



OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET

Brian P. Kemp
Governor

Rick Dunn
Director

Capital Expenditure Written Justification

For projects with total expected capital expenditures of \$1 million or greater, recipients must complete and meet the substantive requirements of a Written Justification for their capital expenditure, except for Tribal governments as discussed below. This Written Justification helps clarify the application of this interpretive framework to capital expenditures, while recognizing that the needs of communities differ. In particular, this justification reflects the fact that the time required for a large construction project may make capital expenditures less responsive to pandemic-related needs relative to other types of responses. In addition, as discussed in section Timeline for Use of SLFRF Funds of this Supplemental Information, SLFRF funds must be obligated by December 31, 2024 and expended by December 31, 2026. Capital expenditures may involve long leadtimes, and the Written Justification may support recipients in analyzing proposed capital expenditures to confirm that they conform to the obligation and expenditure timing requirements.

Further, such large projects may be less likely to be reasonably proportional to the harm identified. For example, construction of a new, larger public facility for the purpose of increasing the ability to socially distance generally would not be considered a reasonably proportional response compared to other less time- and resource-intensive options that may be available and would be equally or more effective. Other solutions, such as improvements in ventilation, could be made more quickly and are typically more cost effective than construction of a new, larger facility. The needs of communities differ, and recipients are responsible for identifying uses of SLFRF funds that best respond to these needs. The Written Justification recognizes this while also establishing consistent documentation and reporting to support monitoring and compliance with the ARPA and final rule. Finally, the Written Justification also reflects the fact that infrastructure projects are generally not within scope of this eligible use category.

The Written Justification should (1) describe the harm or need to be addressed; (2) explain why a capital expenditure is appropriate to address the harm or need; and (3) compare the proposed capital expenditure against alternative capital expenditures that could be made. The information required for the Written Justification reflects the framework applicable to all uses under the public health and negative economic impacts eligible use category, providing justification for the reasonable design, relatedness, and reasonable proportionality of the capital expenditure in response to the harm or impact identified.

Recipients that complete analyses with minimal or no quantitative data should provide an explanation for doing so. In determining whether their proposed capital expenditure is superior to alternative capital expenditures, recipients should consider the following factors against each selected alternative.

- a. A comparison of the effectiveness of the capital expenditures in addressing the harm identified. Recipients should generally consider the effectiveness of the capital expenditures in addressing the harm over the useful life of the capital asset and may consider metrics such as the number of impacted or disproportionately



OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET

Brian P. Kemp

Governor

Rick Dunn

Director

impacted individuals or entities served, when such individuals or entities are estimated to be served, the relative time horizons of the project, and consideration of any uncertainties or risks involved with the capital expenditure.

- b. A comparison of the expected total cost of the capital expenditures. Recipients should consider the expected total cost of the capital expenditure required to construct, purchase, install, or improve the capital assets intended to address the public health or negative economic impact of the public health emergency. Recipients should include pre-development costs in their calculation and may choose to include information on ongoing operational costs, although this information is not required.

Recipients should balance the effectiveness and costs of the proposed capital expenditure against alternatives and demonstrate that their proposed capital expenditure is superior. Further, recipients should choose the most cost-effective option unless it substantively reduces the effectiveness of the capital investment in addressing the harm identified.



OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET

Brian P. Kemp
Governor

Rick Dunn
Director

Please complete all fields below:

Project ID:	
Project Name:	
Location Address:	
Location City:	
Location State:	
Location Zip:	
Location County:	

Description of Capital Expenditure

Please complete the following sections. All information should be included in the submission of this document. Additional attachments should not be provided unless requested by OPB.

1. Description of Harm or Need to be Addressed

Instructions: Recipients should provide a description of the specific harm or need to be addressed, and why the harm was exacerbated or caused by the public health emergency. When appropriate, recipients may provide quantitative information on the extent and type of the harm, such as the number of individuals or entities affected.

Justification (3500-character limit):

--



OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET

Brian P. Kemp

Governor

Rick Dunn

Director

2. Explanation of why a capital expenditure is appropriate

Instructions: Provide an independent assessment demonstrating why a capital expenditure is appropriate to address the specified harm or need. This should include an explanation of why existing capital equipment, property, or facilities would be inadequate to addressing the harm or need and why policy changes or additional funding to pertinent programs or services would be insufficient without the corresponding capital expenditures. Recipients are not required to demonstrate that the harm or need would be irremediable but for the additional capital expenditure; rather, they may show that other interventions would be inefficient, costly, or otherwise not reasonably designed to remedy the harm without additional capital expenditure.

Justification (3500-character limit):



OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET

Brian P. Kemp

Governor

Rick Dunn

Director

3. **Comparison of the Proposed Capital Expenditure Against Alternative Capital Expenditures**

Instructions: Recipients should provide an objective comparison of the proposed capital expenditure against at least two alternative capital expenditures and demonstrate why their proposed capital expenditure is superior to alternative capital expenditures that could be made. Specifically, recipients should assess the proposed capital expenditure against at least two alternative types or sizes of capital expenditures that are potentially effective and reasonably feasible. Where relevant, recipients should compare the proposal against the alternative of improving existing capital assets already owned or leasing other capital assets. Recipients should use quantitative data when available, although they are encouraged to supplement with qualitative information and narrative description.

Justification (3500-character limit):

--