



# Combating Drugs in America

153968

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by  
Public Domain

United States Senate

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

153968

## BRINGING THE DRUG STRATEGY INTO ACTION

ONDCP Drugs & Crime  
Clearinghouse

Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr.  
United States Senate  
October 1994

# COMBATING DRUGS IN AMERICA -

## Putting the Drug Strategy into Action

INTRODUCTION by Chairman Joseph R. Biden, Jr.	i
I. CONTROLLING THE STREETS -- Help for the Front Line	1
II. CLOSING THE REVOLVING DOOR -- Tough Treatment for Drug-Addicted Offenders	27
III. CUTTING CRIME BEFORE IT OCCURS -- Drug Treatment and Prevention	51
IV. COMMANDING THE NATION'S DRUG EFFORT -- New Authority for the Federal Drug Director	62
V. CRIME LAW ANTI-DRUG PROGRAMS -- A How-To Guide	69
Appendix List of U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee Hearings on the National Drug Control Strategy	112

NCJRS

APR 27 1995

ACQUISITIONS

# *INTRODUCTION*

*Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr.*

*Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee and  
Senate International Narcotics Control Caucus*

With the passage of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 into law last month, the nation has a major new tool with which to fight illegal drugs and related crime. This new law reflects the lessons learned over more than five years of focused efforts to staunch an illegal drug trade that raged out of control, turning neighborhood after neighborhood, community after community into violent battle grounds and destroying more and more lives. At the beginning of this year, in issuing my fifth annual report on America's national drug strategy, I proposed an ambitious agenda, challenging Congress and the Administration to translate the policy consensus we had finally reached into action. The new law answers this challenge in each of the major areas I outlined. Now, we must put this law to work.

Of course, the new law addresses a broad spectrum of crime and violence problems. But, as a key part of the legislation, I specifically sought to pursue each of the substantive goals identified by drug policy experts over many years of study and called for first in alternative drug strategies I issued and then as well by the Clinton Administration:

First, the Crime Law acknowledges that drug-related crime -- like most crime of all kinds -- is fought primarily at the state and local level. Focusing on the violence threatening us today, the new law commits an unprecedented level of federal dollars to the front lines of local law enforcement. It funds more police to fight the street-level drug trade through the proven tactics of community policing. It funds more secure prison space to ensure that violent drug offenders could be kept off the streets. It funds more drug treatment in prison -- for mandatory drug treatment prior to release for every drug addict -- proven to cut recidivist rates in half. And it funds cost-effective boot camp prisons for non-violent offenders and Drug Courts for minor, young offenders now on probation or parole. In each area, the new law delivers needed resources to states and local governments willing to take a tougher line with those who break the law.

Second, focusing on the future, the Crime Law invests in prevention programs that can steer our children away from crime and drugs before they ever get started. Too many of our children are growing up surrounded by the violence and devastation that drugs wreck; they must have an opportunity to feel safe and to learn that alternatives to the violence and crime around them exist. There are programs at work in many communities today that have demonstrated success in helping at-risk kids escape the

streets. The new law offers resources to those willing to replicate tested prevention and education programs to keep kids off drugs, out of gangs, and away from crime.

Finally, I called for increased authority for the Drug Director, so that he could effectively lead the multi-pronged effort we need. With additional budget and program authority provided by the new law, the Drug Director will finally have the ability to enforce the national drug strategy -- to ensure that the fight receives the needed resources, that those resources are used most effectively, and that every agency involved in the fight against illegal drugs is held accountable to the goals and focus of the national strategy.

With the passage of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, my purpose in issuing this report on the national drug strategy is different from the five that preceded it. Instead of detailing the key drug policy arguments and potential directions for our national strategy, this report confronts a question that is as hopeful as its answer is difficult --

How are the front-line fighters of America's anti-drug effort to make the greatest and best use of the Crime Law's unprecedented six-year commitment of \$28 billion in federal assistance?

### *Putting the Crime Law to Work Against Drugs*

It is worth noting just how far we have come since the release of President Bush's and Drug Director William Bennett's first drug strategy in September, 1989 -- more than five years ago. Their first drug strategy sought a total of \$350 million in federal aid to state and local law enforcement, with states matching the federal assistance dollar for dollar. The first drug strategy I offered -- in January 1990 -- called for more than \$1 billion in aid to state and local law enforcement -- a controversial view at the time.

To the credit of many, a consensus has been reached in the intervening years. So today, there is widespread agreement that there are many successful efforts state and local officials can -- and have -- deploy against drugs. What's more, the key barrier to undertaking these efforts is now widely recognized as simply the resources necessary to do the job.

In the most fundamental sense, that is what the Crime Law does -- provide the dollars to do job: more police to close down more drug dealers, more prisons to incapacitate today's violent thugs, more treatment to stop as many young offenders as possible from becoming tomorrow's violent criminals, and more prevention to keep children out of the crime and drug stream before they enter its waters. The fact that the federal government has put its money behind state and local police, prison wardens, prosecutors, judges, treatment professionals, prevention providers, citizens, and all others on the front lines is both a practical accomplishment and a symbolic one. The new law

represents the federal government's full support for the drug-fighting efforts of those who work daily to fight illegal drugs and related crime.

### *Taking Aim at Drug Criminals*

We now have the tools necessary to do what those who know best want to do. The Crime Law provides a broad array of legal and practical reforms that will help bring significant numbers of hard-core drug addicts under control. As I have argued since the first strategy I offered, hard-core addicts are at the root of America's drug epidemic, for they abuse most of the drugs, commit much of the drug-related crime, and are responsible for the vast majority of the drug-fueled violence and human tragedy that has altered life in America so dramatically.

The most important task for any crime bill is whether it does all we know how to do to target America's hard-core addicts. The Crime Law rises to this task with several practical and proven steps:

- \* 100,000 more state and local police officers -- with all of these officers deployed in community policing. Street-level policing closes down open-air drug markets and discourages dealers from setting up shop in a neighborhood where cops are watching who comes and goes.

\* At least 125,000 more prison cells, or as many as 200,000 more prison cells being made available through the construction of boot camp prisons. These boot camp prisons are appropriate for many of the non-violent criminals who would otherwise be sitting in a more expensive, traditional prison cell. We have too few secure spaces now to keep all the violent or "career" criminals -- annually, about 30,000 violent offenders serve no time behind bars because of space shortages. To maximize the number of offenders serving time, we must use a variety of prison settings -- as appropriate for each individual offender.

\* Drug Courts for 600,000 drug-abusing offenders who today walk the streets on probation -- not drug-tested, not treated, and facing almost no chance of detection and punishment should they return to drugs and crime. It is time to put some teeth behind the charge I offered in my first drug strategy when I wrote: "every hard-core addict must be faced with one of two stark choices, get into treatment or go to jail and get treatment there." For at least 600,000 drug-abusing offenders, the Crime Law does exactly that. Funds are available for Drug Courts that mandate testing/treatment, strict supervision, job training, and -- for those who violate those conditions -- jail.

- \* Drug treatment for 350,000 drug-addicted prisoners -- with about 200,000 drug-addicted prisoners released every year without being treated, we speed the "revolving door" experienced by many criminals in our justice system as these untreated offenders too often return to drugs and predatory crime. Drug Director William Bennett prodded us long ago to expand treatment, noting that drug treatment cuts the chance of a return to crime by half.
  
- \* Cutting the availability of deadly military-style assault weapons -- weapons of war with no legitimate sporting purpose that have become the weapon of choice for many drug dealers and gang members. These weapons represent a grave threat to our police, who find themselves outgunned by those who don't hesitate to kill over drug territory.

### *Helping Our Children*

All of the efforts just described focus on those who have already become ensnared in the spiral of drugs and crime. These efforts may turn some of these offenders around, but their primary goal is to make our communities safe for law-abiding citizens. In the long run, of course, if we are to achieve lasting success in reducing illegal drugs and crime, we must not wait to intervene until someone has already started down road to addiction, to dealing, to crime, to violence. The Crime Law takes steps to reach our children early, to turn their minds and their hearts against drugs, to teach them that

alternatives exist and that they are responsible for doing something positive with their lives. The Law offers resources to states and localities to offer:

- \* Drug abuse treatment and prevention programs;
- \* Treatment and prevention of child abuse, so much of which is tied directly to the abuse of drugs;
- \* "Safe haven" programs that provide academic and recreational programs to children after school, over the summer and during holidays -- keeping children away from the perverse allure of drugs;
- \* Early intervention teams of police, social workers, educators and doctors intervening together in the young lives of juvenile victims and offenders;
- \* Sports programs for children in high-crime areas, and sports mentoring programs where athletes serve as positive role models and counselors for children at risk for gang and drug activity; and
- \* Gang alternatives that give children something positive to "belong to," such as Boys and Girls Clubs, scout troops and little leagues.

Preliminary evidence from the field is in -- thoughtful, creative prevention and education programs work. The Crime Law focuses on replicating tested programs in communities throughout the nation. The programs are numerous and varied by design. We have learned that there is no single cure to the risks of crime and violence, because there is no single cause. Preventing crime depends on many different and overlapping efforts working at the same time. The programs funded by the Crime Law are designed to allow each community to tailor its efforts to its needs, in the search for its own best answers.

#### *The Purpose of this Report*

Of course, America's drug epidemic has become such a pervasive part of life in America that no law alone, however comprehensive, will destroy its grip on America. But the Crime Law is the major step in the right direction.

This report is meant to serve as a guide as we move to implement the new law. It describes in some detail the policy goals the Crime Law is intended to serve, reviewing the theory behind each goal, but also identifying working programs from across the nation -- the success stories of the kind that served as the models for the programs in the Crime Law. In addition, the final chapter is an early version of a "user's guide" to the Crime law. It contains a brief description of each program, its purpose, eligible applicants, a summary of the application process, terms and requirements, funding availability, and contacts for further information. Although most of the funding will

become available in fiscal year 1996, dollars became available October 1, 1994, for several programs and they are marked on the Table of Contents with an asterisk.

\* \* \* \* \*

I give my thanks to all of you engaged in the fight against drugs, who will use the tools offered by this law. You will make real change happen. I hope the Crime Law marks the beginning of that effort to fully implement the consensus drug strategy all of you have fought so hard to forge.

I also thank my staffs of the Senate Judiciary Committee and Senate International Narcotics Control Caucus for their work on the legislation and for putting together this manual -- Chris Putala, Adam Gelb, Tracy Doherty, Mimi Murphy, Jenna Nober, and Cynthia Hogan. I would also like to thank Andrew Plepler, a Justice Department attorney currently assisting the Judiciary Committee staff.

Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr.

October 5, 1994

# CHAPTER I.

## CONTROLLING THE STREETS -- HELP FOR THE FRONT LINES

Passage of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 into law begins six years of unprecedented federal assistance to state and local law enforcement. This marked departure from past practice is justified by many fundamental changes to the American landscape -- the rise and random nature of violent crime, more neighborhoods under the brutal control of thugs and street punks, and more American lives altered by fear. But, no single change more justifies the nearly \$28 billion in federal assistance to state and local agencies than the scourge of drugs.

In the several previous editions of this report, Chairman Biden has underscored the need -- and promise -- of taking on the drug scourge where it hits hardest -- on

America's streets. The paradox that drugs are most subject to control where they exert the most damage to society is a phenomenon that has withstood more than a decade of academic analysis<sup>1</sup> and it is a conclusion long supported by these pages.

Taking on the drug scourge on the front-lines -- our streets -- requires change in police tactics and strategies. Chief among these tactics is community policing. But, with its emphasis on greater police presence and one-on-one relations with the community, implementing community policing requires more police officers. It is just that simple.

This is the central justification for the centerpiece of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act -- the \$8.8 billion 100,000 police program. No other element of the Crime Law has greater importance to implementing an effective national drug strategy. And since the first edition of this report, Chairman Biden has called for such a commitment to state and local police. But, it is not until this edition -- nearly four years since the first -- that this call has been translated into action. President Clinton, Drug Director Brown, and Attorney General Reno deserve tremendous credit for turning Chairman Biden's "prescription" into "action."

The Crime Law includes several other provisions that will deliver more troops to the front-lines of the effort against drugs. All told, the Crime Law provides \$10.8 billion for state and local law enforcement -- aiding the police officers and prosecutors who

---

<sup>1</sup>The analyses of Dr. Mark H. Moore and Dr. Mark A.R. Kleiman have developed and informed the debate about the role of street-level drug enforcement, and both deserve much of the credit for this central insight.

work for states, counties, cities and towns. The pages ahead outline many of the programs that make up this \$10.8 billion commitment.

### Community Policing -- Shutting Down Open-Air Drug Markets

For the past 10 years, since the crack epidemic turned neighborhoods into battle zones, most law enforcement agencies have fought the dealers and the addicts head on. They broke down doors, they made sweeps and carried out raids, and they made arrests - more than 1 million a year -- for violations of drug laws.

The results were less than spectacular. Drug dealers went to jail; other neighborhood opportunists took their place. As soon as one block was cleaned up, the selling would shift around the corner. Ring leaders learned the justice system would turn juveniles loose, so they recruited young kids into their operations and outfitted them with guns.

Local police officers were among the first to recognize the shortcomings, and the first to decide to try something different. They began experimenting with a new set of tactics and strategies called "community policing," a change that has turned into the most dramatic and promising law enforcement reform in decades.

The Crime Law provides \$8.8 billion to the community policing effort -- a program that will put 100,000 more community police officers on the nation's streets over the next six years. The first installment of the funds -- \$1.3 billion -- will begin to be distributed this month.

This commitment by President Clinton and the Congress to the courageous men and women serving on the front lines of the nation's battle against crime and drugs is both unprecedented and long overdue. Officers have been overwhelmed by the rising tide of drug-related violence: in 1961, there was 1 police officer for every violent crime; today, there are nearly 5 violent crimes for every police officer.

