contribute to timesavings and thereby enhance the community policing presence through officer redeployment. MORE grants are awarded for one year only. Renewals are available for up to two years after the initial grant period for civilian hires, at the discretion of the COPS Office and subject to funding availability.



For technology and equipment purchases, the term of the grant funding is one year, with no option for renewal. Monitoring efforts evaluate whether the costs are timely and allowable. For COPS compliance purposes, "timely" is defined as consistent with the local government's procurement practices, and "allowable" is defined as the costs specified on the grantee's approved award budget.

- It should be noted that it may be permissible to obtain additional items in support of the MORE grant as a result of cost savings. For example, a department requests and receives funding to obtain eight (8) computers and is able to obtain 10 computers at the same price due to discounts. All use of saved funds must be consistent with the program outlined in the approved application. As of March 8, 1999, the COPS Office required prior written approval only if the utilized saved funds are in excess of \$1,000. However, the agency is not required to demonstrate additional redeployment based on the use of this money since the required redeployment is linked to the dollars spent rather than the number of items purchased.

## **EXAMPLES**

### **Allowable/Unallowable Costs by Program**

#### **Hiring Grant Allowable Costs**

Allowable costs include the salaries and approved fringe benefits for three years (36 months) for sworn entry-level, lateral-transfer, or rehired officers. Up to 75% of the entry-level salary and benefits actually incurred, with a \$75,000 limit over the three-year grant period, will be paid by award money with the remaining portion of the salary paid by local funding.

- Approved fringe benefits include, but are not limited to, department costs for FICA/Social Security, health insurance, life insurance, vacation and sick leave not included in base salary, retirement benefit contribution, worker's compensation, and unemployment insurance. Fringe benefits must be part of the grantee's standard benefit package for locally-funded entry-level officers to qualify as allowable under the COPS grant. Fringe benefits that are absolutely NOT approved are costs of equipment, training, uniforms, vehicles, and overtime. For assistance in determining other allowable costs approved under specific Hiring grants, please refer to the COPS budget memorandum, which all grantees receive as part of their award package.



- Salary and benefits may be paid during training if this is the grantee's standard practice for all officers. Examples of training include, but are not limited to, academy training, field training, and probationary training.
- If the grantee chooses to transfer veteran officers into community policing activities, the veteran officers do not have to begin those activities until the new hires finish the required training program for that particular grantee. (Training programs include academy, field, and probationary training.) The reason for this policy is twofold. First, if veterans were deployed to community policing while the new hires are in training or are not fully prepared to fill the vacant position, there would be a deficiency in another area of the police department. Second, the policy encourages consistency for COPS grantees by allowing departments to transfer veterans to community policing at the time that the newly hired officers graduate from training, which is the same time that the newly hired officers otherwise would have been deployed directly into community policing. Note that in this circumstance, the allowable costs are still the costs associated with the newly hired officers, rather than the veteran locally-funded officers who are redeployed into community policing to fulfill the grant requirements.

#### **MORE Grant Allowable Costs**

- **MORE '95, '96, '98** (*\*this list includes the majority of funded items, but items not on this list may have been approved on a case-by-case basis for particular MORE '95, '96, or '98 grants*)
  - a. mobile data computers/laptops
  - b. crime analysis hardware/software
  - c. mapping software
  - d. personal computers
  - e. automated aided dispatch systems
  - f. automated booking systems
  - g. dictation systems
  - h. salary and benefits to civilians that result in the redeployment of sworn officers
  - i. administrative assistants
  - j. record clerks
  - k. booking clerks
  - l. dispatchers
  - m. certain training costs
  - n. certain overtime costs for officers (allowable for MORE '95 only)



- **MORE 2000**
  - a. salary and benefits to civilians that result in the redeployment of sworn officers
  - b. administrative assistants
  - c. record clerks
  - d. booking clerks
  - e. dispatchers
  
- **MORE 2001**
  - a. mobile data computers/laptops
  - b. crime analysis hardware/software
  - c. mapping software
  - d. personal computers
  - e. automated aided dispatch systems
  - f. automated booking systems
  - g. dictation systems
  
- **MORE 2002**
  - a. mobile data computers
  - b. computer aided dispatch systems
  - c. records management systems
  - d. crime analysis hardware/software
  - e. automated booking systems
  - f. automated fingerprint identification system
  - g. video arraignment equipment
  - h. personal computers

The COPS budget memorandum specifies the approved allowable costs for each grant award. Under the Hiring and MORE grants those items not approved are unallowable costs. Examples of those costs include, but are not limited to, the following.

