

Contents

Final Rule “Policy Language”	2
Capital Expenditures:.....	3
Capital Expenditures.....	4
Public Comment:	4
Treasury Response:.....	4
Capital Expenditures.....	5
Public Comment:	5
Treasury Response:.....	6
Overview of General Standards	7
Presumptions on Capital Expenditures.....	11
Projects Enumerated as Eligible by Treasury	12
Projects Beyond Those Enumerated as Eligible by Treasury	12
Additional Provisions, Standards, and Definitions	13
Overview of Final Rule.....	15
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES.....	15

Capital Expenditures

Final Rule “Policy Language”

[Final Rule Pg. 4448](#)

§ 35.6 Eligible uses.

(b) Responding to the public health emergency or its negative economic impacts. A recipient may use funds to respond to the public health emergency or its negative economic impacts if the use meets the criteria provided in paragraph (b)(1) of this section or is enumerated in paragraph (b)(3) of this section; provided that, in the case of a use of funds for a capital expenditure under paragraphs (b)(1) or (b)(3) of this section, the use of funds must also meet the criteria provided in paragraph (b)(4) of this section. Treasury may also articulate additional eligible programs, services, or capital expenditures from time to time that satisfy the eligibility criteria of this paragraph (b), which shall be eligible under this paragraph (b).

(1) Identifying eligible responses to the public health emergency or its negative economic impacts.

(i) A program, service, or capital expenditure is eligible under this paragraph (b)(1) if a recipient identifies a harm or impact to a beneficiary or class of beneficiaries caused or exacerbated by the public health emergency or its negative economic impacts and the program, service, or capital expenditure responds to such harm.

(ii) A program, service, or capital expenditure responds to a harm or impact experienced by an identified beneficiary or class of beneficiaries if it is reasonably designed to benefit the beneficiary or class of beneficiaries that experienced the harm or impact and is related and reasonably proportional to the extent and type of harm or impact experienced.

(ii) Responding to the negative economic impacts of the public health emergency for purposes including:

(A) Assistance to households and individuals, including:

(iv) Capital expenditures and other services to address vacant or abandoned properties;

(B) Assistance to small businesses, including:

(1) Programs, services, or capital expenditures that respond to the negative economic impacts of the COVID–19 public health emergency, including loans or grants to mitigate financial hardship such as declines in revenues or impacts of periods of business closure, or providing technical assistance; and

(2) A program, service, capital expenditure, or other assistance that responds to disproportionately impacted small businesses, including rehabilitation of commercial properties; storefront and facade improvements; technical assistance, business incubators, and grants for start-ups or expansion costs for small businesses; and programs or services to support micro-businesses;

(C) Assistance to nonprofit organizations including programs, services, or capital expenditures, including loans or grants to mitigate financial hardship such as declines in revenues or increased costs, or technical assistance;

(D) Assistance to tourism, travel, hospitality, and other impacted industries for programs, services, or capital expenditures, including support for payroll costs and covered benefits for employees, compensating returning employees, support for operations and maintenance of existing equipment and facilities, and technical assistance; and

(E) Expenses to support public sector capacity and workforce, including:

(4) Capital expenditures. A recipient, other than a Tribal government, must prepare a written justification for certain capital expenditures according to Table 1 to paragraph (b)(4) of this section. Such written justification must include the following elements:

(i) Describe the harm or need to be addressed;

(ii) Explain why a capital expenditure is appropriate; and

(iii) Compare the proposed capital expenditure to at least two alternative capital expenditures and demonstrate why the proposed capital expenditure is superior.

Treasury SLFRF Policy Clarification Resource: Summary of Interim Final Rule Public Comments and Treasury's response.