By helping to reverse this trend, the federal government is fighting hard-core drug addicts and the disruption they cause in the community in the most productive way it can -- by helping state and local law enforcement arrest, prosecute, convict and punish drug criminals.

The increase of 100,000 officers by the year 2000 will represent an increase in the ranks of state and local law enforcement of nearly 20 percent. The bill further provides \$1 billion for Drug Courts to punish and treat the addicted, nonviolent offenders the police will arrest. Another \$9.7 billion for boot camps and prison cells will ensure that there is sufficient space in secure facilities for those who use violence to ply their trade.

The community policing program follows on the heels of the successful \$150 million Police Hiring Supplemental Program, which has put 2,000 more community police on the streets over the past year. Despite concerns about the burden placed on local budgets by the funds matching requirement, demand for the program was so strong that the U.S. Department of Justice had to turn away 9 out of every 10 applicants. Clearly, similar concerns about a lack of local interest in the Crime Law's community policing program seem exaggerated.

But as important as the number of new officers is -- perhaps the strongest single deterrent to drug-dealing, drug-buying and crime is a cop standing right there on the corner -- the real significance of the community policing program lies in its emphasis on a new style of law enforcement.

The crux of community policing is the forging of a partnership between police and the citizens they are sworn to serve and protect. It pulls officers out from behind desks and police cruisers and puts them out on the streets, walking beats, popping into local hangouts, getting to know the trouble spots and the trouble makers.

Police build trust with residents, trust that turns into information about crimes and drug dealers. They link up with other city agencies -- the Sanitation Department, the Parks and Recreation Department, the Housing Department, even the Health Department -- to target services and coordinate programs that provide an impact that

lasts far longer than a stand-alone police crackdown. Officers become allies with the community, rather than an occupying force.

Where the effectiveness of police operations was once measured solely in terms of arrests, response time, seizures and the street value of the drugs seized, community policing shifts the focus to identifying problems and preventing crime before it happens. By targeting hotspots with directed, rather than random patrol, it can improve the quality of life in a neighborhood without huge numbers of arrests -- arrests that swamp the courts and the jails and that engender disrespect for the law when they fail to lead to serious charges or prison time.

Community policing techniques, such as blocking off streets, enforcing housing codes, or establishing a network of community activists who can report drug-selling directly to beat officers by beeper or cellular telephone, dramatically disrupts open-air drug markets. In addition to making the neighborhood more livable, the sustained effort that community policing makes possible reduces the ready availability of drugs to addicts. By doing so, it effectively raises the price of the drugs, since users must spend a longer amount of time searching for their next "score."

Make no mistake, community policing does not mean police officers will not make arrests. It does not mean that all officers will be on foot, or that they won't be able to respond quickly in emergencies. Rather, community policing is tougher on crime because it is smarter.

A few creative and innovative examples from the field provide compelling evidence of how this is so:

- \* In Tampa, Florida, police committed themselves to moving crack dealers off of street corners and forged an unprecedented alliance with citizens in the community to achieve it. Through a combination of standard "buy-bust" operations, new outreach to the community, and involvement of other city agencies and the local media, the dealers had been driven off within a year and the streets in the targeted area returned to normal.
- \* In New Haven, Conn., Police Chief Nick Pastore's aggressive community policing effort lead to a 10 percent drop in serious crime in 1992.
- \* Community policing techniques were introduced in the New York City subway system four years ago and the results have been phenomenal: robberies have fallen by 52 percent.
- \* In the Englewood section of Chicago, community policing was credited with a 6 percent decrease in violent crime last year.
- \* A community policing project in the Eastside neighborhood of Wilmington, Del., which combined foot patrols with community development efforts, has

suppressed drug activity there without displacing it to other parts of the city.

- \* From Seattle, Wash., to Savannah, Ga., police officers are riding bicycles through neighborhoods, putting them in much closer contact with citizens than officers patrolling in squad cars.
  
- \* In St. Paul, Minn., and other cities, police have convinced phone companies to take a technological step backwards, replacing push button pay phones with rotary dials to prevent drug dealers from congregating and using them as personal offices.
  
- \* In Tulsa, Okla., two-officer teams work drug-infested apartment complexes, serving as role models for the kids and developing informants for investigations.
  
- \* In Boston, Mass., city police can demand that other city agencies respond promptly to crime-breeding situations, such as abandoned cars, burned-out streetlights or littered lots.

In essence, then, the Crime Law codifies what progressive police chiefs and policing experts have been saying for several years now -- that law enforcement can make

a difference in communities if they work together. Drug pushers can be pushed off the corner. Children can be steered into positive activities. Communities can be reclaimed.

The Crime Law provides that 85% of the \$8.8 billion authorization will be used to hire police and put them to work in the community. In cities where officers have been laid-off, the bill permits departments to rehire them, ensuring that already-trained officers return to the streets as soon as possible.

But although community policing can be highly effective, it is difficult to put into place. Any police chief will tell you that you can't simply hire a cop, tell him to walk a beat and expect to be doing effective community policing. It can require changing training, management, and operating procedures, doing community outreach, and often, changing the philosophy and attitude of the entire department.

That is why the remaining 15% of the police grants are to be used for programs that weave the community policing concept into the fabric of departments, and that ensure new officers are adequately screened and prepared to serve. Such programs include:

- \*\* Teaching officers how to mediate and resolve conflicts, so they can quiet disputes before they explode.

- \*\* Teaching citizens how to better protect themselves, and to bring victims, witnesses and others in closer communication and contact with police and the courts.
- \*\* Coordinating police efforts with community groups and with other federal programs working to stem violence.
- \*\* Injecting officers as mentors and role models directly into the lives of at-risk kids through Police Athletic Leagues and Big Brother/Big Sister programs.
- \*\* Increasing the amount of time the officers actually spend on the street by cutting down time wasted sitting around courthouses waiting to testify.
- \*\* Developing advanced communications and other technologies that will help shift the focus of police work from reaction to prevention.
- \*\* Redeploying existing police officers who spend their days behind desks back to the streets.

Further, to ensure that the federal funds will translate directly into more police on the streets, and that the states will bear an increasing share of the financial burden over the years, the legislation mandates that state and local governments specify in advance how they intend to pick up the slack as the federal contributions decline.

The Crime Law gives jurisdictions the flexibility to decide for themselves how much they will contribute each year of the grants -- the only stipulations are that the

federal share must decline each year and that the total funds applied to any one officer not exceed \$75,000.

In addition, the legislation holds the Attorney General directly accountable for the program's success or failure, providing the authority to revoke or suspend a policing grant if a department or state is not in compliance with the standards and conditions of the program. This ability to cut off funds will help ensure that police departments adopt the concept of community policing and actually put more officers out on the street.

The Crime Law's community policing grant program will accelerate the adoption of police-community cooperation as the predominant method of modern law enforcement. As the model becomes ingrained in the operations of police forces of cities, towns and counties across the nation, there is good reason to believe that crime -- and the paralyzing fear of crime -- will begin to subside.

#### Rural Drug Enforcement -- Aid to America's Heartland

The rise of violent crime and drug trafficking in the rural areas of the nation is one of the most disturbing patterns in the national crime epidemic. Americans who fled the cities to provide a safe environment for their families have found they have not escaped the wrath of crime and drugs.

The anecdotes relayed in the news each day remind us that crime is too close for comfort:

- \* According to the FBI's latest report, violent crimes rose by nearly 6% in America's rural counties.
- \* Violent assaults rose 30 times faster in rural counties than in America's 25 largest cities.
- \* The number of rapes rose more than 9% in rural counties, while decreasing by nearly 4% in urban America.
- \* Drugs are an increasing menace in rural states: the number of drug arrests for drug abuse violations in rural areas jumped almost 23 percent in 1992.
- \* New drugs -- such as the smokeable methamphetamine "ice" and a new inhalant "cat" -- have proven especially popular in rural areas.

The rural crime problem is particularly disturbing because local law enforcement agencies do not have the resources or the training to target the regional and interstate crime and drug rings that are increasingly moving to rural areas. Rural officers do not have the same access to basic and advanced law enforcement training courses as do officers from larger jurisdictions.

Chairman Biden has long recognized the need for greater efforts to target the epidemic of drug trafficking and violent crime that plague rural America. And the rural provisions in the Crime Law incorporate many of the measures which he -- along with Senators Baucus, Pryor, Harkin, Bumpers, Conrad, Daschle, Leahy, Heflin, and Bryan, among others -- proposed three years ago in "The Rural Crime and Drug Control Act of 1991."

Since the key battlefield for fighting drugs is at the state and local level, Chairman Biden believes that federal aid should also be provided directly to state and local law enforcement -- thus, the Crime Law will put \$240 million in the hands of state and local law enforcement in rural areas.

Half of this aid will be divided equally among 19 rural states. The \$6.5 million per state is enough to deploy an additional 50 drug-fighting police in each state -- and this is above and beyond the grants for community policing also available to rural states.

The remaining 50% of this aid is targeted to rural areas of the other 31 non-rural states.

The Crime Law also provides \$5 million to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia, to develop a specialized course of instruction for rural law enforcement officers in the investigation of drug trafficking and related crimes. Special instruction is essential because there are special challenges facing rural law enforcement.

For example, officials in these areas must dismantle clandestine laboratories which are often located in rural areas. Thus, these investigators face not only the dangers front-line officers encounter everywhere, but are often injured by the poisonous chemicals used in the manufacturing process.

To further boost federal assistance to rural law enforcement, the bill provides for the Attorney General to establish a Rural Crime and Drug Enforcement Task Force in every federal judicial district that encompasses significant rural lands. The task forces must include officials from state and local law enforcement agencies, the U.S. Attorney from the district, and agents from the FBI, DEA, INS, and the U.S. Marshals Service. Representatives from other federal law enforcement agencies, such as the Customs Service, the Park Police, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and the Bureau of Land Management may also participate.

Since inter-agency cooperation and coordination is necessary for effective enforcement operations, the legislation also authorizes the Attorney General to cross-designate up to 100 federal agents to fight drug trafficking and serious violent crime in local jurisdictions.

With these and other provisions, the Crime Law makes the resources of federal agencies -- both in manpower and in expertise -- available to law enforcement in rural areas to target the drug traffickers and violent criminals who spoil the tranquility of America's countryside.

## Byrne Grants -- Maintaining the Successes of Interagency Cooperation

Since its inception under the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs has been one of the most successful and popular assistance programs administered by the federal government.

The program was established to direct aid to the state and local officers at the forefront of the nation's battle against drugs. Another principal aim was to gain a leg up on smugglers and dealers by coordinating the efforts of state and local officers with those at the federal level through multi-jurisdictional drug enforcement task forces.

The need for direct aid and intergovernmental cooperation remains as strong today as ever. The Administration recognized this, but believed that the federal commitment to state and local law enforcement could be maintained and enhanced directly through the other assistance programs in the Crime Law. Indeed, \$27.5 billion of the total \$30.2 billion authorized by the law goes to state and local cops, corrections, courts and community groups -- by far the largest federal commitment to state and local crime and drug fighters ever.

Nonetheless, Chairman Biden believed that the success of the Byrne grants should be continued. The Crime Law reflects this -- it authorizes \$1 billion for the Byrne program over 6 years, exceeding, for fiscal year 1995, the highest allotment the program

has ever received. This funding will permit the multi-jurisdictional drug task forces -- and the 20 other purposes for which the Byrne funds can be used -- to operate uninterrupted.

In addition, the Crime Law adds four new programs that can be funded by the Byrne grants:

- 1) programs that transfer to adult court cases of 16- and 17-year-olds charged with serious crimes, such as drive-by shootings;
- 2) DNA laboratory testing;
- 3) drunk driving prosecution programs; and
- 3) enforcement and prevention programs targeted at juvenile gangs.

With the added flexibility of these additional funds, and the authorization of \$1 billion, the Byrne drug enforcement program is certain to remain a key component of the combined federal-state-local effort to combat illicit drugs.

#### Federal Assistance to State Court Systems -- Keeping the System Afloat

Though they are far less visible to the American public than the police, prosecutors, judges, public defenders, probation officers and other officials who make up our court system are no less important. For if the courts are clogged, criminal cases are

delayed and plea bargained down, reducing the effectiveness of swiftly administered justice. Civil cases are all but pushed off the dockets.

Senator Heflin recognized the strain that the addition of 100,000 new community police officers will place on those responsible for handling drug offenders and other criminal defendants after they are arrested and charged. Thus, the Crime Law authorizes \$150 million in federal assistance to state court systems to help them cope with the new load.

#### Community-Based Prosecutors -- Reaching Out to Victims and Witnesses

In addition to the support for prosecuting attorneys under the State Courts grants, the Crime Law creates a new program specifically for prosecutors.

The \$50 million "Community-Based Justice Grants for Prosecutors" program is broadly analogous to the concept of community policing: it seeks to bring prosecutors closer in touch with the residents of their jurisdictions, which, in turn, will help them identify and successfully prosecute drug gangsters and other violent offenders.

If police officers riding in cruisers with their windows rolled up are isolated from the community, then prosecutors must seem like aliens from outer space. Residents of

drug-infested neighborhoods don't know them, don't trust them and have little reason to put their lives on the line as witnesses for them. In fact, many prosecutors believe that forging closer ties to the community is one of the most important steps they can take toward breaking through the wall of silence surrounding heavily-armed drug dealers.

The grants funded by the Crime Law will be used for programs to bring prosecutors together with community members, school officials, probation officers, youth and social service providers, as well as with the police, to target violent juveniles. Other programs will coordinate criminal justice and community resources to develop violence prevention and conflict resolution efforts to quell disputes before they explode in gunfire.

#### Assault Weapons Ban -- Stripping Drug Traffickers of their Prized Weapons

Controlling America's arms race is synonymous with controlling the epidemic of violence and drug-related mayhem on America's streets. That is the unequivocal message sent by the assault weapons ban contained in the Crime Law.