#### **Hiring Grant Unallowable Costs**

- a. overtime
- b. training (other than salary or benefits paid during training)
- c. weapons
- d. communication equipment
- e. uniforms
- f. vehicles
- g. indirect costs

#### **MORE Grant Unallowable Costs**

- a. direct salaries and benefits of sworn officers
- b. police vehicles
- c. vehicle siren equipment
- d. office equipment/furniture
- e. weapons and ammunition



- f. cellular telephones
- g. radios
- h. pagers
- i. uniforms
- j. narcotics dogs/horses
- k. bullet proof vests
- l. breathalyzers
- m. radar guns
- n. video cameras
- o. phone lines and voice mail systems
- p. educational material
- q. televisions/VCRs
- r. indirect costs
- s. all equipment and technology (unallowable for MORE 2000 only)
- t. overtime (unallowable for all MORE programs except MORE '95)

#### D. Source and Amount of Matching Funds

##### DEFINITION

In the absence of a local match waiver (discussed below), the grantee is obligated to match a portion of the costs of the program, project, or activity as funded by the COPS program. With the exception of the CIS Program (see below), grant awards may cover only up to 75% of the project costs over the grant period as outlined in the application submission; therefore, the grantee must contribute at least 25% of total project costs unless a waiver is obtained from the COPS Office. Waivers are approved on a case-by-case basis based on severe fiscal distress. Qualifying agencies may receive a partial waiver of which 90% of the project costs are paid by federal funds, with a corresponding 10% local match, or a full waiver in which 100% of the project costs are paid with federal funds.

Any required local match must be fully paid before the end of the grant funding period. The grantee should be able to identify the source of matching funds, the amount paid, and the timing of the payments. The local match requirement follows the logic that the COPS Program supplies "seed" money to law enforcement agencies to initiate or enhance community policing.

For the CIS Program, however, a local match is not required. The CIS Program, funds school resource officer salary and benefits over the three-year grant period with an increased funding cap of \$125,000 per officer. Additional salary or benefits must be paid with State or local funds. No other local match is required.



## CONDITIONS

The Hiring and MORE grant awards have different compliance conditions for the local match requirement:

For Hiring grant awards (AHEAD, FAST, UHP), the COPS grant will provide up to 75% of an entry-level salary and benefits package over three years with a maximum of \$75,000 per position. Grantees are responsible for at least 25% of the salary and fringe benefit package through the local match. If a particular COPS officer's salary is not entry level due to experience (i.e., a lateral hire from another jurisdiction), academic attributes, or other reasons, any portion of the salaries or fringe benefits that is above entry-level must be provided by the grantee in addition to the required local match. CIS grantees, while not otherwise required to pay a local match, are responsible for any additional costs for entry-level salaries and benefits over the maximum of \$125,000 (over three years) per officer.

For all MORE grant awards, the COPS grant will provide up to 75% of the allowable costs for equipment and technology and civilian support services under the grant guidelines. Grantees are responsible for contributing at least 25% of the remaining costs. For civilian hires, the COPS grant will provide up to 75% of the salaries and approved benefits packages. Unlike the Hiring grant programs, the 75% reimbursement is not based upon entry-level salary and benefits, but is based, instead, on the actual salary and benefits packages of the approved civilian positions.

For Hiring and MORE grantees, if the total project costs actually incurred by the grantee are higher than the costs anticipated in the approved grant application, the grantee must pay for the additional costs with State and/or local funds. If the actual project costs are lower than originally anticipated, grantees (except CIS grantees) still must ensure that they contributed the legally required minimum 25% of actual project costs with State and/or local funds (in the absence of a local match waiver).

### **Local Match Guidelines**

There are several guidelines that must be observed by grantees when meeting the local match requirement, regardless of the type of grant awarded. One of these guidelines concerns the minimum required level of local matching throughout the life of the grant. For MORE grants, the grantee is responsible for at least 25% of the total cost of



allowable items. For hiring grants (with the exception of CIS), the local share also must be at least 25% of the total cost of salaries and fringe benefits over the three-year funding period.

Moreover, for Hiring grants (excluding CIS) the percentage of total officers' salaries and benefits paid with Federal funds must decrease each year while the local match increases accordingly (the "decreasing Federal share" concept). For example, if the award amount were \$75,000, with a required local match of \$25,000 (based on a total entry-level salary and benefit package of \$100,000 over three years), the grantee might spend \$30,000 in Federal money the first year, with a \$3,000 local match. The following year the grantee might spend \$25,000 in Federal funds, with an \$8,000 match; the third year the remaining \$20,000 of the Federal funds would be spent, with a \$14,000 local match. As illustrated by this example, the Federal share decreased each year while the local match correspondingly increased.

An additional guideline to follow concerns the type and source of the match. The type of match must be a cash match and the source of funding may not be Federal unless specifically authorized by Federal statute. The funding for local match must be in addition to funds previously budgeted for law enforcement purposes and may not have come from other COPS grants or supplements. The grantee must be able to identify the source of their matching funds. Ideally, it is beneficial if a grantee proactively documents the specific source for and timing of the local match, such as a separate line item in the local budget.

Further, all COPS grant local matches must be paid in cash; for example, grantees may not count equipment costs outside of the programmatically approved project towards the local match. For example, if a MORE project costs a total of \$100,000 for computers, software, and installation, the applicant must pay \$25,000 of these costs (25% of total project costs) as the local match. The local jurisdiction may not substitute non-project expenditures, such as training officers on the use of equipment, as the match.