[Final Rule Pg. 4442](#)

Capital Expenditures:

In the interim final rule, Treasury permitted funds to be used for a limited number of capital expenditures mostly related to the COVID-19 public health response. This decision granted recipients some discretion to use SLFRF funds to address COVID-19 prevention and mitigation through certain investments in equipment, real property, and facilities, which Treasury recognized as critical components of the public health response. In the final rule, Treasury considered maintaining the provisions in the interim final rule or expanding allowable capital expenditures to provide recipients greater flexibility to pursue other capital investments that are responsive to the public health emergency and its negative economic impacts. While expanding allowable capital expenditures may increase the risk that recipients will undertake

large expenditures that do not sufficiently address intended harms, or address harms in a less cost-efficient manner than an alternative investment (e.g., a program or service), expanding allowable capital expenditures would likely help fill critical gaps in recipients' response to the pandemic and provide equipment and facilities that generate benefits beyond SLFRF's period of performance. To preserve flexibility while mitigating risks, the final rule allows recipients to undertake an expanded set of capital expenditures while requiring additional written justifications for projects with an expected total cost at or over \$1 million. Treasury believes this approach balances the implementation of appropriate risk-based compliance requirements and the provision of administrative convenience for smaller capital expenditures, while generally allowing recipients the flexibility to undertake a greater variety of responsive capital expenditures.

Capital Expenditures

Public Comment: Many commenters requested clarification around the types and scope of permissible capital investments in public facilities to meet pandemic operational needs; ventilation improvements in congregate settings, health care settings, or other key locations; and whether support for prevention and mitigation in congregate facilities could include facilities renovations, improvements, or construction of new facilities, or if the facilities must solely be used for COVID-19 response.

Treasury Response: For clarity, Treasury has addressed the eligibility standard for capital expenditures, or investments in property, facilities, or equipment, in one section of this Supplementary Information; see section Capital Expenditures in General Provisions: Other. In recognition of the importance of capital expenditures in the COVID-19 public health response, Treasury enumerates that the following projects are examples of eligible capital expenditures, as long as they meet the standards for capital expenditures in section Capital Expenditures in General Provisions: Other:

- Improvements or construction of COVID-19 testing sites and laboratories, and acquisition of related equipment;
- Improvements or construction of COVID-19 vaccination sites;
- Improvements or construction of medical facilities generally dedicated to COVID-19 treatment and mitigation (e.g., emergency rooms, intensive care units, telemedicine capabilities for COVID-19 related treatment);
- Expenses of establishing temporary medical facilities and other measures to increase COVID-19 treatment capacity, including related construction costs;
- Acquisition of equipment for COVID-19 prevention and treatment, including ventilators, ambulances, and other medical or emergency services equipment;

- Improvements to or construction of emergency operations centers and acquisition of emergency response equipment (e.g., emergency response radio systems);
- Installation and improvements of ventilation systems;
- Costs of establishing public health data systems, including technology infrastructure;
- Adaptations to congregate living facilities, including skilled nursing facilities, other long-term care facilities, incarceration settings, homeless shelters, residential foster care facilities, residential behavioral health treatment, and other group living facilities, as well as public facilities and schools (excluding construction of new facilities for the purpose of mitigating spread of COVID–19 in the facility); and
- Mitigation measures in small businesses, nonprofits, and impacted industries (e.g., developing outdoor spaces).

[Final Rule Pg. 4389](#)

[Capital Expenditures](#)

The interim final rule expressly permitted use of funds for a limited number of capital expenditures that mostly pertained to COVID–19 prevention and mitigation. These included capital investments in public facilities to meet pandemic operational needs, such as physical plant improvements to public hospitals and health clinics; adaptations to public buildings to implement COVID–19 mitigation tactics; ventilation improvements in congregate settings, health care settings, or other key locations; assistance to small businesses and nonprofits and aid to impacted industries to implement COVID–19 prevention or mitigation tactics, such as physical plant changes to enable social distancing. For disproportionately impacted populations and communities, the interim final rule also expressly permitted development of affordable housing to increase the supply of affordable and high-quality living units.

Public Comment: Many commenters supported the interim final rule’s allowance of capital expenditures in facilities to meet pandemic operational needs but requested that the final rule explicitly allow for a broader range of capital expenditures. Commenters expressed an interest in investing in equipment, real property, and facilities that they argued will yield lasting benefits beyond the SLFRF period of performance. Some commenters stated that the approach in the interim final rule limited the vast majority of capital expenditures to governments that experienced revenue loss under Sections 602(c)(1)(C) and 603(c)(1)(C) and that this approach may prevent some governments from fully meeting the needs of their residents. A few commenters argued that Treasury should limit use of funds on capital expenditures not related to addressing a direct pandemic harm, such as general economic development or workforce development, and some expressed support for generally limiting capital expenditures to those that address the needs of low-income communities and communities of color.