For years, Chairman Biden had urged his colleagues in Congress to support the American people -- and the nation's police officers -- by breaking the National Rifle Association's chokehold on sensible gun control legislation. Only then, he argued, could the nation begin the task of disarming the drug thugs who use weapons of war to terrify their communities and protect their ill-gotten fortunes.

Last November, the Senate finally switched sides in the debate, and President Clinton signed the Brady Bill into law. Despite charges that the measure would simply burden law-abiding citizens, with no impact on criminals, the Brady Law has already paid dividends by keeping guns out of the hands of hundreds of convicted criminals.

In just the first 100 days after the law took effect February 28 of this year, a survey of law enforcement agencies found that 3,008 applications for guns had been denied, a rate of nearly 5 percent. In addition, 70 licensed firearms dealers reported to the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms that they had denied 624 applications after checking the applicants' criminal histories.

As Treasury Secretary Bentsen, a hunter himself, said:

"We stopped them from buying guns, and we probably stopped them from committing some terrible crimes."

The assault weapons ban in the Crime Law builds on the success of the Brady Handgun Law, restricting the easy availability of guns with firepower that overwhelm our police; of weapons that have no place in hunting or sport, whose only function is to kill human beings at a furious pace. It was a dramatic rejection of the politics of exaggeration and distortion in the face of a \$25 million media blitz and behind-the-scenes barrage by the NRA and other gun extremists.

The provision -- the product of tireless work by Chairman Biden, Senator Feinstein, Senator DeConcini and Senator Metzenbaum and Congressman Schumer -- is tailored narrowly so it targets criminals, not lawful hobbyists, hunters or other sports persons. The measure:

- \* prohibits the manufacture, transfer and possession of 19 specifically-named semiautomatic assault weapons;
- \* bans the possession or transfer of large capacity ammunition feeding devices -- defined as more than more than 10 rounds;
- \* grandfathers all firearms that are lawfully possessed before the date of its enactment;
- \* doubles the penalty from 5 to 10 years for violations of firearms laws involving assault weapons;
- \* specifically exempts more than 650 manual and semi-automatic guns, as well as antique weapons, and weapons operated by bolt pump or slide action.
- \* instructs the Attorney General to conduct a study of the impact of the ban on violent and drug trafficking crime, and report the results within 30 months.

Rigorous enforcement of the ban -- and many more steps -- will have to be taken to deprive the drug dealers and their henchmen of their weapons of choice. But passage

of the assault weapons ban was another politically torturous and significant step toward ridding our neighborhoods of guns meant for battlefields.

Guns, Drugs and Youth -- A Sensible Step to Control Youth Violence

Much less controversial but perhaps as important as the assault weapons ban, the Crime Law takes a major step toward controlling the explosion of drug-related gun violence among the nation's children.

The recruitment of juveniles into the illicit drug trade has put guns into the hands of thousands of youths. Children whose hands are barely big enough to hold the grip of a pistol are killing and being killed alike.

Prof. Alfred Blumstein of Carnegie Mellon University, among others, have documented the horrifying jump in juvenile violence, and the relationship of that violence to the recruitment of juveniles into the illicit drug trade. Prof. Blumstein notes that since 1985 -- the outbreak of the crack cocaine epidemic --

- \* the juvenile homicide rate has doubled, while the rate for adults over 24 has remained the same; and
- \* the number of juvenile homicides with guns has doubled, while the number of non-gun killings stayed steady.

To address this tragedy head on, a provision in the Crime Law championed by Senator Kohl prohibits the sale or transfer of handguns to children under the age of 18, and it prohibits juveniles from possessing handguns, except in certain circumstances. The federal crime is punishable by up to 1 year in prison. It also requires that the juvenile's parent or legal guardian be present at all court proceedings related to the case.

The impact of this provision, too, is largely dependent on aggressive enforcement. For children especially, the knowledge that they have a decent chance of being caught is the greatest deterrent the law can provide.

#### Drug-Crime Penalties -- Increasing the Cost of Crime Without Further Federalization

In addition to providing state and local authorities with many of the resources they need to mount a renewed campaign against open-air drug markets and drug traffickers, the Crime Law toughens many already strong federal penalties against drug sales and trafficking. The legislation:

- \* Directs the U.S. Sentencing Commission to enhance penalties for drug dealing in drug-free zones;
- \* Triples the maximum penalty otherwise authorized for using kids to sell drugs in drug-free zones;

- \* Directs the Sentencing Commission to enhance penalties for possession of drugs or smuggling of drugs into federal prisons;
- \* Requires that sentences for providing or possessing drugs in prison be consecutive to any other drug sentence imposed;
- \* Increases penalties for dealing drugs near public housing;
- \* Enhances penalties for drug dealing near truck stops and rest areas;
- \* Prohibits advertising for the purpose of seeking or offering drugs.
- \* Protects jurors and witnesses in capital cases by permitting courts to withhold their names if their safety would be jeopardized by publicity.

These increased penalties will help take serious drug criminals off of our streets. But Chairman Biden believes the Crime Law accomplished another important goal -- retaining the division between federal and state crime-fighting responsibility by resisting the loud calls for further expansion of federal criminal jurisdiction.

Chairman Biden stood firm against further encroachment into state jurisdiction because it is both unwarranted and unwise. Today, 96% of all criminals are arrested, prosecuted, tried, sentenced, convicted and incarcerated at the state and local levels. This is appropriate. It is the local police who are the experts when it comes to busting street gangs, street thugs and street punks.

Moreover, the citizens of each and every community -- not federal officials in Washington -- feel the brunt of every criminal offense. They should judge the severity of

the crimes committed in the community and they should fashion the appropriate solutions.

The core federal responsibility is to combat complex federal crimes and to champion federal rights and liberties. The skills and resources of federal officers and judges are best devoted to investigating, prosecuting and trying big, multi-state gang activity and multi-state drug rings.

The disparity in resources makes it clear why attempts to bring local drug- and street-crime into the federal system are doomed to failure:

- \* There were 544,309 state and local police officers in 1992. The federal "police" (the FBI, DEA, U.S. Marshals, and the Border Patrol) number a total of 20,400 agents -- four percent the size of the state forces.
- \* There are 9,602 state trial judges who can hear felony and serious misdemeanor cases. Federally, there are 629 district court judges -- only 7 percent of the comparable state criminal bench.
- \* At the state and local levels, there are over 23,000 prosecutors trying criminal cases. There are about 3,000 federal prosecutors.
- \* In 1992, there were 48,366 criminal filings in the U.S. District Court. That same year, there were over 4 million criminal filings in state courts of

general jurisdiction -- felonies and serious misdemeanors -- 82 times as many as in federal court.

\* Indeed, between 1955 and 1991, a total of 1.3 million criminal cases were filed in the U.S. District Courts. So, in 36 years, there were one-third the number of cases filed in federal court as were filed in one year in state court.

\* Today, there are about 1.3 million inmates in state prisons or jails. The number in federal prisons is about 84,000 -- or only six percent as many.

Chairman Biden withstood further federalization of drug offenses because it would be ineffective and inconsistent -- and thus undermine the deterrent force of the law. It is the certainty of apprehension, prosecution and punishment that really matters when it comes to deterring crime. Expanding federal jurisdiction would give prosecutors and courts thousands more cases than they can possibly handle.

By necessity, then, the great majority of those cases would fall by the wayside in the federal system. Rather than deterring crime, expanded federal jurisdiction would simply raise false expectations -- and when these expectations lead to disappointment, the result would be further erosion of the public confidence in the ability of justice to be served.

The Crime Law does the job right: it provides an unprecedented infusion of resources to those on the front lines of the nation's crime fighting efforts. That is the

best way to combat crime in this country -- not by holding out promises to the American people that cannot be kept.

## CHAPTER II.

### CLOSING THE

### REVOLVING DOOR --

### TOUGH TREATMENT FOR

### DRUG-ADDICTED OFFENDERS

America's drug epidemic has been met with a huge commitment to punishment. American prisons hold about 1 million convicted criminals -- 4 in every 10 are drug-addicted. American courts supervise another 2.8 million Americans released on probation or parole -- about half of these 2.8 million abuse drugs. Still, the drug

epidemic proceeds unchecked and unbowed by the billions spent to punish drug-addicted offenders.

Why hasn't this worked? Should we be doing something else? Both are questions posed by those critical of the national drug strategy and those supportive of the direction of the drug strategy. But, analyses of the punishment component of the national drug strategy from both extremes of the debate have missed the mark. As Chairman Biden offered throughout the past years' debate on crime legislation, liberals' arguments that drug offenses are punished too severely and conservatives' arguments that our criminal justice system is not punitive enough both come up short.

Instead of the polar extremes, the Crime Law ascribes to the view forwarded by Chairman Biden. This view has been discussed and documented in previous editions of this report. In its most succinct form, the view holds that "every hard-core addict must be faced with one of two stark choices, get into treatment or go to jail and get treatment there."<sup>2</sup> In other words, more important than the severity of punishment is the certainty of punishment. And, the "carrot" of drug treatment is not enough to change the behavior of most hard-core addicts without the "stick" of tough punishment hanging over the head of the hard-core addict.

The Clinton Administration fought hard for a Crime Law that moves past the polarizing inaccuracies of liberal and conservative views. And, to the Administration's

---

<sup>2</sup>This argument was first posited in January, 1990, in Chairman Biden's first drug strategy.

great credit, the Crime Law largely lives up to the goals set by previous editions of this report.

Most important, the Crime Law provides \$1 billion for Drug Court programs that will put some "teeth" back into the nation's overloaded probation system. Instead of having 600,000 drug-addicted offenders on probation without being supervised, treated for their addiction, tested for drug abuse, or under any fear of being punished for violating the conditions of their release, the Drug Court program will put these 600,000 offenders under real supervision. Under the Drug Court program, these 600,000 non-violent drug-addicted offenders who would otherwise have been sentenced to probation will actually be punished -- drug treatment will be provided, with abstinence confirmed by regular drug tests and backed-up by certain jail time for abusing drugs or otherwise violating the terms and conditions of their probation.

The Crime Law also takes unprecedented steps toward a goal previous editions of Chairman Biden's drug strategies have advocated -- treating drug addicts while they are behind bars, so they do not return to the streets certain to return to drugs and predatory crime. Are the results of drug treatment perfect, so that every treated addict never returns to drugs? Of course not. But, the hard evidence cited by treatment proponents and opponents alike is that drug treatment will cut the likelihood of a return to drugs and crime by half. As previous editions of this report have offered, the low cost of drug treatment combined with its efficacy makes this too good a deal to pass up. Fortunately, the Crime Law does not pass up this deal -- investing nearly \$400 million in prison drug

treatment, enough to treat 250,000 state and local inmates, and 100,000 more in federal prisons.

In keeping with the balanced strategy advocated on these pages, the Crime Law also provides unprecedented resources -- \$9.7 billion over the next six years -- to expand the nation's ability to punish drug dealers and other violent criminals. This huge expenditure -- called for, supported by, and paid for by Chairman Biden, other Congressional Democrats and the Clinton Administration -- is justified by the fact -- one most often cited by conservatives and too often discounted by liberals -- that the worst drug offenders and other violent criminals actually serve less than one-half their sentence. This, too, is an element of certain punishment.

It must also be pointed out that the Crime Law provides the flexibility essential to reaching the goal of increasing time-served behind bars. While calls to simply build more prisons have appealing simplicity, as Chairman Biden has argued, the flexibility for states to build such low-cost alternatives suited to the roughly 150,000 non-violent offenders currently in traditional prisons means the most "bang" for the fewest "bucks." A good deal all should be happy to take.

What are these low-cost alternatives? Military-style boot camps are one of the most familiar -- the same punishment delivered at about 40% the cost of traditional prisons. Another example, one repeatedly called for by Senator John Glenn (D-Ohio), are low-cost, prefabricated units such as Quonset huts. As Senator Glenn has argued, if

such units are good enough for our nation's military families, they are good enough for our nation's prisoners. Of course, security concerns mean that the most violent offenders will still have to be housed in secure prison cells, but there are many other prisoners who could be housed in such facilities without any danger to the public.

The remainder of this chapter discusses each of the Crime Law programs that will help close the "revolving door" that symbolizes too much of our criminal justice system.

#### Drug Courts -- Tough Treatment for Addicted Offenders

The nation's probation population has reached an all-time high: 2.8 million adult Americans are now under the supervision of probation officers. Half of these offenders - - 1.4 million -- are substance abusers -- thieves, drug dealers and others whose addictions, in one way or another, fuel their crime.

Yet only about 800,000 of these drug-addicted probations receive any sort of treatment, testing or other services that address their problems. The remaining 600,000 offenders are convicted but not punished or treated. They are simply given probation, which means they are put back on the streets.

And since the number of new probation officers has not kept pace with the growth in the probation population, probation caseloads now average 124 offenders. In

some jurisdictions, caseloads can exceed 200! Obviously, with this many offenders under their charge, officers are able to conduct minimal supervision -- perhaps 15 minutes per week -- at best.

This situation leaves these non-violent, drug-abusing offenders out on the streets, still addicted to drugs, probably still committing crimes -- under virtually no control, monitoring or treatment whatsoever -- even though we know, from none other than former national drug director William Bennett -- that drug treatment cuts crime in half.

The \$1 billion Drug Court program in the Crime Law will end this leniency for at least those 600,000 offenders currently falling through the cracks. It will bring them under the close supervision of specially-designated judges and teams of prosecutors, probation officers, treatment providers and others.

And it will accomplish this reduction in crime and addiction at a fraction of the cost of sending these offenders to prison: The price of a year in the Drug Court program is typically \$2,000 or less; a year in jail or prison might cost \$20,000.

#### How the Drug Court Works

The key to the Drug Court programs funded by the Crime Law is the mixture of two equally important components:

- 1) Comprehensive services, such as relapse prevention, health care, education, vocational training, family support and child care, job placement and housing services; and
- 2) Swift and certain sanctions for failure to comply with program requirements, including frequent, random drug testing, intensive surveillance in the community, and a comprehensive treatment regimen, such as mandatory attendance at special counseling sessions and self-help groups like Narcotics Anonymous and Alcoholics Anonymous.