Grantees must also be able to demonstrate that they budgeted the additional funds to pay for the local match after the grant award start date or, if prior to that date, (a) in specific anticipation of receiving the COPS grant award or (b) as reserve or discretionary monies that were not otherwise budgeted for a specific law enforcement purpose, in addition to funds previously budgeted for law enforcement purposes. If the supporting documentation clearly indicates that



either of these conditions exists, the grantee may use those funds as an acceptable source for the local cash match. If the documentation cannot support a causal link between the budgeted funds and the anticipation of the grant award, or if the funds are not in addition to funds previously budgeted for specific law enforcement purposes, there is a violation of the matching funds requirement.

It should also be noted that grantees are excused from either the whole or a portion of the local cash match if the law enforcement agency has obtained a local match waiver from the COPS Office. Only a small portion of waiver requests are granted and they are considered at the time of application or post award if the community can prove severe financial distress or other severe mitigating factors. Grantees who receive a waiver should have a copy of the COPS Office's notification of the approved waiver on site with their grant records.

#### **Examples – Acceptable Sources of Matching Funds:**

- New Local Appropriations;
- State Funds: it is permissible to use State funds only if allowable by State law;
- Other Federal Funds: it is permissible to use Federal funds only if specifically; authorized by Federal statute (e.g., funds appropriated for Indian tribal governments or the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) performing law enforcement functions on Indian lands; funds received through the Assets Forfeiture equitable sharing program; or funds awarded by another Federal agency whose statute specifies that those funds may be used as local match to other Federal grants)
- Other State or local Grant Funds: it is permissible to use other State or local grant funds as local match only if allowable by that particular State or local grant program
- Reserved, Discretionary, and Other Undesignated State or local funds

## **E. Supplanting**

### **DEFINITION**

For the purpose of COPS grants, supplanting means using COPS grant funds to replace State, local or BIA funds which otherwise would have been spent on the specific law enforcement purpose of the COPS grant award. To comply with the nonsupplanting requirement, COPS grant funds must supplement the budget of the



law enforcement agency, not replace any currently, historically, or future appropriated funds for the grant purposes. For example, COPS Hiring grant funds may not replace State or local funding for hiring sworn officers and COPS MORE funds may not replace State or local funding for purchasing equipment or technology or for hiring civilians that would have been budgeted in the absence of receiving COPS grant funding.

The nonsupplanting requirement of the COPS statute reads as follows:

Funds made available under [the COPS statute] to States or units of local government shall not be used to supplant State or local funds, or, in the case of Indian tribal governments, funds supplied by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), but shall be used to increase the amount of funds that would, in the absence of Federal funds received under [the COPS statute], be made available from State or local sources, or in the case of Indian tribal governments, from funds supplied by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. 42 U.S.C. § 3796dd-3(a)

#### CONDITIONS

Regardless of the type of grant, complying with the nonsupplanting requirement entails using COPS grant funds to increase the level of State, local, or Bureau of Indian Affairs funds that would be made available for the grant purposes in the absence of the grant (the "baseline" level of funding). For Hiring grants, the increased level of funding pertains to hiring new officers. For MORE grants, the level of increased funding applies to purchasing equipment and technology, hiring civilians, or, under the MORE '95 program, funding overtime.

Generally speaking, this means that grantees must (a) use their grant funds to hire officers or civilians or purchase equipment or technology after the grant award start date (unless COPS specifically authorizes the use of funds for pre-award hires or purchases) and (b) use their grant funds to increase the amount of local funds otherwise budgeted and expended for the specific grant purpose by hiring additional officers or civilians, or purchasing additional equipment and technology, and taking active and timely steps during the grant periods to fill vacancies that arise among their locally-funded sworn forces or civilian personnel.

While these general requirements apply to COPS grantees, they may still demonstrate compliance with the nonsupplanting requirement even if they (a) use funds to pay for officers or civilians hired pre-award, or equipment or technology purchased pre-award, as long as



the grantee can demonstrate that the individuals were hired, or the items purchased, in specific anticipation of receiving the grant funds (and, therefore, that no State, local, or BIA funds were already budgeted for those hires or purchases); or (b) reduce their local budgets for sworn personnel, civilians, or equipment/technology (as applicable per specific grant program), as long as the grantee can demonstrate that the reductions in State, local, or BIA funding occurred for reasons unrelated to the receipt of COPS grant funds (and therefore that no State, local, or BIA funds would have remained in the budget for those purposes even in the absence of the COPS grant).