Many commenters requested that capital expenditures related to direct COVID–19 public health response be included as enumerated eligible uses. The requested types of expenditures include improvements and construction of hospitals and health clinics (including behavioral health clinics), as well as other health-related infrastructure improvements, such as improvements to medical equipment or public health information technology. These commenters stated that investments in health and public health systems are vital to ensuring critical infrastructure necessary to respond to continued impacts of COVID–19 or to address disparities in health, due to lack of access to health care, that contributed to disproportionate impacts of COVID– 19 on some communities. Further, some commenters requested that construction or improvements of emergency management and public safety facilities be deemed eligible, citing that some of these sites serve as remote vaccination sites or are otherwise crucial to the pandemic public health response.

Commenters also requested use of funds for capital expenditures that support community needs apart from health care, such as new construction or improvements to schools, affordable housing (beyond presumed disproportionately impacted communities), childcare facilities, and community centers; some suggested that all types of projects permissible under the Community Development Block Grant Program should be eligible both for policy and administrability reasons. Further, some commenters also asked for clarification as to whether parks and recreational facilities are eligible if built in certain disproportionately impacted areas, as well as public transportation infrastructure.

Finally, some commenters also requested use of funds for capital expenditures in government administration buildings, such as public courthouses, as well as technology infrastructure that would allow for remote delivery of public benefits. Others also asked about whether funds could be used to renovate vacant business district buildings or commercial spaces to spur economic recovery.

Treasury Response: Capital expenditures, in certain cases, can be appropriate responses to the public health and economic impacts of the pandemic, in addition to programs and services. Like other eligible uses of SLFRF funds in this category, capital expenditures should be a related and reasonably proportional response to a public health or negative economic impact of the pandemic. The final rule clarifies and expands how SLFRF funds may be used for certain capital expenditures, including criteria and documentation requirements specified in this section, as applicable.

Treasury provides presumptions and guidelines for capital expenditures that are enumerated earlier in sections Public Health, Negative Economic Impacts, and General Provisions: Other under the Public Health and Negative Economic Impact eligible use category (“enumerated projects”), along with capital expenditures beyond those enumerated by Treasury. In addition to satisfying the two-part framework in Standards: Designating a Public Health Impact and Standards: Designating a Negative Economic Impact for identifying and designing a response to

a pandemic harm, Treasury will require projects with total expected capital expenditure costs of \$1 million or greater to undergo additional analysis to justify their capital expenditure. Increased reporting requirements will be required for projects that are larger in size, as well as projects that are not enumerated as eligible by Treasury, with certain exceptions for Tribal governments discussed below. Smaller projects with total expected capital expenditures below \$1 million will not be required to undergo additional analysis to justify their capital expenditure, as such projects will be presumed to be reasonably proportional, provided that they are responding to a harm caused or exacerbated by the public health emergency. These standards and documentation requirements are designed to minimize administrative burden while also ensuring that projects are reasonably proportional and supporting Treasury's risk-based approach to overall program management and monitoring.

This section provides (1) an overview of general standards governing capital expenditures; (2) presumptions on capital expenditures, which help guide recipients in determining whether the expenditure meets the standards and the associated documentation requirements; and (3) additional standards and requirements that may apply.

[Overview of General Standards](#)

In considering whether a capital expenditure would be eligible under the public health and negative economic impacts eligible use category, recipients must satisfy the requirements for all uses under the public health and negative economic impacts eligible use category, including identifying an impact or harm and designing a response that addresses or responds to the identified impact or harm. Responses must be reasonably designed to benefit the individual or class that experienced the impact or harm and must be related and reasonably proportional to the extent and type of impact or harm. Recipients should consult further details on this standard provided in the sections Standards: Designating a Public Health Impact and Standards: Designating a Negative Economic Impact under General Provisions: Structure and Standards.

In addition to the framework described above, 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 lead-times, 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. See section Uses Outside the Scope of this Category in General Provisions: Other.