For many defendants, facing up to their addiction and meeting with all of the requirements of the Drug Court program is the hardest things they've ever had to do. And on top of that, many are required to perform community service, to pay back society for the harms they have caused, and to help cover the costs of their own supervision.

In stark contrast to traditional probation, where violations are rarely detected and even more rarely punished, the Drug Court responds to each and every slip with a sanction. The sanctions get increasingly harsh if violations persist -- perhaps two days in jail, then 10, then 30 -- until, if the participant seems unwilling to stay clean, he is "flunked" out and faces his full sentence in jail.

#### A Proven Record of Success

Since the establishment of the Miami Drug Court five years ago by Attorney General Reno, similar courts have been established in more than 30 cities across the

nation. A devoted group of judges, prosecutors, probation officers, treatment providers and others have formed a new organization, the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, to spread the message about how the courts operate.

The rapid growth of Drug Courts is a testament to their value in controlling addicted offenders and handling the clogged courtroom calendars. Some results:

- \* In Miami, a study that followed Drug Court graduates for 18 months after discharge found that only 3 percent of its graduates had been re-arrested. The re-arrest rate for similar offenders who didn't go through the program was 33 percent -- 10 times higher.

The study also found that those offenders who were re-arrested stayed free from arrest far longer than other offenders, suggesting that the program cut down on the offenders' crime rates. Those Drug Court participants who were arrested averaged 8 months between arrests; similar offenders not in the program were re-arrested after only 2 to 3 months.

And the program got these results at a cost of \$700 per offender, while it cost \$17,000 to put an offender in the county jail.

- \* In Kings County, New York, the District Attorney's office diverts prison-bound felony drug defendants to a residential treatment program, and even helps them find jobs through a business advisory council. This program is run by a prosecutor, Charles Hynes, an aggressive prosecutor who realizes

that certain offenders "would return to society in a better position to resist drugs and crime after treatment than if they had spent a comparable time in prison at twice the cost."

70 percent of the offenders in the DTAP, or Drug Treatment Alternative-to-Prison program, stay through the program; and almost every single one of those who don't fully comply are tracked down by a special team of enforcement officers and brought back to court.

- \* In Coos County, Oregon, the rate of positive drug tests dropped from more than 40 percent to less than 10 percent after the probation department subjected offenders to a tough program of drug treatment and testing.
- \* In Michigan, some judges have instituted a drug testing program which imposes progressively harsher sanctions with each failure. Most offenders - no matter how serious their addiction -- seem to learn quickly: of 200 offenders in the program, only 28 have failed.
- \* An intensive supervision program with regular drug testing and effective sanctions run by the District of Columbia's Pretrial Service's found that offenders in the program were rearrested at a rate that is less than one-third the rate of the offenders in the regular supervision program.

This program places special emphasis on imposing swift sanctions.

Through an integrated computer system, a judge sitting on the bench can be alerted to the results of a drug test almost instantaneously, so the sanction may be applied as close to the violation as possible.

- \* An Oakland Drug Court program with regular drug testing found that the re-arrest rate was reduced by 45% when the program went into effect. And because participants spent 35,000 fewer days in custody than they otherwise would have, Alameda County generated more than \$2 million in two years by renting unused prison space to neighboring counties.

Drug Court programs are no day at the beach. When these offenders are put on standard probation, they are virtually unsupervised and they have almost no responsibilities. In the Drug Court, they are subjected to a strict regimen of detoxification and treatment programs, urine testing and close surveillance.

The comprehensive services, combined with the swift and certain sanctions, provide effective and cost-effective punishment for drug-addicted criminals where none existed before.

## Drug Treatment in Prison -- Reducing Recidivism by Helping Addicts Kick the Habit

In keeping with Chairman Biden's ultimatum to drug-addicted criminals -- "You must get into treatment, or go to jail and get treatment there" -- the Crime Law provides \$383 million for drug treatment in state and federal prisons for junkies who flunk out of the Drug Court and others whose compulsive substance abuse has landed them behind bars.

Evidence about the effectiveness -- and cost-effectiveness -- of prison-based treatment programs has been substantial for some time now.

- \* The Stay 'N Out program in New York State has been evaluated on several occasions -- it was found to reduce recidivism rates by one-third and at a lower cost than straight prison time.<sup>3</sup>

The Wexler evaluation noted that the Stay 'N Out program consists of several critical features, notably segregation from the general prison population, although not total isolation, mandatory treatment as a condition of parole and aftercare treatment. These critical features of a successful program are also mandated by the treatment provisions in the Crime Law.

---

<sup>3</sup>Harry K. Wexler, Douglas S. Lipton and Bruce D. Johnson, "A Criminal Justice System Strategy for Treating Cocaine-Heroin Abusing Offenders in Custody," National Institute of Justice, March 1988.

\* The Cornerstone Program in Oregon consists of a 10- to 12-month therapeutic community program for inmates in Oregon who are paroled directly from the program, and are provided with 6 months of aftercare and other services while they are on parole. Evaluations determined that 51 percent of the program graduates had no subsequent convictions after three years, whereas only 11 percent of those who dropped out within 60 days had not been reconvicted.<sup>4</sup>

The Cornerstone Program also has a six-month after-care program, which was deemed essential to its success. When inmates are discharged from the prison gates with nothing but a bus ticket and a few dollars, too many simply return to their old stomping grounds, join their old friends and quickly forget everything they have learned in treatment.

In 1990, the year after the Cornerstone study, then-national drug director William Bennett issued a report touting the effectiveness of drug treatment in cutting crime. The report concluded that treatment cuts offenders' participation in criminal activity in half. "We get results," the report said. "[A]ddicts change their self-destructive pattern of behavior and stop or dramatically reduce drug use."<sup>5</sup>

But the Crime Law's passage comes after a wave of recent sophisticated studies that are particularly compelling:

---

<sup>4</sup>Gary Field, "The Effects of Intensive Treatment on Reducing the Criminal Recidivism of Addicted Offenders," Federal Probation, December 1989.

<sup>5</sup>"Understanding Drug Treatment," Office of National Drug Control Policy White Paper, June 1990.

- \* RAND, the respected research firm, concluded that treatment was seven times as cost effective than law enforcement in reducing the consumption of cocaine.<sup>6</sup> Treatment was so cost-effective that even if addicts began using as soon as they left treatment, the reduction in use during treatment alone would still exceed the reduction that law enforcement could achieve for the same expenditure.
  
- \* The State of California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, in a study that used randomly selected samples of treatment clients and control groups, found that five different treatment methods, including the therapeutic community model used in prisons, average \$7 in savings for every dollar invested.

In 1992, the study found, the cost of treating approximately 150,000 individuals was \$200 million. The benefits received during treatment and in the first year afterwards totaled approximately \$1.5 billion in savings. The largest savings were came from reductions in crime.<sup>7</sup> Criminal activity declined by two-thirds, and, confirming many other studies, the greater the length of time spent in treatment, the greater the percent reduction in criminal activity.

- \* In Texas, only 195 of 3,611 inmates (5 percent) released from a prison-based therapeutic community since March 1993 have been returned to jail for any reason, including technical violations of conditions of release. Another 390

---

<sup>6</sup> C. Peter Rydell and Susan S. Everingham, "Controlling Cocaine: Supply Versus Demand Programs", Rand Corporation, 1994.

<sup>7</sup> State of California, Department of Alcohol and Drug Problems, "Evaluating Recovery Services: The California Drug and Alcohol Treatment Assessment (CALDATA)", August, 1994.

offenders have dropped out of the after-care program, but even if all of these offenders returned to incarceration, the program's recidivism rate would be only 16 percent, easily three times better than the general prison population.

The results of the program, combined with other evidence of the effectiveness of prison treatment, convinced Texas officials to mount an aggressive treatment expansion program in the state's correctional system. By the end of fiscal year 1996, the state plans to have 14,000 beds dedicated to treating addicted offenders -- a tremendous commitment, but even that rapid growth will not meet the need.

\* At the Donovan Correctional Facility in San Diego, 38 percent of those who complete the 12-month treatment program, which includes three months of aftercare under parole supervision and provides no sentence reductions for participation, are eventually returned to prison. This compares to a reincarceration rate of 60 percent for a group of similar offenders who did not go through the program.<sup>8</sup>

The Crime Law will help replicate successful models like these in prison and jail systems across the nation. It provides \$270 million in grants to treat up to 250,000 offenders in state prisons, as well as within local correctional and detention facilities in which inmates are incarcerated long enough to permit sufficient treatment. Since after-

---

<sup>8</sup>Harry K. Wexler and Wendy F. Graham, "Prison-Based Therapeutic Community for Substance Abusers: Retention, Re-arrest and Reincarceration," presented to the American Psychological Association, August 1994.

care is such a critical component of lasting effects, preference in the grant process is given to programs with strong after-care provisions.

The legislation also authorizes \$113 million to treat offenders in the custody of the federal Bureau of Prisons, enough to treat about \$100,000 addicts. It also sets up a graduated schedule for the provision of drug treatment to federal inmates, mandating that 50 percent of eligible inmates receive treatment by the end of fiscal year 1995, 75 percent by the end of 1996, and that all qualifying inmates receive treatment by the end of fiscal year 1997.

Drug treatment in prisons is designed to break the link between addiction and crime. The best programs are designed to address social, behavioral, educational and vocational problems -- as well as addiction -- to ensure that the inmates are released back into society equipped to live a drug-free and crime-free life.

We cannot afford not to make the necessary commitment to this successful approach to reducing drug addiction and crime. We rarely have the opportunity to adopt a policy that we know has been successful and that we know is cost effective. Treatment in prisons is smart crime policy, smart budget policy and smart drug policy.

## Boot Camps and Prisons -- Creating Cells for Violent Offenders

The Crime Law also provides \$9.7 billion federal dollars to help the states build secure prisons, boot camps and other facilities -- all designed to ensure that expensive prison space is occupied by the offenders who need and deserve it most -- those who commit crimes of violence.

The prisons grants are divided into three programs:

- 1) Violent Offender Incarceration -- \$3.95 billion for prison-building grants to states, including the flexibility to build and operate military-style boot camp prisons, but with the legislated goal of ensuring that "prison cell space is available for the confinement of violent offenders"<sup>9</sup>;
  
- 2) "Truth in Sentencing" -- Another \$3.95 billion for an incentive program that is available to states that require all repeat violent offenders to serve 85 percent of their sentences; and,
  
- 3) Alien Incarceration -- \$1.8 billion to compensate states for the expense of incarcerating criminals who are in the United States illegally.

---

<sup>9</sup>Title II, Subtitle A, Section 20101 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

Chairman Biden has long advocated boot camps as a cost-effective, alternative to traditional prisons for young, non-violent and drug offenders. Since the first "shock incarceration" program was instituted in Georgia in 1983, at least 41 similar programs have been started in 26 states.

For many boot camp inmates, the program's grueling schedule of work, physical exercise, and remedial education -- combined with drug treatment -- is the first time in their lives that they learn responsibility, discipline and respect for the law. The camps both punish and give inmates a shot at rehabilitation. Those who fail to take the opportunity to turn themselves around are quickly returned to a regular prison.

In addition, the legislation mandates that boot camp programs do not allow inmates to quickly forget everything they have learned once they return to the community. After their 3- to 6-month term is over, they must receive aftercare services -- such as continued drug counseling or treatment, and educational and job training.

The boot camp program follows the same general strategy as the Drug Courts: to provide tough, cost-effective punishment for non-violent offenders while concentrating costly prisons on violent offenders.

Boot Camps are a Cost-Effective Alternative: A slot in a boot camp costs about one-third the price of a prison cell. A boot camp can be built for about 25 percent of the cost of a prison, and, on a per inmate basis, it can be run at about half the cost.

Moreover, because of the intensity of the boot camp program, it gets the same results as a conventional prison in one-half to one-third of the time. Recidivism rates for boot camp graduates are about the same as for those who spend a full year in prison.

Boot Camps Can Free Up Prison Space for Violent Offenders: According to the most recent Justice Department survey of state prisons, some 160,000 inmates have never committed a violent crime. They are non-violent offenders with either no prior records or minor ones. These are the offenders who would be moved into the less expensive boot camps, making more room in traditional prisons for drug thugs and others who have committed crimes of violence.

By providing states with the means to switch non-violent offenders into boot camps, the Crime Law enables states to throw the book at violent criminals and keep them in prison for longer terms.

One of the keys to the Violent Offender Incarceration grants is flexibility in how the funds may be used. The \$4 billion authorization could be used solely to build and operate state prisons for violent criminals. Prisons in several states have been built but remain empty due to lack of operating funds.

For illustrative purposes, we might posit that states would spend the entire \$4 billion in the program on boot camps. If this choice were made, it would fund the construction of 400,000 boot camp prison beds, or, alternatively, enough to operate some

200,000 boot camp beds each year for six years, the life of the grants. If -- as is not the case today -- all of these boot camp facilities could be used to house non-violent offenders and free space in conventional prisons for violent offenders, this might be the most cost-effective way of providing, in effect, new prison cells for violent criminals.

Flexibility also was built into the "Truth-in-Sentencing" program. Initially, the Republican prison proposal required all violent offenders to serve 85 percent of their sentences. Since violent offenders generally serve about 40 percent of their sentences today, this mandate would have cost the states more than \$60 billion over the next five years. It was simply too expensive. The result would have been almost no new prisons.

To trim that \$60 billion cost so states could afford to build more prison cells, the 85 percent requirement was changed to apply to second-time violent offenders. This will cost the states roughly \$20 billion over the next five years -- still costly, but a bit more reasonable.