The supplanting analysis is therefore generally a two-step process:

- (1) do facts exist that "look like" possible supplanting? (e.g., COPS funds paid to an officer or civilian hired pre-award; reductions in local funding for sworn officers during the life of an active COPS Hiring grant); if so,
- (2) can the grantee demonstrate either that (a) it would not have hired the officers or civilians, or purchased the equipment or technology, pre-award unless it had anticipated the receipt of the COPS grant because it had no State, local, or BIA funds budgeted for that purpose? (In the case of pre-award hires or purchases); or (b) it would have reduced its budget for sworn officers, civilians, or equipment/technology purchases, as applicable, for reasons unrelated to the COPS grant, even if the grant had not been awarded? (In the case of budget reductions).

If the grantee can demonstrate these circumstances, it has not violated the nonsupplanting requirement – despite the facts that may at first "look like" supplanting – because it has shown that the COPS funds did not actually supplant (replace) State, local, or BIA funds that otherwise would have been spent on those purposes.

Fact patterns which might "look like" possible supplanting violations and trigger a further review occur in four primary areas:

- Hiring sworn officers or civilians or purchasing equipment/technology, depending on the type of grant, **before** the award date of the grant.
- Delays in filling vacant locally-funded sworn officer positions or civilian positions, depending on the type of grant.
- Decreases in the baseline level of funding for sworn officers, civilians or equipment/technology during the grant period.



- Decreases in the baseline level of sworn officer or civilian positions during the grant period.

### **Hiring Sworn Officers or Civilians or Purchasing Approved Technology and Equipment before the Award Date of the Grant**

Except for AHEAD and FAST recipients, grantees are prohibited from using COPS grant funds to pay for officers or civilians who are hired prior to the award start date of the grant without written approval from the COPS Office. AHEAD and FAST grant recipients were prohibited from using grant funds to pay for officers hired before the approved hiring start date (AHEAD: 10/1/94; FAST: 2/8/95), which differed from the start date of these awards. To obtain such approval, the grantee must provide documentation, from the time of the pre-award hiring, that proves that the additional officers or civilians were hired in specific anticipation of receiving COPS grant funds and were not otherwise funded with State, local, or BIA funds.

Acceptable forms of documentation may include (and must be dated on or about the time of the pre-award hiring):

- Internal departmental memoranda linking the hiring to the anticipated COPS grant funding;
- Governmental memoranda linking the hiring to the anticipated COPS grant funding;
- Documentation provided to the officers or civilians in question explaining that continued employment is contingent upon receiving grant funds; and/or
- Budget documentation demonstrating that the positions in question were not funded with State, local, or BIA funds (or were funded with anticipated incoming COPS grant funds)

The same provisions for hiring also apply to the purchase of approved technology and equipment before the award date of a MORE grant. If grantees acquired (or signed a binding contract to acquire) the technology and equipment that was requested on the grant application before the award date, documentation from the time of the pre-award purchase is required to prove that the purchase was in anticipation of the grant funding. The examples of acceptable documentation for Hiring grants can also be used to support the relationship between the purchased items and the anticipated grant award for MORE grants. In addition, MORE grantees may have contracts with vendors (or may be able to obtain copies of such documents from the vendors) showing that completion of the purchase was contingent upon the grantee's receipt of COPS grant funds.

### **Exception to Pre-Award Hiring Prohibition: Part-time to Full-time Promotions**

A unique exception to the pre-award or pre-approval hiring date requirement is the promotion of a previously locally-funded (and, therefore, usually hired pre-award) part-time officer or civilian to full-time status under the COPS grant. In this circumstance, the grantee should obtain written authorization from the COPS Office for this use of funds and must hire a new officer or new civilian with local funds to backfill the vacant part-time position **before** expending COPS funds on the full-time position. COPS Hiring or MORE grant funds may not be expended on the new full-time position until the grantee has backfilled the part-time vacancy with a new hire using local funding.

If the supporting documentation, or lack thereof, reveals that the pre-award hiring or the purchase of technology and equipment was not a direct result of anticipated grant funds, but would have occurred regardless of the grant availability, or if a grantee promoted a locally-funded officer or civilian from part-time to a full-time COPS grant position, but did not "backfill" the resulting part-time vacancy with local funds, a supplanting violation has occurred.

### **Requirements for Written Approval**

Under any "early hire" or "early purchase" situation, or promotions from a locally-funded part-time to full-time COPS-funded position, COPS grantees are required by their Grant Conditions to seek written prior approval from the COPS Office for the requested use of funds. Grantees who failed to obtain prior written approval from the COPS Office before using COPS grant funding for pre-award hires or purchases must seek a retroactive review of their use of funding to determine compliance.

### **Delays in Filling Vacant Locally-funded Sworn Officer Positions or Civilian Positions**

COPS grantees also must take active and timely steps through their standard recruiting and hiring procedures to fill vacancies arising in their locally-funded sworn officer or civilian (depending on the type of grant) positions. Any delay in filling locally-funded vacancies must not be a direct result of receiving grant funds.