As noted above, Tribal governments are not required to complete the Written Justification for projects with total capital expenditures of \$1 million or greater. Tribal governments generally have limited administrative capacity due to their small size and corresponding limited ability to supplement staffing for short-term programs. In addition, Tribal governments are already subject to unique considerations that require additional administrative processes and administrative burden for Tribal government decision making, including capital expenditures. Tribal governments generally are subject to a jurisdictionally complex sets of rules and regulations in the case of improvements to land for which the title is held in trust by the United States for a Tribe (Tribal Trust Lands).²⁵⁰ This includes the requirement in certain circumstances to seek the input or approval of one or more federal agencies such the Department of the Interior, which holds fee title of Tribal Trust Lands.

As a result of their limited administrative capacity and unique and complex rules and regulations applicable to Tribal governments operating on Tribal Trust Lands, Tribal governments would experience significant and redundant administrative burden by also being required to complete a Written Justification for applicable capital expenditures. While Tribal governments are not required to complete the Written Justification for applicable capital expenditures, the associated substantive requirements continue to apply, including the requirement that a capital expenditure must be reasonably designed to benefit the individual or class that experienced the identified impact or harm and must be related and reasonably proportional to the extent and type of impact or harm. Note that, as a general matter, Treasury may also request further information on SLFRF expenditures and projects, including capital expenditures, as part of the regular SLFRF reporting and compliance process, including to assess their eligibility under the final rule.

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.

1. **Description of harm or need to be addressed:** 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.

2. **Explanation of why a capital expenditure is appropriate:** Recipients should 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.

3. **Comparison of the proposed capital expenditure against alternative capital expenditures:** 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. 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 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.

As an example, a recipient considering building a new diagnostic testing laboratory to enhance COVID-19 testing capacity may consider whether existing laboratories sufficiently meet demand for COVID-19 testing, considering the demand for test results (along with their turnaround time) as well as the impact of current testing availability on the spread of COVID-19. Recipients may also consider other public health impacts of the level of diagnostic testing capacity, for example if insufficient capacity has decreased testing for other health conditions. The recipient may consider alternatives such as expanding existing laboratories or building a laboratory of a different size. In comparing the effectiveness of the capital expenditures, examples of factors that the recipient may consider include when the facilities will become operational and for how long; the daily throughput of COVID-19 tests; and the effect on minimizing delays in test results on the populations that such tests will serve. In comparing costs, the recipient may compare the total expected cost of the new laboratory (including costs of acquisition of real property, construction of the laboratory, and purchase of any necessary equipment needed to operationalize the lab), against the expected costs of expanding existing laboratories (whether by replacing current equipment with higher throughput devices or physically expanding space to accommodate additional capacity) or building a new laboratory of a different size, including by leasing property. As a reminder, recipients should only consider alternatives that are potentially effective and reasonably feasible.

Because, in all cases, uses of SLFRF funds to respond to public health and negative economic impacts of the pandemic must be related and reasonably proportional to a harm caused or exacerbated by the pandemic, some capital expenditures may not be eligible. For example, constructing a new correctional facility would generally not be a proportional response to an increase in the rate of certain crimes or overall crime as most correctional facilities have historically accommodated fluctuations in occupancy.²⁵¹ In addition, construction of new congregate facilities, which would generally be expected to involve expenditures greater than \$1 million, would generally not be a proportional response to mitigate or prevent COVID-19, because such construction is generally expected to be more costly than alternative approaches or capital expenditures that may be equally or more effective in decreasing spread of the disease.²⁵² These alternatives include personal protective equipment, ventilation improvements, utilizing excess capacity in other facilities or wings, or temporary facility capacity expansions.

Large capital expenditures intended for general economic development or to aid the travel, tourism, and hospitality industries—such as convention centers and stadiums—are, on balance, generally not reasonably proportional to addressing the negative economic impacts of the pandemic, as the efficacy of a large capital expenditure intended for general economic development in remedying pandemic harms may be very limited compared to its cost.²⁵³

Presumptions on Capital Expenditures

For administrative convenience, the final rule provides presumptions on whether a Written Justification is required—and required to be submitted to Treasury through reporting—based on the type and size of the capital expenditure, as detailed in the table below.