Chairman Biden has been one of the Senate's longest and most vocal supporters of the truth-in-sentencing ideal. He, along with Senator Kennedy, were among the principal authors of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines a decade ago, guidelines that abolished parole and provided for tough, determinate sentences for federal criminals. Under the Guidelines, time served by federal prisoners must add up to at least 85% of time sentenced.

Precisely because he supports the twin goals of truth in sentencing and expansion of the nation's prison capacity, Chairman Biden believes we must have a workable plan. That is why the legislation contains a reverter clause - a kind of "insurance policy" that will shift unspent dollars from the "Truth-in-Sentencing" program to the Violent Offender Incarceration program if the states cannot meet the full 85% requirement.

The hope is that the states will spend \$20 billion in return for \$3.9 billion in federal help. But, if they do not, we must have a way to build prison cells.

The "insurance policy" will take 2 years to go into effect; 2 years to test if states will use the "truth-in-sentencing" grants. The next time the "insurance" will be available is 2 years after that, then at the end of the 5th and 6th years of the legislation.

More Drug Courts and boot camps will begin to fill in the vacuum that currently exists between probation and prison. On the one hand, there are at least 160,000 many people in prison who could be more effectively, and more cost-effectively, punished and rehabilitated in boot camps.

On the other hand, there are some 600,000 offenders out on probation who need to be under much tighter control than they are now, with their probation officers' caseloads at 100, 150, even 200 or more.

The new Drug Courts and boot camps will mean that the drug-addicted offenders arrested by the 100,000 new community police officers will face certain punishment with sentences that fit their crimes and treat their addictions. These are tough programs that will ensure, for the first time, that low-level, non-violent drug offenders are truly held accountable. And in the process, they will ensure that there is sufficient space in prison for drug dealers and violent offenders.

#### Certain Punishment for Young Offenders -- Accountability in the Juvenile Justice System

Few problems with the nation's struggle against drugs and crime are as evident as the shortcomings of the juvenile justice system. Drug dealers know the juvenile laws and the juvenile system as well as anyone -- and they have taken advantage of it, recruiting ever younger and more vulnerable children into their operations because they know they will likely escape meaningful punishment if they are caught.

But despite the terrible increase in violent, drug-related crime among juvenile, the fact is that most juvenile delinquents are not committing murders and muggings. They are stealing, vandalizing, getting into the same kind of trouble kids got into before the advent of crack and the ready access to firearms.

Currently, the juvenile justice system has no capacity to deal with these delinquents -- the type of kids who are suspended from school or come into contact with

the juvenile justice system for the first time. It suffers from one of the same faults as in the adult system: a judge has only one of two stark options -- prison, which is either too severe or too expensive; or probation, which is far too overloaded with cases to provide meaningful supervision and accountability for misbehavior. There is virtually nothing in between. nothing to provide for effective and cost-effective punishment or rehabilitation.

The \$150 million "Certainty of Punishment" program in the Crime Law takes aim at these young offenders -- trying to straighten out candy-aisle shoplifters before they become gun-toting carjackers. It funds a range of intermediate sanctions programs that bring hold juvenile offenders responsible for their actions. The alternative methods of punishment include:

- \* weekend incarceration and community-based incarceration;
- \* electronic monitoring;
- \* community service programs with work placement services;
- \* innovative programs aimed as substance abuse and gang-related offenses;
- \* drug and alcohol treatment programs, with aftercare, vocational training, family counseling and other services.

Many of these programs have proven that intensive intervention early in the lives of young people headed from trouble can make a difference. A few examples:

- \* The Southwest Key Day Treatment Program in Austin, Texas, provides round-the-clock tracking of kids who have had a brush with the law, and

who are out on probation or parole. The program counsels the kids and their parents, and also requires the kids to attend daily work-related, social skills and recreation sessions.

The Texas Youth Commission reports that the kids who complete the program have a 65% lower re-arrest rate than kids released from institutions directly into standard parole services.

- \* The Juvenile Diversion Program in Pueblo, Colorado, requires first-time, non-violent offenders to sign a behavioral contract and become involved with a non-profit agency; the youths are also tutored, counseled and required to pay restitution to their victims.

The program reports that 83% of its graduates are not re-arrested during the two years the program tracks them.

- \* In Mercer, Pennsylvania, the Specialized Treatment Services program targets delinquents with mental health problems for intensive counseling and academic services.

The program reports that more than 80% of the kids who complete the program do not get into serious trouble during the five years that they are followed after release.

- \* At Syracuse University, a 10-week curriculum that teaches anger control, moral reasoning and prosocial skills to juvenile offenders and their families

had a recidivism rate of 15 percent, compared to 43 percent for similar offenders who didn't receive the training.

The availability of correctional options such as these will help guarantee that juvenile offenders both pay and learn from their mistakes.

# CHAPTER III.

## CUTTING CRIME BEFORE

## IT OCCURS --

### DRUG TREATMENT AND

### PREVENTION

The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 undertakes not only an unprecedented commitment of federal resources to boosting the capacity of state and local law enforcement to deter, arrest, punish and treat drug offenders, but it also takes the view long espoused by the nation's police officers -- we must prevent crime before it occurs. Who could disagree? It seems surreal not to do everything we can to

prevent Americans from becoming victims of crime, rather than simply focusing on what the criminal justice system can do after an American has been victimized by crime or after an American child has fallen prey to the perverse allure of drugs.

As this report has confronted in the past, the argument against an investment in treatment and prevention perhaps reflects skepticism that crime and drug abuse can be prevented. If it is only skepticism that must be confronted, there is room for optimism. The source of that optimism -- the growing evidence that drug treatment and prevention work,<sup>10</sup> that help today means less crime and drug abuse tomorrow.

The inter-generational cycle of drugs and crime has been documented well. An addicted mother gives her daughter her first hit of heroin. A dealer asks his little brother to go on a few runs for him. One friend gives another a piece of his drug-selling "turf." And before he knows it, a young, impressionable child is co-opted into the drug culture. Once entangled, deviancy becomes normalcy, and without an education, without the support of a mentor or role model, and without self esteem, the chances of breaking out are slim. Many of these children -- far too many -- wind up addicted, in jail, or dead.

Chairman Biden has long recognized the futility of fighting a one-sided, reactive battle against addiction and crime. Since the release of his first drug report nearly four

---

<sup>10</sup>See, for example, studies cited in Chapter II of this report; National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, "Invest in Treatment for Alcohol and Other Drug Problems: It Pays," July 1994; and President's Commission on Model State Drug Laws, "Socioeconomic Evaluations of Addictions Treatment," December 1993.

years ago, he has called for a greater federal commitment to providing youth -- particularly those from areas of high poverty and heavy drug traffic -- the chance to choose a future free from drugs, gangs and guns. The Crime Law holds out this opportunity, with \$4.4 billion for programs that offer alternatives to the temptations of the streets and the pull of corrupt peers. To address those who still do not resist -- those on the brink of a criminal career -- the legislation provides local jurisdictions with the flexibility to provide drug treatment. For although treatment within the criminal justice system is effective, the best approach is to prevent the downward spiral from addiction into crime in the first place.

The remainder of this chapter details the numerous programs that the Crime Law will provide to keep children away from crime and drugs: the "safe havens" that will -- if nothing else -- keep children out of the way of the crossfire and gunfights that have become commonplace on too many American streets and in too many American neighborhoods; and the drug treatment that has proven effective at cutting drug abuse -- and drug-related crime.

Before undertaking this discussion, though, it must be pointed out that the Crime Law was never intended to provide -- nor could it -- the primary federal response to the shortfall in drug treatment. A comprehensive drug bill must tackle the complicated and expensive problem of providing drug treatment to all the estimated one million hard-core addicts who could be treated. Important gains against this drug treatment shortfall will

be achieved by the Crime Law, but no one should be lulled into believing that the Crime Law has accomplished all that is necessary on this score.

### Substance Abuse Treatment -- Early Intervention in Budding Criminal Careers

As the previous chapter of this report detailed, the Crime Law aims to shut the revolving door by treating addicts within the criminal justice system; as these next few pages demonstrate, the legislation also aims to treat addicts before incarceration becomes necessary. Chairman Biden has long considered that drug treatment should be the cornerstone of the effort to fight the harms of addiction.

Those who question whether we can afford to pay for drug treatment have missed the point -- the real question to ask is whether we can afford not to pay for drug treatment? For every dollar we spend treating hard-core addicts, we save \$7 dollars later -- in reduced crime and other high social costs of addiction.

The most obvious costs of drug abuse are well known -- crime infested streets, crack babies, AIDS, and neglected or parentless children. Yet, the hidden costs are just as damaging -- burdens on our social institutions, in particular our health care and social service agencies, cause higher health care costs, higher medical insurance, lost productivity, an unskilled, uneducated workforce, and higher taxes to support the operations of the criminal justice system.

The Crime Law contains several provisions aimed at closing the drug treatment gap:

- \* The Local Partnership Act gets federal dollars quickly and directly to where they are needed most -- to local officials, and gives them the flexibility to use the money to address their most urgent and critical crime prevention problems -- such as a shortage of drug treatment. If the entire \$1.6 billion authorized under the Local Partnership Act were use to fund drug treatment programs, at least 320,000 drug addicts could be treated. It is essential to meet this shortfall, for many of these addicts commit 20, 50, or even up to 200 crimes each year to support their habits.
  
- \* Local Crime Prevention Block Grant -- \$377 million allotted directly to local governments, based on their jurisdiction's share of violent crime, for a variety of purposes including treatment and rehabilitation to prevent the use and sale of illegal drugs by juveniles.
  
- \* Model Intensive Grants -- \$626 million to target crime-fighting aid to urban and rural areas that have been especially hard-hit by violence and drug trafficking. It brings together law enforcement officials with educators, community leaders and others to streamline their efforts to relieve the conditions that encourage crime and to provide meaningful and lasting alternatives to involvement in crime --

including the development of community-based substance abuse treatment facilities.

- \* Ounce of Prevention Grants -- \$90 million for an interagency council including the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services and other cabinet heads to provide grants to fund programs including substance abuse treatment and prevention.

For too long the focus of the drug debate has been on choosing between treatment and enforcement. It is a debate we can no longer afford. These programs, together with those under the Drug Courts and drug treatment in prisons provisions, are a significant step in the right direction -- cutting crime and saving tax dollars. However, far more must be done.

#### Community-based Prevention -- Providing Education and Opportunity

Treatment alone will not slow down the escalating cycle of inter-generational involvement in drugs and crime. We must prevent children from being drawn into the web of drugs and crime by providing them with something else to believe in, someone to turn to, and someplace safe to go. The harsh reality is that we cannot always count on the family to provide children with these fundamentals; nor can we count on them to

instill in youth the elemental teachings of life -- personal values, self worth, and goals for the future.

The Crime Law recognizes that to steer kids down the right path, we must make a national commitment to showing them a better way by giving them constructive ways to spend their time, role models to look up to, and meaningful opportunities. It also realizes that the success of prevention and education depends upon a coordinated community effort linking early intervention and prevention with smart treatment and aftercare programs.

Getting the community actively involved in the care and supervision of its children is one of the key aims of the Crime Law, and thus it contains built-in incentives to leverage community resources, energy and support. Under the Community Policing program, for example, \$1.3 billion dollars may be used to fund early intervention teams of police, social workers, educators and doctors working together to prevent youth from drug and crime involvement through proactive prevention such as Police Athletic Leagues, mentoring, conflict resolution and victim services.

This provision will help bring programs such as "PAT," a supervised sports program run by the Birmingham, Ala., Police Department, to needy neighborhoods across the country. "PAT" offers more than softball, basketball, or baseball; the police have imported energy and imagination to turn their recreation program into a crime prevention tool. Kids are required to study for at least one hour every night -- the

program supplies tutors -- and maintain a "C" average in order to play on a team. Their efforts have paid off -- the department reports that juvenile crime has dropped 30% in the disadvantaged neighborhoods served by the program.

The Crime Law also recognizes that change must come from within the community. A real investment in effective prevention and education programs cannot be imposed from Washington. Community support is key and so is easy access. Thus, under the Community Schools provision, the Crime Law encourages residents, local businesses and civic organizations to band together and set up community-based prevention centers in the heart of the neediest neighborhoods.

The goal of this program is to give kids something to do with their free time today -- with sporting and recreational programs, and to provide them with the tools they need to succeed tomorrow -- through workforce preparation, entrepreneurship, tutorial and mentoring programs, an initial physical examination, and provision of first aid and nutrition guidance. There is a catch: groups must utilize existing facilities such as public schools or recreation centers that are easily accessible. These facilities will serve as safe-havens for children in areas with a high incidence of poverty and crime during the afternoons, weekends, and holidays.

Community school programs are underway in many neighborhoods across the nation and have already begun to make a difference. The Crime Law authorizes \$567 million to make such programs available in more communities. It will fund programs

such as Communities in Schools Houston, which has successfully kept 90% of the kids it serves in school at the end of the year. (State-wide, one-third of students entering high school fail to graduate). The key to its success: professionals set up shop in the schools and provide one-on-one counseling, mentoring, tutoring, job training and crisis intervention.

In addition to those programs, the Crime Law provides local communities with resources to develop and implement the services most needed in their area. For example, the Local Crime Prevention Block Grants provide \$377 million directly to local governments to fund any one of a variety of crime prevention programs such as:

- \* Boys & Girls Clubs in public housing projects. These clubs are more than sports and recreation. They have a proven drug and crime prevention record of success. A 1992 study showed that housing projects with Boys & Girls Clubs experienced: 13% fewer juvenile crimes; 22% less drug activity; and 25% less crack presence than projects without clubs;
- \* Youth Employment and Skills -- to encourage private employers to hire at-risk teens and young adults, who must avoid crime and drug use and stay in school in order to remain in the program.
- \* Midnight Basketball -- evening and night-time sports leagues to keep kids off the streets and out of trouble, pure and simple. They build values like teamwork,

sportsmanship, and personal responsibility. They put youngsters who may have few positive influences in their lives in touch with coaches and parents who care. And the kids don't just shoot baskets; in order to play, they've got to attend job counseling or other educational programs as well.