A situation independent of the grant may prevent the grantee from adhering to historical practices, such as a local hiring freeze, pending litigation, or an officer's deployment to military leave, and result in a delay in filling locally-funded vacancies. If grantees deviate from their standard hiring procedures in these or other cases, documentation should demonstrate the reasons for the deviation. If, after reviewing all pertinent documentation, the grantee has demonstrated that the delays occurred for a reason unrelated to the COPS grant, then a supplanting violation has not occurred.

If grantees do not have formal documented procedures for hiring and recruiting, historical practices may be used as evidence of standard procedures. In the situation where grantees have continued to follow those historical practices for filling vacancies in locally-funded positions during the period of the grant, the nonsupplanting requirement is met.

For grantees without formal written guidelines, the following items are examples of information that could be considered in evaluating "active recruiting and timely filling of vacant locally-funded positions":

- If the grantee typically hires replacement law enforcement officers from a civil service list of certified candidates, confirmation from the grantee or a civil service official showing that the grantee followed historical practices in requesting, reviewing, and/or interviewing from the list during the grant period;
  - If the grantee hires replacements to coincide with State, local, or law enforcement agency training academies, verification from the grantee or an academy official showing that the grantee followed similar practices after the grant award date;
  - If the grantee claims that high turnover rates make it difficult to fill all vacancies quickly, evidence from prior to the grant period showing that the high turnover rates reflect the grantee's historical hiring and attrition patterns;
  - If the grantee is filling both COPS positions and locally-funded positions, both should be filled at approximately the same rate. If a grantee fills COPS vacancies at an unreasonably faster rate, it must justify that its reasons for doing so are unrelated to the receipt of COPS grant funding.
  - To meet the timing of school years, grantees may hire new, additional officers to fill CIS-funded vacancies prior to filling locally-funded, non-school resource sworn officer vacancies, as long as the grantee is continuing to take active and timely steps to fill local sworn officer vacancies.
-



The existence of locally-funded vacancies (of any number) during the grant period is not, by itself, a violation of grant requirements, as long as the grantee can demonstrate that it is taking active and timely steps to fill those vacancies or that delays in filling the positions are unrelated to the receipt of COPS grant funds.

Grantees experiencing a delay in filling locally-funded vacancies may contact the COPS Office to request written guidance on whether the delay complies with the nonsupplanting requirement.

### **Decrease in the Baseline Level of Funding**

The goal of both the Hiring and MORE grants is to increase the "baseline" level of State, local, or Bureau of Indian Affairs funds which would otherwise be budgeted for sworn officers (Hiring grants) and civilians or equipment (MORE grants), with COPS grant funds. For the purposes of the COPS Program, the determinant for a possible supplanting violation includes both the level of funding and the level of sworn officer positions (Hiring grants) and civilian positions (MORE grants).

To determine the baseline level, the State, local, or BIA funding for sworn officer or civilian positions (depending on the type of grant) and number of sworn officer or civilian positions must be measured as of each grant's threshold review date. (See Appendix C for the applicable review date for each type of COPS grant.) This level should be reviewed for each fiscal year during the grant period to determine whether any additional State, local, or BIA funding was budgeted for additional positions after the original threshold date. If the baseline funding increased during the grant period, the highest documented level of State, local, or BIA funding or positions for sworn officers or civilians should be used as the new baseline level from that date forward during the remainder of the grant and retention periods.

If, during the grant period, the State, local, or BIA baseline level of funding or number of sworn officer or civilian positions has decreased, the grantee must be able to demonstrate (with supporting documentation) that the reduction in funding or force occurred for a reason unrelated to the receipt of COPS funding (such as fiscal distress, civilianization of sworn positions, or a management reorganization unrelated to COPS) to comply with the nonsupplanting requirement. Acceptable forms of supporting documentation may include, but are not limited to:



- State, city or county council meeting minutes;
- Internal departmental budget directives;
- Internal law enforcement agency documents;
- Independent management studies recommending reductions;
- Documentation for other local agencies outlining budget reductions; and
- Evidence that, although the number of baseline officer positions may have decreased during the grant period, the level of State, local, or BIA funds for those positions did not decrease (as a result of increasing officer salary costs, for example, or because fewer part-time officers were assigned to cover hours previously worked by a higher number of part-time officers)

### **Impact of Failure to Retain on Supplanting Analysis**

An agency, with multiple COPS Hiring grants, which fails to retain officer positions following the expiration of one Hiring grant, may be in violation of the nonsupplanting requirement on its later Hiring grants for an unjustified reduction in baseline officers. For example, a failure to retain, one (1) COPS FAST officer position, which otherwise would have been retained with local funding, may result in an unapproved baseline reduction for the active UHP grant, since the retained COPS FAST officer position should have **increased** the UHP grant baseline by one position. To comply with the nonsupplanting requirement, the grantee must demonstrate that the failure to retain the FAST officer position with State, local, or BIA funds, upon grant expiration, occurred for reasons unrelated to the UHP grant.

