

In order for a proposal to be able to compete and be rated by the ESC, it must include the following:

- Any locked facility constructed or renovated with state funding awarded under this program shall include space to provide onsite, in-person visitation capable of meeting or surpassing the minimum number of weekly visits required by state regulations for persons detained in the facility. (Gov. Code § 15820.946 subd. (f))
- Any county applying for financing authority under this program shall include a description of efforts to address sexual abuse in its adult local criminal justice facility constructed or renovated. (Gov. Code §15820.946 subd. (g))

The Proposal structure is designed to allow county applicants to demonstrate how their proposed project meets the need for ALCJFs as stated in SB 844, and how proposed expenditures of public funds meet the identified need and are justified. The presentation of information about the proposed project should allow both applicants and raters to make a step-by-step connection between the need addressed by the project and its associated budget request.

The raters will ask many questions about the proposed project as they evaluate, including but not limited to:

- What need is the project designed to meet?
- What construction work does the county propose is necessary to meet this need?
- How will offender programming and/or treatment be served in the proposed new or renovated facility?
- What is the county plan of action to accomplish the legal, design, and build steps required for this project?
- What is the total project cost, what are the funding sources, and how will the county allocate expenditures of these funds?
- Will the county be prepared to proceed with the project in a timely manner if financing is approved?

SB 844 describes the purpose for which ALCFJ construction financing is to be awarded. Additionally, the legislation states specific factors to be considered in assessing how well a proposal suits those purposes. In each section of the proposal, the rater (1) assesses how well the narrative addresses the general merit factors that apply to this section, and (2) assesses special factors mentioned in the SB 844 legislation as criteria for funding.

- a. General merit is assessed on a 13-point scale:
 - 0 Fails to meet minimum standards for financing

- 1-3 Reaches minimum standards despite deficiencies
- 4-6 Generally adequate
- 7-9 Good
- 10-12 Excellent

- b. Special merit factors are scored from 0 to 4; depending on the factor, it may be scored on a 0-4 range, or as yes/no (0/4).

For an ALCJF construction project, county applicants must answer the following questions:

1. Statement of Need: What are the safety, efficiency, and offender programming and/or treatment needs addressed by this construction proposal? Please cite findings from the needs assessment (through 2019) submitted with this proposal.

General Merit Factors

- A. To what extent does the need described in the proposal match the legislative intent of SB 844?
- B. Does the applicant provide a compelling case for the use of state financing to meet this need?
- C. How well is the description of need supported by evidence provided by the applicant?

2. Scope of Work: Describe the areas, if any, of the current facility to be replaced or renovated, and the nature of the renovation, including the number of cells, offices, classrooms or other programming/treatment spaces to be replaced or added and the basic design of the new or renovated units.

General Merit Factors:

- A. How will the planned replacement, renovation, or new construction meet the needs described in Question 1 (Statement of Need)?
- B. How well does the proposed project plan suit general operational requirements for the type of facility in the proposal, including factors such as safety, security and efficiency?
- C. Where applicable, how well does the proposed project meet specific needs for programming and treatment space?

Special factors (Gov. Code §15820.946 subd. (c)) Funding consideration:

- A. Does the county plan for seeking to replace compacted, outdated, or unsafe housing capacity that will also add treatment space; or,
- B. Does the county plan for seeking to renovate existing or build new facilities that provide adequate space for the provision of treatment and rehabilitation services, including mental health treatment.

- 3. Programming and Services: Describe the programming and/or treatment services currently provided in your facility. Provide the requested data on pretrial inmates and risk-based pretrial release services. Describe the facilities or services to be added as a result of the proposed construction; the objectives of the facilities and services; and the staffing and changes in staffing required to provide the services.**

General Merit Factors:

- A. How clearly described are the facility's current programming and/or treatment services?
- B. If improvements to programming and/or treatment services are expected as a result of the planned construction project:
- Are the improvements to programming and/or treatment services clearly described?
 - How strong is the evidence provided by the applicant that the programming and/or treatment services planned for inmates upon project completion will help reduce recidivism or meet inmates' health and treatment needs while incarcerated?
- C. If improvements are designed to replace compacted, outdated, or unsafe housing capacity:
- How are the program and treatment service needs of the facility population expected or planned to be met?
 - Are the improvements to housing deficiencies clearly described?
 - To what extent will the deficiencies be remedied by the proposed construction?
- D. How thoroughly does the staffing plan and lines of authority (including interagency partnerships, if relevant) in program and treatment management meet operational objectives?