- \* Police Partnerships for Children -- to provide a protective, comforting net of law enforcement officers and family service workers around small children who have been traumatized by violence, on a 24-hour a day basis, so they are there when the children need them the most.
  
- \* Safe Low-Income Housing -- to get police officers to live in the communities they serve, investing them in the livelihood of their neighborhoods and making their neighbors feel safe.
  
- \* Anti-Crime Youth Councils -- to give kids a stake in their schools and communities by involving youth in the planning of responses to violence and in resolving disputes.
  
- \* Hope in Youth -- to fund programs such as "ROAR," which targets children who are at risk for school failure which often leads to delinquency. ROAR uses pediatric visits to inspire an interest in reading.

\* Gang Prevention Services for Boys & Girls -- to provide educational, health, career and other services to at-risk youths who might otherwise elect lives of crime and drugs. This provision would fund programs such as "STARS" -- Success Through Academic and Recreational Support -- a program which the Fort Myers, Fla., police chief reports has led to a 27% reduction in juvenile arrests and a dramatic reduction in repeat-offender arrests.

We must help our children discover that they have a future, that they do not have to become a part of the cycle, and that all roads are not dead-ends. We must make drug use and trafficking less attractive and less tempting. To do so we must show our children that opportunity is within their reach by giving them a better education, job training, mentors, and role models. We must provide them with positive alternatives to hanging out on the streets, and we must treat their addicted parents, brothers, sisters, and friends.

Most importantly, we have got to let our children know that they are important and that they matter. Youths need self-esteem and self-worth to have the strength to resist the seduction of drugs and crime. Neighborhoods and homes must become more nurturing places to live. We must show our children that somebody cares.

CHAPTER IV.  
COMMANDING THE NATION'S  
DRUG EFFORT --  
  
NEW AUTHORITY FOR THE  
FEDERAL DRUG DIRECTOR

Six years ago, Chairman Biden, along with Senator DeConcini, spearheaded the effort to create the Office of National Drug Control Policy to coordinate the efforts of the numerous federal agencies involved in the fight against drug abuse.

At the time, Chairman Biden believed that the terrible scourge of drug abuse and drug-related violence would provide the impetus for a true, government-wide effort to combat the problem. He did not expect that the Drug Director's office would encounter stiff resistance in devising, funding and implementing the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy.

But clearly that is what happened. As has been demonstrated by numerous Judiciary Committee hearings, and by hearings in the House of Representatives by Chairman Conyers, and despite the labors of Drug Director Brown, our national drug control efforts have been hamstrung because the drug director's office was never permitted to realize its intended authority. The office was severely weakened under the previous Administration, which turned it into a dumping ground for political appointees and is still struggling to gain the stature the original legislation foresaw.

The Crime Law amendments to the National Narcotics Leadership Act finally put some real punch into the drug director's office. The changes give the office the authority it needs to get the job done, to make the national drug director what he was originally intended to be: a true general in command of our war on drugs.

### New Drug Director Powers

#### Up-front Budget Authority

Previously, the director could certify whether an agency's drug budget request was sufficient to implement the objectives of the drug strategy. But if the budget request was

inadequate, he could not say what would be adequate, so no one knew how far short the budget was falling from what was really needed.

Now, the director is instructed to specify what budget levels are sufficient to fulfill strategy goals and orders him to certify each drug agency's request, in whole or in part.

The Act also directs him to recommend specific drug budgets for each agency by July 1 of each year, when federal agencies are starting to prepare their budgets, so they can plan in concert with the strategy.

With these changes, which essentially codify part of an executive order signed by the president late last year, the nation will finally get a real handle on what it's going to take to fight this war.

#### Implementing the National Strategy

The Director was not permitted to transfer small amounts of funds or personnel between federal drug-fighting agencies to fine tune programs and investigations, unless the agency approved.

The Crime Law provisions now allow the Director to temporarily reassign personnel between agencies, in addition to permitting him to shift up to 2 percent of an agency's drug dollars to another agency, subject to approval by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress.

The Director also is empowered to issue "Funds Control Notices" to drug control agencies, telling them how and when they can spend their drug budgets.

The new powers in the Crime Law will, for the first time, give the director real control over implementing the drug strategy, real authority to keep the agencies focused on the policies and objectives of the strategy each year. It will give him the flexibility he needs to respond quickly and decisively to new situations and priorities.

### Other Drug Director Provisions

#### Outcome Measures

Perhaps more significantly than expanding the powers of the Drug Director's Office, the Crime Law requires that we begin to look at and evaluate the national drug control effort in a new light -- one focused on the consequences of drug abuse and drug trafficking.

In the past, success or failure was measured in terms of drug arrests, drug seizures, drug-related emergency room admissions and dirty drug tests among jail inmates. To be sure, these measures are critical to the nation's understanding of progress in the fight against illegal drugs.

But clearly other indicators must be used as well, measures that take account of the damage that drugs cause to society and the expenses they entail. That is why the Crime Law mandates a new set of data to be collected and monitored and to be brought

into the national debate about the direction of the anti-drug effort. These measures include:

- \* the extent of drug-related health care costs
- \* the size of the black market drug economy
- \* the extent of illicit drug use
- \* the extent of drug-related crime
- \* the availability of illegal drugs
- \* the shortfall in meeting the demand for drug treatment.

This "harm-based" approach will give the nation a much more comprehensive yardstick by which to measure its progress. Moreover, it will encourage drug-fighting agencies to concentrate their efforts on program designed to reduce the human misery and the financial costs of drug abuse.

#### Asset Forfeiture

The bill provides the Director with authority over the \$20 million expected to be available from the "Super Surplus" of the Special Forfeiture Fund. These funds had been effectively under the control of the Treasury-Postal Appropriations Subcommittee.

#### Staffing

Under the previous Administration, the Drug Director's office had become a dumping ground for political appointees. At one point, during 1992, 46 of the office's 109 employees were political appointees -- 42 percent.

President Clinton wisely scaled back the size of the office, to 25, but Chairman Biden, Senator DeConcini and others believed that number was too small. The office has since grown to 40, but coordinating of the efforts of 50 federal departments and agencies is simply not possible without sufficient staff.

The Crime Law sets a floor of 75 employees for the office, a size that should be adequate to carry out its duties.

#### Ban on Political Campaigning

The Crime Law prohibits any Senate-confirmed officer of ONDCP from engaging in any federal election campaign activities, a provision that has been long advocated by Senator Simon.

#### Sunset

Finally, the bill extends the life of the drug policy office for three more years, to September of 1997.

"Coordination" has been a linchpin of the comprehensive drug strategies offered by Chairman Biden over the past four years. In an effort as complex and difficult as combating the scourge of drug abuse, involving some 50 federal departments and

agencies, state and local officials and community organizations across the nation, strong leadership is essential. The tools this legislation provides to the Drug Director's office will ensure that it is able to fulfill that role.

## V. CRIME LAW ANTI-DRUG PROGRAMS

- I. PROGRAMS FOR POLICE 72
  - A. COMMUNITY POLICING\*  
Police hiring and other grants
  - B. BYRNE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM\*
  - C. RURAL CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT  
Byrne-type grants for rural areas
  - D. MODEL INTENSIVE GRANTS
  
- II. COURTS, PROSECUTORS AND CORRECTIONS 79
  - A. DRUG COURTS\*  
Enhanced supervision and treatment of drug-addicted offenders released on probation
  - B. COMMUNITY BASED JUSTICE GRANTS  
Prosecutor led cooperative efforts to combat juvenile crime

\* PROGRAM FUNDING BEGINS FISCAL YEAR 1995

- C. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT IN STATE PRISONS
- D. PRISONS -- "VIOLENT OFFENDER INCARCERATION"\*  
Expand prison and boot camps
- E. PRISONS -- "TRUTH IN SENTENCING INCENTIVE"  
Expand prison capacity in states which have implemented "Truth in Sentencing"
- F. CERTAIN PUNISHMENT FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS  
Programs for offenders 22 or younger, including juveniles

III. PROGRAMS FOR MAYORS AND COUNTY OFFICIALS

86

- A. MODEL INTENSIVE GRANT PROGRAM  
Anti-crime programs involving public safety, youth programs and infrastructure improvements to crime
- B. LOCAL PARTNERSHIP ACT  
Locally developed education, substance abuse and jobs programs
- C. PREVENTION BLOCK GRANTS  
Locally developed crime prevention program
- D. OUNCE OF PREVENTION\*  
Youth violence prevention, substance abuse treatment, and child abuse prevention

\* PROGRAM FUNDING BEGINS FISCAL YEAR 1995

IV. PROGRAMS IMPLEMENTED BY NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

95

- A. COMMUNITY SCHOOLS YOUTH SERVICES AND SUPERVISION\*  
Keeping schools open as "safe havens" against violence
- B. COMMUNITY POLICING\*  
Prevention programs in conjunction with police
- C. CERTAIN PUNISHMENT FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS  
Substance abuse treatment and other services to children in the juvenile justice system
- D. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT IN STATE PRISONS
- E. DRUG COURTS\*  
Substance abuse treatment and other services for drug-abusing offenders on probation
- F. COMMUNITY-BASED JUSTICE GRANTS FOR PROSECUTORS  
Substance abuse treatment and other services to children in the juvenile justice system
- G. LOCAL PARTNERSHIP ACT  
Locally developed education, substance abuse and job programs
- H. PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT  
Locally developed crime prevention programs
- I. MODEL INTENSIVE GRANT PROGRAM
- J. OUNCE OF PREVENTION\*  
Youth violence prevention, substance abuse treatment, and child abuse prevention

\* PROGRAM FUNDING BEGINS FISCAL YEAR 1995

I. PROGRAMS FOR POLICE

- A. COMMUNITY POLICING\*  
Police hiring and other grants
- B. BYRNE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM\*
- C. RURAL CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT  
Byrne-type grants for rural areas
- D. MODEL INTENSIVE GRANTS

\* PROGRAM FUNDING BEGINS FISCAL YEAR 1995

**\*\*\* FUNDS AVAILABLE IN FISCAL YEAR 1995 \*\*\***

**GRANT: COMMUNITY POLICING**

**PURPOSE**

To hire and train new police officers for community policing.

To provide funds for equipment, technology, overtime, and other systems or personnel to support community policing. (See list attached.)

To redeploy existing officers to community policing through increased use of technology.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

States, units of local government, and multi-jurisdictional or regional consortia thereof.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

Local officials submit applications directly to the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Attorney General is to develop simplified applications for jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000 and for jurisdictions seeking grants of less than \$1 million.

50% of the total \$8.8 billion in funding must be allocated to jurisdictions with populations over 150,000; 50% is to be allocated to jurisdictions of 150,000 or less.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

The grants provide \$75,000 in salary and benefits to hire and train each officer over 3-5 years, or up to 75% of the salary and benefits of an officer over that period, whichever is less. Local jurisdictions determine whether the federal grants will last 3, 4 or 5 years.

Local jurisdictions determine how the \$75,000 federal contribution is spent over the life of the grant. The only requirements are that the federal share must decrease each year, and that the federal funds must supplement, not supplant, state and local police funding.

Up to \$1.3 billion of the grants may be used for community policing implementation, overtime, training and management programs, and police-led prevention programs, such as Police Athletic Leagues.

At least \$7.5 billion of the grants may be used for hiring new police officers and/or re-hiring laid-off police officers for deployment in community policing.

In fiscal years 1995 and 1996, up to 20% of the hiring funds may be used for equipment, technology and support systems and personnel, if those expenditures increase the number of community police officers. (Every \$75,000 spent for these purposes must result in the deployment of at least one additional police officer to the street.) These funding purposes are limited to 10% of the grants for fiscal years 1997-2000.

In fiscal year 1995, \$200 million will be distributed in October to jurisdictions which applied for, but did not receive, grants under the Police Hiring Supplemental program. (No new applications are required from jurisdictions which have already applied.)

Applications should reflect consultation between police management and labor in developing community policing and officer redeployment plans.

### **FUNDING**

Total national funding is \$8.8 billion over six years. \$1.3 billion for fiscal year 1995 is available October 1, 1994, \$200 million of which will be distributed to agencies that applied but did not receive grants under the Police Hiring Supplemental Program. All agencies, including those which received the supplemental funds, may apply for a portion of the remaining \$1.1 billion available in fiscal year 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER -- 1-800-421-6770.**

LIST OF PROGRAMS, PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES  
TO SUPPORT COMMUNITY POLICING

- A. Increase the number of law enforcement officers involved in activities that are focused on interaction with members of the community on proactive crime control and prevention by redeploying officers to such activities;
- B. Develop and establish new administrative and managerial systems to facilitate the adoption of community-oriented policing as an organization-wide philosophy;
- C. Payment for overtime to assist the implementation of community-oriented policing;
- D. Establish and implement innovative programs to increase and enhance proactive crime control and prevention programs, such as Police Athletic Leagues, involving law enforcement officers and young persons in the community;
- E. Develop new technologies to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in reorienting the emphasis of their activities from reacting to crime to preventing crime;
- F. Establish innovative programs to reduce and keep to a minimum, the amount of time that law enforcement officers must be away from the community while awaiting court appearances;
- G. Provide specialized training to law enforcement officers to enhance their conflict resolution, mediation, problem solving, service, and other skills needed to work in partnership with members of the community;
- H. Increase police participation in multidisciplinary early intervention teams;
- I. Develop and implement innovative programs to permit members of the community to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in the prevention of crime in the community, such as citizens' police academies, including programs designed to increase the level of access to the criminal justice system enjoyed by victims, witnesses, and ordinary citizens by establishing decentralized satellite offices (including video facilities) of principal criminal courts buildings;
- J. Establish, implement and coordinate crime prevention and control programs (involving law enforcement officers working with community members) with other Federal programs that serve the community and community members to better address the comprehensive needs of the community and its members;
- K. Support the purchase by a law enforcement agency of no more than 1 service weapon per officer, upon hiring for deployment in community-oriented policing, or, if necessary, upon existing officers' initial redeployment to community-oriented policing.