If the grant award is for part-time officers or civilian support services, the baseline funding level analysis is still applicable. However, due to the generally more frequently fluctuating number of part-time officer or civilian positions, a supplanting analysis should always include an evaluation of the overall amount of State and/or local funds budgeted and expended on part-time sworn officer or civilian law enforcement coverage (rather than simply the number of part-time positions).

It is important to note that a nonsupplanting violation only occurs if a grantee reduces its locally-funded law enforcement budget (and corresponding number of positions) as a direct result of receiving COPS funding. To verify compliance, grantees are required to demonstrate that any reduction in local funding for sworn officers and civilians, or a reduction in the number of sworn officer and civilian positions, is unrelated to the receipt of COPS funds.

**Examples – Supplanting Situations:**

- Grantee delays filling locally-funded vacancies as a result of receiving COPS funds for additional sworn officers (or civilians, depending on the grant).
- Grantee reduces its budget of State, local, or BIA funds for sworn personnel (or civilians, depending on the grant) as a direct result of receiving COPS funds.
- Grantee fails to retain an officer on an early Hiring grant while implementing other active Hiring grant(s), resulting in a failure to increase its locally-funded baseline (by the retained position) for the active grant(s).

**F. Reporting**

## DEFINITION

Two types of reports are required from grantees: 1) Program Progress Reports; and 2) Financial Status Reports. Reports are survey instruments that the COPS Office uses to monitor grants. For Hiring grants, these Progress Reports request information about the status of the grant in terms of selection, hiring and training; characteristics of the officers hired; descriptions of officer activities; and general information about the department. The MORE Program requires submission of one MORE Progress Report detailing background information on the department, equipment and technology purchasing and information on civilian hiring. The Financial Status Reports (required of both Hiring and MORE grantees) request information on monies spent, including amounts for Federal expenditures, local matching contributions, and the unobligated balance of the award.

The type of Program Progress Reports required depends on the type of grant award. During the period of December 1999 to November 2003, the Hiring grants (except CIS) required two reports: 1) Department Initial Report; and 2) Department Annual Report. Effective November 1, 2003, the Department Initial Reports were discontinued. Currently, the Hiring grantees are required to submit Department Annual Reports. The CIS program does not require a Department Initial Report and may require less frequent submission of the Department Annual Reports. The MORE grants require only one Progress Report.



## CONDITIONS

The type of progress reports required depend on whether the grant is COPS Hiring or MORE. Financial Status Reports require the same format for all grants. Grantees are required to complete the Financial Status Reports for every quarter of the active grant period even if the grant has been in effect for only a portion of the reporting period and no money has been drawn down.

**Department Initial Report: Hiring.** Grants awarded between December 1999 to November 2003 were required to submit a Department Initial Report if the department has never previously received a COPS Hiring grant. Only one report is required per agency for the life of the grant. The exception to this is for agencies that have received both a Phase I and other Hiring grant(s). If this is the case, the department was required to submit one Department Initial Report for the Phase I grant and is also required to submit a separate one for the other Hiring grant(s) (except for the CIS program, which does not require an Initial Report as well as Hiring grants awarded after November 2003). This report solicits information regarding pre-grant data, which serves as a baseline for measuring the grantee's future progress in community policing. Information gathered addresses the grantee's training curriculum, demographics of police force, and community policing activities. The Department Initial Report also collects information about a department's actual and budgeted number of locally-funded officers.

A hard copy of the Department Initial Report is sent to all UHP grantees within 30 days of receiving an award packet if a grant is awarded for the first time. The report is due back to the COPS Office within 45 days of receipt of the award packet by the grantee.

As noted above, the CIS grant program and the Hiring grant program after November 2003 does not have an Initial Report requirement.

**Department Annual Report: Hiring.** The Department Annual Report (DAR) solicits information concerning the status of the implementation of the grant. Questions on this report include demographics of police force, retention plans, and community policing programs and activities.

A hard copy of the Department Annual Report is mailed to all grantees with an active UHP grant. (As noted previously, the CIS program may require less frequent submission of the Department Annual Report.) Department Annual Reports are mailed in December



of each year, for the reporting period covering January 1 - December 31, throughout the life of the grant. These reports are due in February of each year.

**COPS Count.** During the survey, a sample of COPS MORE grant recipients are contacted by the COPS Office and asked for information regarding the status of their grants as of a selected date. This survey information is then summarized and compared with the total number of civilians and equipment funded as of the same selected date. Specific survey information includes; updates on the status of grant funded civilian personnel and equipment as well as redeployment dates and related questions for MORE grants; and grantee plans concerning future hiring of civilians and redeployment.

**Progress Report: MORE.** The MORE Progress Report requires the grantee to provide information about the enhanced levels of community policing that have resulted from the purchase of equipment and/or the hiring of civilian personnel funded under the COPS MORE Grant Program. The information from this report will be used to monitor each grantee's progress and to provide summary data on the project supported with COPS MORE funding.

The report must be completed by the grantee even if it has not hired the civilian personnel or purchased the equipment awarded under the COPS MORE Program. The reports are mailed approximately 12-18 months after the original award start date. These reports are to be returned within 45 days of their receipt.