Special Factors (Gov. Code § 15820.946 subd. (b)) Mandatory Criterion:

- A. The county provided documentation that states the percentage of its inmates on pretrial status between January 1, 2015 and December 31, 2015 in the narrative of question 3.
- B. A description of the county risk-assessment-based pretrial release program is provided in the narrative of question 3.

- 4. Administrative Work Plan: Describe the steps required to accomplish this project. Include a project schedule, list the division/offices including personnel that will be responsible for each phase of the project, and how it will be coordinated among responsible officials both internally and externally.**

General Merit Factors:

- A. How clearly described are the elements of the work plan: timeline, assigned responsibilities, and coordination?
- B. Can the scope of work described in Question 2 (Scope of Work) feasibly be accomplished within the time allotted?

5. Budget Narrative: Describe the amounts and types of funding proposed and why each element is required to carry out the proposed project. Describe how the county will meet its funding contribution (match) requirements for all project costs in excess if the amount of state financing requested and how operational costs (including programming costs) for the facility will be sustained.

General Merit Factors:

- A. Is the allocation of effort in the budget appropriately matched to the objectives described under project need, scope of work, offender treatment and programming, and administrative work plan?
- B. Are the budgeted costs an efficient use of state resources?
- C. Rate the applicant's plan for sustaining operational costs, including programming over the long term.

6. Readiness to Proceed (Gov. Code § 15820.946 subd. (b)(2)) Funding Preference:

- A. Did the county provide a board resolution: 1) authorizing an adequate amount of available matching funds to satisfy the counties' contribution 2) approving the forms of the project documents deemed necessary, as identified by the board (SPWB) to the BSCC, to effectuate the financing authorized by the legislation, 3) authorizing the appropriate signatory or signatories to execute those documents at the appropriate times. The matching funds mentioned in the resolution shall be compatible with the state's lease revenue bond financing. See page X of the Proposal Form and Instructions for more information regarding "compatible funds".

Note: Finance and the SPWB will ultimately make the final determination of any fund sources compatibility with the SPWB's lease revenue bond financing.

- B. Did the county provide documentation evidencing CEQA compliance has been completed? Documentation of CEQA compliance shall be either a final Notice of Determination or a final Notice of Exemption, as appropriate, and a letter from county counsel certifying the associated statute of limitations has expired and either no challenges were filed or identifying any challenges filed and explaining how they have been resolved in a manner that allows the project to proceed as proposed.

The evaluation factors to be used and the maximum points that will be allocated to each factor are shown in the table below.

EVALUATION FACTOR		Scoring Method	Percentage	Weighted Score
1.	Statement of Need	0-12	15%	18
2.	Scope of Work	0-12	10%	12
	SF A/B: Feasible plan to replace compacted housing/expand program/treatment space	0-4		4
3.	Offender Programming and Services	0-12	25%	30
	SF A: Documents pretrial inmate percentage	0/4		4
	SF B: Describes risk assessment-based pretrial release process	0/4		4
4.	Administrative Work Plan	0-12	10%	12
5.	Budget Narrative	0-12	10%	12
6.	A. Readiness: Board Resolution	0/12	15%	18
	B. Readiness: CEQA Compliance	0/12	15%	18
TOTAL POINTS		96	100%	132

Notes:

SF Special Factor
0-12 Scored on a 0 to 12 pt. range
0-4 Scored on a 0 to 4 pt. range
0/4 Scored 4 if pass, 0 if fail
0/12 Scored 12 if pass, 0 if fail