**\*\*\* FUNDS AVAILABLE IN FISCAL YEAR 1995 \*\*\***

**GRANT:** BYRNE FORMULA GRANTS

**PURPOSE**

To help state and local criminal justice agencies improve a wide range of law enforcement and crime prevention programs, including the 21 previously authorized purposes such as state and local drug task force efforts and the following new purposes:

- \* law enforcement and prevention programs relating to gangs, or to youth who are involved or at risk of involvement in gangs;
- \* the development or improvement of forensic lab DNA analysis;
- \* enforcement and prosecution of persons charged with driving while intoxicated or other alcohol related motor vehicle violations; and
- \* effective bindover systems for the prosecution of juveniles who commit certain violent crimes.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

States

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

States submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

75% Federal share.

Byrne formula grant terms and restrictions apply.

**FUNDING**

\$1 billion over six years (FY95-FY97). \$450 million available beginning October 1, 1994.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:** U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE CENTER: 1-800-421-6770.

**GRANT: RURAL CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT**

**PURPOSE**

Grants used for drug enforcement in rural States and "nonmetropolitan areas" of each State. These grants will support activities identical to existing Byrne enforcement formula grants.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

States, cities, towns, and counties (alone or in combination).

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

States' annual Byrne formula grant application serves as application for these grants.

Rural jurisdictions apply to State offices that currently distribute Byrne grants.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

75% Federal share. Non-federal portion to be paid in cash. Grants can extend for up to 4 years (multijurisdictional drug task forces exempted from time limitation).

Byrne formula grant terms and restrictions apply.

States must specify how the grant will be coordinated with existing Byrne formula funds.

**FUNDING**

\$240 million over 5 years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

States guaranteed minimum of \$250,000 per year, remaining funds will be allocated by formula according to population.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER -- 1-800-421-6770**

**GRANT: MODEL INTENSIVE GRANT PROGRAMS**

**PURPOSE**

To develop 15 comprehensive crime prevention programs that involve law enforcement organizations, nonprofit community organizations, and other community resources to relieve conditions that encourage crime and provide alternatives to involvement in crime.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Cities, towns, and counties.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

Cities, towns, and counties submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Law enforcement contact cities, towns and counties.

Nonprofit organizations, citizen groups, volunteer organizations, and private businesses must be involved in developing applications.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

100% Federal funds.

Funds may be used for public safety services, equipment or facilities; youth programs; community-based substance abuse treatment; street lighting; public transportation; and other public facilities or services.

Federal funds must supplement, not supplant local funds.

**FUNDING**

\$626 million over five years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER AT 1-800-421-6770.**

## II. COURTS, PROSECUTORS AND CORRECTIONS

### A. DRUG COURTS\*

Enhanced supervision and treatment of drug-addicted offenders released on probation

### B. COMMUNITY BASED JUSTICE GRANTS

Prosecutor led cooperative efforts to combat juvenile crime

### C. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT IN STATE PRISONS

### D. PRISONS -- "VIOLENT OFFENDER INCARCERATION"\*

Expand prison and boot camps

### E. PRISONS -- "TRUTH IN SENTENCING INCENTIVE"

Expand prison capacity in states which have implemented "Truth in Sentencing"

### F. CERTAIN PUNISHMENT FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS

Programs for offenders 22 or younger, including juveniles

\* PROGRAM FUNDING BEGINS IN FISCAL YEAR 1995

**\*\*\* FUNDS AVAILABLE IN FISCAL YEAR 1995 \*\*\***

**GRANT:** DRUG COURTS

**PURPOSE**

To increase monitoring of non-violent, addicted offenders on probation or supervised release through testing, treatment and other programs, and by sanctioning offenders who fail to comply with program requirements.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Chief executives or chief justices of states, and units of local government.

**APPLICATIONS PROCESS**

These are discretionary grants. Officials submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

75% Federal share.

No violent offenders may participate in Drug Court programs. Violent offender is defined as a person who is charged with or convicted of an offense involving a firearm or dangerous weapon, an offense that resulted in death or serious bodily injury, an offense involving the use of force, or a person who has one or more prior convictions for a felony crime of violence involving the use or attempted use of force against a person with the intent to cause death or serious bodily harm.

**FUNDING**

\$1 billion over six years (FY95-FY2000). \$29 million available beginning October 1, 1994.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:** THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER -- 1-800-421-6770.

**GRANT: COMMUNITY-BASED JUSTICE GRANTS FOR PROSECUTORS**

**PURPOSE**

To fund cooperative and coordinated efforts of prosecutors, school officials, police, probation officers, youth and social service professionals to improve the prosecution of young violent offenders; and to develop violence prevention programs including mediation, conflict resolution, counseling, educational and recreational programs as an alternative to criminal involvement.

In rural states, funds can also be used for cooperative efforts between state and local prosecutors, victim advocacy and assistance groups, social and community service providers to investigate and prosecute child abuse cases, and to treat and prevent child abuse.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

State and local prosecutors.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

These are discretionary grants. State and local prosecutors submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

100% Federal funds. Grants renewable for up to 2 years.

Rural States include: Alaska, Arkansas, Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

**FUNDING**

\$50 million for 5 years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER AT 1-800-421-6770.**

**GRANT:     SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT IN STATE PRISONS**

**PURPOSE**

To provide residential substance abuse treatment programs within state correctional facilities, local correctional and detention facilities.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

States.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

These are discretionary grants. States submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

75% Federal share.

Drug treatment program must last 6 to 12 months in facilities set apart from general inmate population; along with drug testing.

Preference is given to States that include after-care services.

**FUNDING**

\$270 million over 5 years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER AT 1-800-421-6770.**

**\*\*\* FUNDS AVAILABLE IN FISCAL YEAR 1995 \*\*\***

**GRANT:** PRISONS -- "VIOLENT OFFENDER INCARCERATION"

**PURPOSE**

To develop prisons for violent offenders or boot camps that can free conventional prison space for violent offenders.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

States or States organized as multi-state compacts.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

\$3.4 billion in formula grants; \$600 million in discretionary grants. States or multi-state compacts submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice. Local jurisdictions submit to the States.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

75% federal share.

To be eligible, a State must provide assurances that it is moving toward truth in sentencing for violent offenders, that it recognizes the rights of crime victims, and that it has developed a comprehensive correctional plan for the supervision and management of offenders and inmates.

States must consult with units of local government and share funds with local units which confine sentenced prisoners due to overcrowding in State facilities.

**FUNDING**

\$3.4 billion will be allocated to eligible States by a formula based on violent crime. \$600 million of the funds are discretionary, to be distributed to States that demonstrate the greatest need and the ability to best use the funds to meet the grant objectives.

\$24.5 million in discretionary grants for boot camps is available beginning October 1, 1994.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:** THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER -- 1-800-421-6770.

**GRANT: PRISONS -- "TRUTH IN SENTENCING INCENTIVE"**

**PURPOSE**

To implement truth in sentencing laws for violent offenders.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

States or States organized as multi-state compacts.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

These are formula grants. States or multi-state compacts submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

75% federal share.

To be eligible, a State must require all violent offenders to serve at least 85% of their sentences, or, since 1993, the State must have passed a law that requires all repeat violent offenders to serve at least 85% of their sentences.

States must also provide assurances that they recognize the rights of crime victims and have developed a comprehensive correctional plan for the supervision and management of offenders and inmates.

**FUNDING**

\$4 billion will be allotted over 6 years according to a formula based on violent crime. Only eligible States will receive funds.

At the end of fiscal years 1996, 1998, 1999 and 2000, funds not allocated under the "Truth in Sentencing" program will be transferred to the "Violent Offender Incarceration" program, and distributed to States eligible under that program.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER -- 1-800-421-6770.**

**GRANT: CERTAIN PUNISHMENT FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS**

**PURPOSE**

To develop alternative punishments for young offenders including: restitution programs, education, job training, substance abuse treatment, family counseling, community-based incarceration, weekend incarceration, electronic monitoring, community service programs, and after-care programs.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

States, cities, towns, and counties.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

States submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Cities, towns, and counties submit applications to States.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

75% Federal share.

Eligible offenders are non-violent, first-time offenders or with minor criminal records who are 22 years of age or younger, including juveniles.

Not less than two-thirds of the funds received by a State shall be distributed to cities, towns, and counties.

In awarding grants, U.S. Attorney General gives priority to States which require juveniles who are caught with a firearm or weapon on school property to be suspended from school and to lose driving privileges.

**FUNDING**

\$150 million over 5 years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER -- 1-800-421-6770**

III. PROGRAMS FOR MAYORS AND COUNTY OFFICIALS

A. MODEL INTENSIVE GRANT PROGRAM

Anti-crime programs involving public safety, youth programs and infrastructure improvements to crime

B. LOCAL PARTNERSHIP ACT

Locally developed education, substance abuse and jobs programs

C. PREVENTION BLOCK GRANTS

Locally developed crime prevention program

D. OUNCE OF PREVENTION\*

Youth violence prevention, substance abuse treatment, and child abuse prevention

\* PROGRAM FUNDING BEGINS IN FISCAL YEAR 1995

**GRANT: MODEL INTENSIVE GRANT PROGRAMS**

**PURPOSE**

To develop 15 comprehensive crime prevention programs that involve law enforcement organizations, nonprofit community organizations, and other community resources to relieve conditions that encourage crime and provide alternatives to involvement in crime.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Cities, towns, and counties.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

Cities, towns, and counties submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Nonprofit organizations, citizen groups, volunteer organizations, and private businesses must be involved in developing applications.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

100% Federal funds.

Funds may be used for public safety services, equipment or facilities; youth programs; community-based substance abuse treatment; street lighting; public transportation; and other public facilities or services.

Federal funds must supplement, not supplant local funds.

**FUNDING**

\$626 million over five years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER AT 1-800-421-6770.**

**GRANT: LOCAL PARTNERSHIP ACT**

**PURPOSE**

To provide additional funds to local governments to develop their own education, substance abuse treatment, and job programs to prevent crime (though grants must be used to fund programs "substantially similar" to several current federal programs -- a list is attached).

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Cities, towns, counties, nonprofits.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

No application for cities, towns, and counties; dollars distributed directly to local governments by formula.

Nonprofits may apply to cities, towns, and counties.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

100% Federal funds.

Local governments decide how to spend dollars (within general purposes of program, of course).

Federal funds must supplement, not supplant local funds. Each year, local governments must identify the amount it spent for the eligible services for the previous year -- any reductions from this local base level amount will result in dollar for dollar reduction in this Federal assistance.

Recipients shall hold at least one public hearing on the proposed use of payments.

Cities, towns, and counties must provide notice of proposed use of funds to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Not less than 10% of amounts obligated for contracts and subcontracts shall be expended for socially and economically disadvantaged small businesses, and minority colleges and universities.

**FUNDING** \$1.6 billion over 5 years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: TO BE SUPPLIED**

LOCAL PARTNERSHIP ACT  
LIST OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

1. The Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program under section 5122 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
2. The National Youth Sports Program under section 682 of the Community Services Block Grant Act (Public Law 97-35) as amended by section 205, Public Law 103-252.
3. The Gang Resistance Education and Training Program under the Act entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executives, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes', approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-509).
4. Programs under title II or IV of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).
5. Programs under subtitle C of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12571 et seq.) as amended.
6. Programs under the School to Work Opportunities Act (Public Law 103-239).
7. Substance Abuse Treatment and Prevention programs authorized under title V or XIX of the Public Health Services Act (43 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).
8. Programs under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.).
9. Programs under part A or B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
10. The TRIO programs under part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).
11. Programs under the National Literacy Act of 1991.
12. Programs under the Carl Perkins Vocational Educational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).
13. The demonstration partnership programs including the community initiative targeted to minority youth under section 203 of the Human Services Reauthorization of 1994 (Public Law 103-232).

14. The runaway and homeless youth program and the transitional living program for homeless youth under title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (Public Law 102-586).
15. The family support program under subtitle F of title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 1148 et seq.).
16. After-school activities for school aged children under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.).
17. The community-based family resource programs under section 401 of the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-232).
18. The family violence programs under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act Amendments of 1984.
19. Job training programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, or the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

**GRANT: PREVENTION BLOCK GRANTS**

**PURPOSE**

To provide additional funds for local governments to develop crime prevention programs targeting youth crimes, youth gangs, child abuse, drug abuse by children, and crimes against the elderly. (See attached for list of possible programs and purposes).

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Cities, towns, counties, and nonprofits.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

No application for cities, towns, and counties; dollars distributed directly to local governments by formula.

Nonprofits may contract with cities, towns, and counties.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

100% Federal funds.

Local governments decide how to spend dollars (within general purposes of program, of course).

A public hearing must be held on proposed use of funds.

Federal funds must supplement not supplant local funds.

Cities, towns and counties must submit notice of proposed use of funds to the U.S. Department of Justice.