**Financial Status Reports.** All COPS grantees are required to submit quarterly Financial Status Reports (FSRs) using a Standard Form 269A (SF-269A). This report reflects the actual federal monies and unliquidated obligations incurred, local matching contributions, and the unobligated balance of federal funds.

COPS grantees are encouraged to submit their FSRs online. Effective June 1, 2004, the COPS Office discontinued sending preprinted blast faxes of SF-269As to grantees, due to the ability to submit online. While grantees are encouraged to submit their SF-269As through the web-based system, we will continue to accept SF-269 through the Control Desk by mail and fax. The fax number for the Financial Status Reports Control desk is (202) 616-9004. Mailed reports should be addressed to the U.S. Department of Justice, Financial Status Reports Control Desk, 1100 Vermont Avenue, NW 6th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20530.



FSRs must be submitted no later than 45 days after the last day of each quarter as follows:

<b>Reporting Quarter</b>	<b>Date Due</b>
Jan 1 - Mar 1	May 15
April 1 - June 30	Aug 14
July 1 - Sept 30	Nov 14
Oct 1 - Dec 31	Feb 14

This report requests information on total monies spent, the breakdown by Federal expenditure and local match, and unobligated amounts. All Financial Status Reports must be completed and sent to the COPS Office no later than 45 days following each calendar quarter. Grantees who do not submit a SF-269A by the due date will be unable to drawdown funds. The payment systems contain an edit that checks for SF-269A delinquency and will reject a drawdown attempt if the report is not up to date.

For general information concerning on-line filing of a SF-269A reports, go to [www.ojp.usdoj.gov/oc](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/oc) or contact the COPS Office Response Center by phone at 800.421.6770 for additional technical assistance or by e-mail at [askCOPSRC@usdoj.gov](mailto:askCOPSRC@usdoj.gov).

**Final Reports.** Final programmatic reports are intended to capture the history of the grant and ensure completion of the required project. Hiring and MORE grantees are required to submit final programmatic reports and final Financial Status reports to the COPS Office so that COPS may officially close out the grant award. Final Financial Status Reports should reflect the total amount of Federal expenditures, total amount of matching contributions, and the amount of unobligated funds, if any. Any unobligated or unspent funds must be returned to the COPS Office and will be deobligated from the award amount.

## G. Training: A Special Condition for CIS Grantees

### DEFINITION

#### **COPS in Schools (CIS) Grantees**

All COPS in Schools awards contain an additional grant condition that requires the officers deployed into the schools as a result of the CIS grant and one designated school administrator per grant to attend COPS-sponsored School Resource Officer (SRO) Training.

Notification of this added grant condition is sent to the grantee with the grant award. Departments are encouraged to attend the training in



the early stages of the grant, but, in all cases, departments must complete their training by the end of the grant award period.

Under the actual grant condition, the SRO(s) deployed to work in the schools as a result of the grant and one school administrator, representing the lead partnering agency, are required to attend this team-based training. Since this is a team-based training, it is encouraged that both the school administrator and the SRO(s) attend the training together; however, the COPS Office recognizes the difficulty in scheduling such an event. Therefore, as long as both the SRO(s) deployed into the school and the representing school administrator each attend a training session sponsored by the COPS Office prior to the end of the grant period, the grant recipient is in compliance with this training condition.

Only the training sponsored by the COPS Office will satisfy this additional grant condition. The COPS Office Grants Administration Division reserves the right to approve all participants to ensure proper representatives attend the training, thereby satisfying the grant condition. Costs, including training, per diem, travel and lodging, up to a maximum of \$1,200 per trainee, will be reimbursed to the grantee by the COPS Office.

## H. Timesavings for Redeployment

### DEFINITION

Timesavings for redeployment applies to the MORE Grant Programs. Redeployment occurs when sworn officers, currently employed by the grantee law enforcement agency, become available to participate in community policing as a direct result of the timesavings achieved by the purchase of technology or equipment or the hiring of civilian support staff.

Prior to the MORE 2002 program, all MORE grantees were required to demonstrate their compliance with this requirement by formally tracking the officer full-time-equivalent hours ("officer FTEs") redeployed into community policing as a result of the MORE project. Redeployment of officer FTEs applies to sworn officers, currently employed by the grantee, who will be able to enhance community policing activities as a direct result of the timesavings resulting from the purchase of the technology, equipment, overtime, or support services. Some MORE grantees with overtime and civilian hire grants received funding renewals for an additional 12 or 24 months and were required to demonstrate continued timesavings and redeployment of



officers during the renewal funding periods. As of the MORE 2002 program, formal tracking of redeployment is no longer required, though MORE 2002 grantees are still expected to redeploy sworn officers into community policing as a result of the timesavings generated by the MORE-funded project.

#### CONDITIONS

To meet the redeployment grant condition, applicants must ensure that the timesaving for redeployment that results from COPS MORE funding, enhances community policing activities.