As discussed above, Tribal governments are not required to complete the Written Justification for applicable capital expenditures, but the associated substantive requirements continue to apply, including the requirement that a capital expenditure must be reasonably designed to benefit the individual or class that experienced the identified impact or harm and must be related and reasonably proportional to the extent and type of impact or harm.

In selecting these thresholds, Treasury recognized that capital expenditures vary widely in size and therefore would benefit from tiered treatment to implement eligibility standards while minimizing administrative burden, especially for smaller projects. For example, Treasury selected \$1 million as a threshold for whether a recipient needs to complete a Written Justification as well as a threshold under which capital expenditures would be presumed reasonably proportional. Treasury estimates that \$1 million would encapsulate the costs of a significant portion of equipment or small renovations. These types of smaller projects are often a necessary and reasonably proportional part of a response to the public health emergency; therefore, the \$1 million threshold provides a simplified pathway to complete smaller projects more likely to meet the eligibility standard. At the same time, Treasury selected \$10 million as the threshold for more intensive reporting requirements, estimating that projects larger than \$10 million would likely constitute significant improvements or construction of mid- or large-sized facilities. As discussed above, given their scale and longer time to completion, these types of larger projects may be less likely to be reasonably proportional responses. The \$10 million threshold also generally aligns with thresholds in other parts of the SLFRF program, such as for enhanced reporting on labor practices.

Expenditures from closely related activities directed toward a common purpose are considered part of the scope of one project. These expenditures can include capital expenditures, as well as expenditures on related programs, services, or other interventions. A project includes expenditures that are interdependent (e.g., acquisition of land, construction of the school on the land, and purchase of school equipment), or are of the same or similar type and would be utilized for a common purpose (e.g., acquisition of a fleet of ambulances that would be used for COVID–19 emergency response). Recipients must not segment a larger project into smaller projects in order to evade review. A recipient undertaking a set of identical or similar projects

(e.g., development of a number of new affordable housing complexes across the recipient jurisdiction) may complete one Written Justification comprehensively addressing the entire set of projects.

Projects Enumerated as Eligible by Treasury

Under the public health and negative economic impacts eligible use category, the final rule provides a non-exclusive list of eligible uses of funding for projects that respond to the public health emergency or its negative economic impacts. Treasury has determined that these enumerated projects are related to the public health emergency and its negative economic impacts; however, recipients (other than Tribal governments) undertaking these projects with total expected capital expenditures of \$1 million or greater must still complete and meet the substantive requirements of a Written Justification as part of their demonstration that the project is a related and reasonably proportional response to the harm identified.

- **Projects with total expected capital expenditures of under \$1 million:** Treasury provides a safe harbor for projects with total expected capital expenditures of less than \$1 million and will not require recipients to complete, submit, or meet the substantive requirements of a Written Justification for the capital expenditure. In essence, recipients may pursue an enumerated project with total expected capital expenditures of under \$1 million without having to undergo additional assessments to meet SLFRF requirements.

- **Projects with total expected capital expenditures of at least \$1 million but under \$10 million:** Recipients should complete a Written Justification for the capital expenditure and make an independent assessment of whether their proposed capital expenditure meets the substantive requirements of the Written Justification. Recipients will not be required to submit the Written Justification as part of regular reporting to Treasury but should keep documentation for their records.

- **Projects with total expected capital expenditures of at least \$10 million:** Similar to the above, recipients should complete a Written Justification of the capital expenditure and make an independent assessment of whether their proposed capital expenditure meets the substantive requirements of the Written Justification. Further, recipients will be asked to submit the Written Justification as part of regular reporting to Treasury. Similar to other parts of the SLFRF program, such as on reporting on labor practices, Treasury recognizes that projects with expected total capital expenditures of at least \$10 million may be less likely to meet eligibility requirements and therefore requires recipients to provide an enhanced level of information to Treasury.