- Agencies funded prior to fiscal year 2002 (MORE 2001 and previous programs) must track timesavings and the redeployment of FTEs into the community policing program after full implementation to demonstrate that, as a result of the grant award, community policing is being enhanced; however, there is no requirement to track every hour of time saved to every hour of community policing.
- Agencies funded in fiscal year 2002 and later (MORE 2002 and any later programs) are not required to track timesavings and redeployment formally, but still must ensure that the officer timesavings resulting from the grant project is enhancing community policing.

The timesavings for redeployment results from the purchase of: 1) technology or equipment; 2) civilians; and 3) overtime (for the MORE '95 program only). Technology or equipment timesavings are the amount of officer's time that the technology or equipment frees up by its use. Civilian timesavings are the amount of time saved by an officer whose position is filled by a newly hired civilian. Overtime timesavings (for the MORE '95 program only) resulted from paying currently employed sworn officers overtime compensation for working additional hours beyond the normal workweek to engage in community policing activities.

Each MORE grantee's specific FTE redeployment requirement is located on the award document. The COPS Office standard for a full-time-equivalent sworn officer equals 1,824 hours. The COPS Office recognizes that, due to differences in shift hours, there may be slight variances in the number of officers redeployed between a grantee and the COPS Office standard formula for calculating redeployment.

**Tracking Timesavings: MORE 2001 and Previous MORE Programs.** Agencies granted an award under the MORE 2001 Program and all previous MORE programs are required to plan and



track timesavings for redeployment realized from the equipment, technology, civilians, or overtime (only for MORE '95 recipients) awarded. (This tracking requirement does not apply to the MORE 2002 and any subsequent MORE programs, although those grantees must still ensure that the officer timesavings resulting from the grant project, is enhancing community policing through redeployment.)

Once the grant is implemented and fully operational (i.e., technology and equipment is purchased, installed and operational, or civilians have been hired) as determined by the law enforcement agency, these grantees must complete a timesavings tracking plan. This tracking plan describes the grantee's methodology for measuring the timesavings for each item, system or group of like items requested and received by the grantee.

For equipment/technology awards, actual tracking, pursuant to the plan, will begin after such single stand-alone, independent element, function, or operation in a geographic area is fully implemented as contained in the plan. For civilian awards, tracking should begin once the employee or employees have been trained and the sworn officers redeployed. Tracking must continue for at least one full year from the date that the grant project is implemented and declared fully operational. This 12-month period is necessary for the agency to achieve the total timesavings required by the one-year MORE grant program.

Information on developing and implementing redeployment tracking plans may be obtained from a COPS grant program specialist or can be found on the COPS MORE Home Page at [www.cops.usdoj.gov](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov).

No one method to track timesavings can adequately cover all situations and all jurisdictions because each jurisdiction varies in size and each situation varies in complexity. Tracking methods can vary from estimating hours saved to directly tracking hours. The tracking method for timesavings should, at least, demonstrate the time that was spent on duties prior to the grant award (without the additional grant-funded equipment or technology or civilian personnel) and how much time is spent on those same duties after the grant award when the grant-funded equipment or technology or civilian personnel are operational. To assist with tracking redeployment, grantees can use baseline time data prior to grant implementation.

All MORE 2001 and previous MORE grantees must maintain the details of worksheets, studies, or any other written evidence that was used to track timesavings. These grantees may be required to produce redeployment tracking plans and supporting timesavings tracking documentation during any monitoring or audit site visits.



Sworn officers who are redeployed into community policing under a MORE grant should be aware of the community policing activities that are part of the local department's strategy. These are the activities that officers should carry out as a result of time saved. Timesavings should initiate or enhance community policing activities that have been approved through the grant program; however, not every hour of timesavings needs to be committed to a specific "community policing activity."

**Elements of a Tracking Plan.** Tracking plans must include a statement explaining how time is being saved, as well as an explanation of the tracking method used. Also, plans should include the method used to track timesavings (estimation, direct tracking sample, study, etc.), the hours to complete the activity before and after the equipment or technology or civilian personnel are implemented, and a short description of enhanced community policing activities resulting from the timesavings. Finally, the plan should include an explanation of how the time saved through this grant will allow the agency to enhance its community policing efforts.

Once fully operational, and timesavings has been tracked, a determination can be made about the actual total hours saved. (For examples of tracking timesaving, see Appendix D.) It should also be noted that a grantee is required to meet the Full-time Equivalencies (FTEs) as demonstrated on their award document.

To demonstrate compliance in reaching required levels of redeployment, grantees must demonstrate satisfactory progress in implementing their COPS MORE grants. (The following is true of any grant, not just MORE.) Unjustifiable delays in grant implementation may result in a finding of noncompliance (and possibly termination of the grant award) if grantees are unable to document satisfactory progress in implementing the grant program (e.g., by documenting the time line of a lengthy procurement process).