Projects Beyond Those Enumerated as Eligible by Treasury

As with all uses, recipients that undertake capital expenditures beyond those enumerated as eligible by Treasury must meet the two-part framework under Standards: Designating a Public Health Impact and Standards: Designating a Negative Economic Impact under General Provisions: Structure and Standards, including the requirement that responses are related and

reasonably proportional to the harm or impact identified. As part of that assessment, these recipients may also be asked to complete a Written Justification. Recipients (other than Tribal governments) are subject to the following presumptions for the Written Justification of the capital expenditure, based on the total expected capital expenditures of the project:

- **Projects with total expected capital expenditures of under \$1 million:** Treasury provides a safe harbor for unenumerated projects with total expected capital expenditures of under \$1 million and will not require recipients to complete, submit, or meet the substantive requirements of a Written Justification of the capital expenditure. Recipients should still make a determination as to whether the capital expenditure is part of a response that is related and reasonably proportional to the public health emergency or its negative economic impacts.
- **Projects with total expected capital expenditures of \$1 million or over:** Recipients should complete a Written Justification of the capital expenditure and make an independent assessment that their proposed capital expenditure meets the substantive requirements of the Written Justification. Further, recipients will be asked to submit the Written Justification as part of regular reporting to Treasury.

Treasury employs a risk-based approach to overall program management and monitoring, which may result in heightened scrutiny on larger projects. Accordingly, recipients pursuing projects with larger capital expenditures should complete more detailed analyses for their Written Justification, commensurate with the scale of the project.

[Additional Provisions, Standards, and Definitions](#)

Strong Labor Standards in Construction

Treasury encourages recipients to carry out projects in ways that produce high-quality work, avert disruptive and costly delays, and promote efficiency. Treasury encourages recipients to use strong labor standards, including project labor agreements (PLAs) and community benefits agreements that offer wages at or above the prevailing rate and include local hire provisions. Treasury also recommends that recipients prioritize in their procurement decisions employers who can demonstrate that their workforce meets high safety and training standards (e.g., professional certification, licensure, and/or robust in-house training), that hire local workers and/or workers from historically underserved communities, and who directly employ their workforce or have policies and practices in place to ensure contractors and subcontractors meet high labor standards. Treasury further encourages recipients to prioritize employers (including contractors and subcontractors) without recent violations of federal and state labor and employment laws.

Treasury believes that such practices will promote effective and efficient delivery of high-quality projects and support the economic recovery through strong employment opportunities for workers. Such practices will reduce likelihood of potential project challenges like work stoppages or safety accidents, while ensuring a reliable supply of skilled labor and minimizing

disruptions, such as those associated with labor disputes or workplace injuries. That will, in turn, promote ontime and on-budget delivery.

Furthermore, among other requirements contained in 2 CFR 200, Appendix II, all contracts made by a recipient or subrecipient in excess of \$100,000 with respect to a capital expenditure that involve employment of mechanics or laborers must include a provision for compliance with certain provisions of the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act, 40 U.S.C. 3702 and 3704, as supplemented by Department of Labor regulations (29 CFR part 5).

Treasury will seek information from recipients on their workforce plans and practices related to capital expenditures undertaken under the public health and negative economic impacts eligible use category with SLFRF funds. This reporting will support transparency and competition by enhancing available information on the services being provided.

Environmental, Uniform Guidance, and Other Generally Applicable Requirements

Treasury cautions that, as is the case with all projects using SLFRF funds, all projects must comply with applicable federal, state, and local law. In the case of capital expenditures in particular, this includes environmental and permitting laws and regulations. Likewise, as with all capital expenditure projects using the SLFRF funds, projects must be completed in a manner that is technically sound, meaning that it must meet design and construction methods and use materials that are approved, codified, recognized, fall under standard or acceptable levels of practice, or otherwise are determined to be generally acceptable by the design and construction industry.

Further, as with all other uses of funds under the SLFRF program, the Uniform Guidance at 2 CFR part 200 applies to capital expenditures unless stated otherwise. Importantly, this includes 2 CFR part 200 Subpart D on post-federal award requirements, including property standards pertaining to insurance coverage, real property, and equipment; procurement standards; sub-recipient monitoring and management; and record retention and access.

Definitions

Treasury adopts several definitions from the Uniform Guidance at 2 CFR 200.1 under this section, including for capital expenditures, capital assets, equipment, and supplies.

Per the Uniform Guidance, the term “capital expenditures” means “expenditures to acquire capital assets or expenditures to make additions, improvements, modifications, replacements, rearrangements, reinstallations, renovations, or alterations to capital assets that materially increase their value or useful life.” The term “capital assets” means “tangible or intangible assets used in operations having a useful life of more than one year which are capitalized in accordance with [Generally Accepted Accounting Principles].”

Capital assets include lands, facilities, equipment, and intellectual property. Equipment means “tangible personal property (including information technology systems) having a useful life of

more than one year and a per-unit acquisition cost which equals or exceeds the lesser of the capitalization level established by the non-Federal entity for financial statement purposes, or \$5,000.” Supplies, which means all tangible personal property other than those included as “equipment,” are not considered capital expenditures.

Recipients may also use SLFRF funds for pre-project development costs that are tied to or reasonably expected to lead to an eligible capital expenditure. For example, pre-project costs associated with planning and engineering for an eligible project are considered an eligible use of funds.

Overview of Final Rule

[Overview of Final Rule Pg. 30](#)

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

As described above, the final rule clarifies that recipients may use funds for programs, services, and capital expenditures that respond to the public health and negative economic impacts of the pandemic. Any use of funds in this category for a capital expenditure must comply with the capital expenditure requirements, in addition to other standards for uses of funds.

Capital expenditures are subject to the same eligibility standard as other eligible uses to respond to the pandemic’s public health and economic impacts; specifically, they must be related and reasonably proportional to the pandemic impact identified and reasonably designed to benefit the impacted population or class.

For ease of administration, the final rule identifies enumerated types of capital expenditures that Treasury has identified as responding to the pandemic’s impacts; these are listed in the applicable subcategory of eligible uses (e.g., public health, assistance to households, etc.). Recipients may also identify other responsive capital expenditures. Similar to other eligible uses in the SLFRF program, no preapproval is required for capital expenditures.

To guide recipients’ analysis of whether a capital expenditure meets the eligibility standard, recipients (with the exception of Tribal governments) must complete and meet the requirements of a written justification for capital expenditures equal to or greater than \$1 million. For large-scale capital expenditures, which have high costs and may require an extended length of time to complete, as well as most capital expenditures for non-enumerated uses of funds, Treasury requires recipients to submit their written justification as part of regular reporting. Specifically:

If a project has total capital expenditures of	and the use is enumerated by Treasury as eligible, then	and the use is beyond those enumerated by Treasury as eligible, then
Less than \$1 million	No Written Justification required	No Written Justification required
Greater than or equal to \$1 million, but less than \$10 million	Written Justification required but recipients are not required to submit as part of regular reporting to Treasury	Written Justification required and recipients must submit as part of regular reporting to Treasury
\$10 million or more	Written Justification required and recipients must submit as part of regular reporting to Treasury	

A Written Justification includes:

- **Description of the harm or need to be addressed.** 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. Recipients may provide quantitative information on the extent and the type of harm, such as the number of individuals or entities affected.
- **Explanation of why a capital expenditure is appropriate.** For example, recipients should include an explanation of why existing equipment and facilities, or policy changes or additional funding to pertinent programs or services, would be inadequate.
- **Comparison of proposed capital project against at least two alternative capital expenditures and demonstration of why the proposed capital expenditure is superior.** Recipients should consider the effectiveness of the capital expenditure in addressing the harm identified and the expected total cost (including pre-development costs) against at least two alternative capital expenditures.

Where relevant, recipients should consider the alternatives of improving existing capital assets already owned or leasing other capital assets.

Treasury presumes that the following capital projects are generally ineligible:

- × Construction of new correctional facilities as a response to an increase in rate of crime
- × Construction of new congregate facilities to decrease spread of COVID-19 in the facility
- × Construction of convention centers, stadiums, or other large capital projects intended for general economic development or to aid impacted industries

In undertaking capital expenditures, Treasury encourages recipients to adhere to strong labor standards, including project labor agreements and community benefits agreements that offer wages at or above the prevailing rate and include local hire provisions. Treasury also

encourages recipients to prioritize in their procurements employers with high labor standards and to prioritize employers without recent violations of federal and state labor and employment laws.