**FUNDING**

\$377 million over five years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER AT 1-800-421-6770.**

LOCAL CRIME PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM  
LIST OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

- A. Education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs to prevent juvenile violence, juvenile gangs, and the use and sale of illegal drugs by juveniles.
- B. Programs to prevent crimes against the elderly based on the concepts of the Triad model.
- C. Programs that prevent young children from becoming gang involved, including the award of grants or contracts to community-based service providers that have a proven track record of providing services to children ages 5 to 18.
- D. Saturation jobs programs, offered either separately or in conjunction with the services provided for under the Youth Fair Chance Program, that provide employment opportunities leading to permanent unsubsidized employment for disadvantaged young adults 16 through 25 years of age.
- E. Midnight sports league programs that shall require each player in the league to attend employment counseling, job training, and other educational classes provided under the program, which shall be held in conjunction with league sports games at or near the site of the games.
- F. Supervised sports and recreation programs, including Olympic Youth Development Centers established in cooperation with the United States Olympic Committee, that are offered--
  - i. after school and on weekends and holidays, during the school year; and
  - ii. as daily (or week-long) full-day programs (to the extent available resources permit) or as part-day programs, during the summer months.
- G. Prevention and enforcement programs to reduce--
  - i. the formation or continuation of juvenile gangs; and
  - ii. the use and sale of illegal drugs by juveniles
- H. Youth anticrime councils to give intermediate and secondary school students a structured forum through which to work with community organizations, law enforcement officials, government and media representatives, and school administrators and faculty to address issues regarding youth and violence.

- I. Award of grants or contracts to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, a national nonprofit youth organization, to establish Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing.
- J. Supervised visitation centers for children who have been removed from their parents and placed outside the home as a result of abuse or neglect or other risk of harm to them and for children whose parents are separated or divorced and the children are at risk because--
  - i. there is documented sexual, physical, or emotional abuse as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction;
  - ii. there is suspected or elevated risk of sexual, physical, or emotional abuse, or there have been threats of parental abduction of the child;
  - iii. due to domestic violence, there is an ongoing risk of harm to a parent or child;
  - iv. a parent is impaired because of substance abuse or mental illness;
  - v. there are allegations that a child is at risk for any of the reasons stated in clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), pending an investigation of the allegations; or of competent jurisdiction, point to the existence of such a risk.
- K. Family Outreach Teams which provide a youth worker, a parent worker, and a school-parent organizer to provide training in outreach, mentoring, community organizing and peer counseling and mentoring to locally recruited volunteers in a particular area.
- L. To establish corridors of safety for senior citizens by increasing the numbers, presence, and watchfulness of law enforcement officers, community groups, and business owners and employees.
- M. Teams or units involving both specially trained law enforcement professionals and child or family services professionals that on a 24-hour basis respond to or deal with violent incidents in which a child is involved as a perpetrator, witness, or victim.
- N. Dwelling units to law enforcement officers without charge or at a substantially reduced rent for the purpose of providing greater security for residents of high crime areas.

**\*\*\* FUNDS AVAILABLE IN FISCAL YEAR 1995 \*\*\***

**GRANT:** OUNCE OF PREVENTION GRANT PROGRAM

**PURPOSE**

To provide summer and after-school education and recreation programs; mentoring and tutoring, job placement assistance, and prevention and treatment of substance abuse, child abuse, and adolescent pregnancy.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Cities, counties, municipalities, school boards, colleges, universities, Indian tribal governments, private nonprofit entities, or consortia of eligible applicants.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

These are discretionary grants. Cities, counties, municipalities, school boards, colleges, universities, Indian tribal governments, private nonprofit entities, or consortia of eligible applicants to submit applications to the Ounce of Prevention Council.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

75% Federal share.

Applicants must demonstrate that a planning process has occurred that included organizations and residents of target areas including young people; a substantial involvement of neighborhood-based entities in carrying out proposed activities; and that a broad base of collaboration and coordination will occur in the implementation of the proposed activities.

Non-federal share may be in cash or in-kind.

**FUNDING**

\$90 million over six years (FY95-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1994.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:** TO BE SUPPLIED

IV. PROGRAMS IMPLEMENTED BY NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

- A. COMMUNITY SCHOOLS YOUTH SERVICES AND SUPERVISION\*  
Keeping schools open as "safe havens" against violence
- B. COMMUNITY POLICING\*  
Prevention programs in conjunction with police
- C. CERTAIN PUNISHMENT FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS  
Substance abuse treatment and other services to children in the juvenile justice system
- D. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT IN STATE PRISONS
- E. DRUG COURTS\*  
Substance abuse treatment and other services for drug-abusing offenders on probation
- F. COMMUNITY-BASED JUSTICE GRANTS FOR PROSECUTORS  
Substance abuse treatment and other services to children in the juvenile justice system
- G. LOCAL PARTNERSHIP ACT  
Locally developed education, substance abuse and job programs
- H. PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT  
Locally developed crime prevention programs
- I. MODEL INTENSIVE GRANT PROGRAM
- J. OUNCE OF PREVENTION\*  
Youth violence prevention, substance abuse treatment, and child abuse prevention

\* PROGRAM FUNDING BEGINS IN FISCAL YEAR 1995

**\*\*\* FUNDS AVAILABLE IN FISCAL YEAR 1995 \*\*\***

**GRANT:**      **COMMUNITY SCHOOLS YOUTH SERVICES AND SUPERVISION**

**PURPOSE**

To provide supervised sports programs, extracurricular and academic programs offered after-school, on weekends, and over the summer in public schools, churches, or other appropriate existing, readily available facilities. Several programs may be offered to children, such as educational, work force preparation, cultural, health programs, social activities, dance, tutoring and mentoring.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Nonprofit community-based organizations are the only entities that can apply.

Nonprofit community-based organizations are defined as local, private organizations with representatives of: local residents, business and civic leaders, educators, religious organizations, law enforcement agencies, public housing agencies, other public agencies, and other interested parties.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

These are discretionary grants. Community-based organizations may submit applications to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Applicants in each State are guaranteed funding based on number of poor children in their State.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

75% Federal share for each FY95-FY96; 70% Federal share for FY-97; 60% Federal share for FY98-FY2000.

Applicants must identify eligible communities (defined as those with significant poverty and juvenile delinquency).

Non-federal share may be in cash or in-kind including plant, equipment and services.

At least 4% of dollars in FY95-FY97 and at least 6% in FY98-FY2000 must be provided by private or non-profit sources.

While religious organizations may participate in community-based organizations, they are prohibited from providing sectarian instruction or worship in connection with an activity funded by this grant program.

Recipients must maintain an average attendance rate of at least 75% of persons enrolled.

**FUNDING**

\$567 million over six years (FY95-FY2000). \$26 million available beginning October 1, 1994.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:** U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AT (202) 205-8347.

**\*\*\* FUNDS AVAILABLE IN FISCAL YEAR 1995 \*\*\***

**GRANT:** COMMUNITY POLICING

**PURPOSE**

To hire and train new police officers for community policing programs and to implement community policing programs.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Community-based programs may apply to, or in conjunction with, States or local police departments.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

Local officials submit applications directly to the U.S. Department of Justice. Applications must reflect consultation with community groups and appropriate private and public agencies, and identify related governmental and community initiatives which complement or will be coordinated with the proposal.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

Up to \$1.3 billion of the \$8.8 billion total may be used for community-based programs that foster police-community interaction, such as police-led prevention programs, Police Athletic Leagues, neighborhood watches and citizens' police academies.

**FUNDING**

\$8.8 billion over 6 years (FY95-FY2000). \$1.3 billion of total funding available for these purposes. Dollars available beginning October 1, 1994.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:** THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER -- 1-800-421-6770.

LIST OF PROGRAMS, PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES  
TO SUPPORT COMMUNITY POLICING

- A. Increase the number of law enforcement officers involved in activities that are focused on interaction with members of the community on proactive crime control and prevention by redeploying officers to such activities;
- B. Develop and establish new administrative and managerial systems to facilitate the adoption of community-oriented policing as an organization-wide philosophy;
- C. Payment for overtime to assist the implementation of community-oriented policing;
- D. Establish and implement innovative programs to increase and enhance proactive crime control and prevention programs, such as Police Athletic Leagues, involving law enforcement officers and young persons in the community;
- E. Develop new technologies to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in reorienting the emphasis of their activities from reacting to crime to preventing crime;
- F. Establish innovative programs to reduce and keep to a minimum, the amount of time that law enforcement officers must be away from the community while awaiting court appearances;
- G. Provide specialized training to law enforcement officers to enhance their conflict resolution, mediation, problem solving, service, and other skills needed to work in partnership with members of the community;
- H. Increase police participation in multidisciplinary early intervention teams;
- I. Develop and implement innovative programs to permit members of the community to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in the prevention of crime in the community, such as citizens' police academies, including programs designed to increase the level of access to the criminal justice system enjoyed by victims, witnesses, and ordinary citizens by establishing decentralized satellite offices (including video facilities) of principal criminal courts buildings;
- J. Establish, implement and coordinate crime prevention and control programs (involving law enforcement officers working with community members) with other Federal programs that serve the community and community members to better address the comprehensive needs of the community and its members;
- K. Support the purchase by a law enforcement agency of no more than 1 service weapon per officer, upon hiring for deployment in community-oriented policing, or, if necessary, upon existing officers' initial redeployment to community-oriented policing.

**GRANT: CERTAIN PUNISHMENT FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS**

**PURPOSE**

To increase accountability for young offenders through alternative punishments including: restitution programs, education, job training, substance abuse treatment, family counseling, community-based incarceration, weekend incarceration, electronic monitoring, community service programs, and after-care programs.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

States, cities, towns, and counties.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

Non-profit agencies may contract with local entities to provide drug treatment, job training, counseling, victims' assistance, restitution and community service programs.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

Depend on contract.

**FUNDING**

\$150 million over 5 years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE CENTER -- 1-800-421-6770**

**GRANT: SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT IN STATE PRISONS**

**PURPOSE**

To provide residential substance abuse treatment programs within state correctional facilities, local correctional and detention facilities, and to provide after-care services.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

States, cities, towns and counties.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

These are discretionary grants. Nonprofit organizations, where permitted, may contract with States and local entities to provide treatment and after-care services.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

75% Federal share.

Drug treatment program must last 6 to 12 months in facilities set apart from general inmate population; along with drug testing.

Priority is given to programs with strong after-care components.

**FUNDING**

\$270 million over 5 years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE CENTER AT 1-800-421-6770.**

**\*\*\* FUNDS AVAILABLE IN FISCAL YEAR 1995 \*\*\***

**GRANT:** DRUG COURTS

**PURPOSE**

To increase monitoring of non-violent, addicted offenders on probation or supervised release through testing, treatment and other services, and by sanctioning offenders who fail to comply with program requirements.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Chief executives or chief justices of states, and units of local government. Non-profit community organizations contract with State or local officials.

**APPLICATIONS PROCESS**

These are discretionary grants. Officials submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice. Non-profit community organizations contract with State or local officials.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

Non-profit agencies may contract with courts to provide drug treatment, aftercare and other services, including health care, education, vocational training, job placement, housing placement, child care and other family support for Drug Court participants.

**FUNDING**

\$1 billion over 6 years (FY95-FY2000). \$100 million available beginning October 1, 1994.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:** THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
RESPONSE CENTER -- 1-800-421-6770.

**GRANT: COMMUNITY-BASED JUSTICE GRANTS FOR PROSECUTORS**

**PURPOSE**

To fund cooperative efforts among prosecutors, school officials, police, probation officers, youth, social service professionals and community members to improve the prosecution of young violent offenders; and to develop violence prevention programs including mediation, conflict resolution, counseling, educational and recreational programs as an alternative to criminal involvement.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

State and local prosecutors, in conjunction with State and local chief executives.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

These are discretionary grants. State and local prosecutors submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Community-based organizations and social service professionals work with prosecutors to develop and implement programs.

Applications must include comprehensive plans that describe community resources that will be incorporated into programs, and explain why grant funds are needed to fill funding gaps.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

100% Federal funds. Grants renewable for up to 2 years.

**FUNDING**

\$50 million over 5 years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE CENTER AT 1-800-421-6770**

**GRANT: LOCAL PARTNERSHIP ACT**

**PURPOSE**

To provide additional funds to local governments to prevent crime through education, substance abuse treatment, and jobs programs that are "substantially similar" to several current federal programs (see attached list).

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Cities, towns, counties and nonprofit organizations.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

No application for cities, towns, and counties; funds are distributed directly to local governments by formula.

Nonprofit organizations may contract with cities, towns, and counties to provide program services.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

Depends on contract.

Recipients must hold at least one public hearing on the proposed use of payments, and must make efforts to include views from senior citizens.

Not less than 10% of amounts obligated for contracts and subcontracts shall be expended for socially and economically disadvantaged small businesses, and minority colleges and universities.

**FUNDING**

\$1.6 billion over 5 years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: TO BE SUPPLIED**

LOCAL PARTNERSHIP ACT  
LIST OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

1. The Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program under section 5122 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
2. The National Youth Sports Program under section 682 of the Community Services Block Grant Act (Public Law 97-35) as amended by section 205, Public Law 103-252.
3. The Gang Resistance Education and Training Program under the Act entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executives, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes', approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-509).
4. Programs under title II or IV of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).
5. Programs under subtitle C of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12571 et seq.). as amended.
6. Programs under the School to Work Opportunities Act (Public Law 103-239).
7. Substance Abuse Treatment and Prevention programs authorized under title V or XIX of the Public Health Services Act (43 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).
8. Programs under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.).
9. Programs under part A or B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
10. The TRIO programs under part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).
11. Programs under the National Literacy Act of 1991.
12. Programs under the Carl Perkins Vocational Educational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).
13. The demonstration partnership programs including the community initiative targeted to minority youth under section 203 of the Human Services Reauthorization of 1994 (Public Law 103-232).
14. The runaway and homeless youth program and the transitional living program

for homeless youth under title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (Public Law 102-586).

15. The family support program under subtitle F of title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 1148 et seq.).
16. After-school activities for school aged children under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.).
17. The community-based family resource programs under section 401 of the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-232).
18. The family violence programs under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act Amendments of 1984.
19. Job training programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, or the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

**GRANT: LOCAL CRIME PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT**

**PURPOSE**

To provide additional funds for local governments to develop crime prevention programs targeting youth crimes, youth gangs, child abuse, drug abuse by children, and crimes against the elderly. (See attached for list of possible programs and purposes).

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Cities, towns, counties, and nonprofit and community-based organizations.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

No application for cities, towns, and counties; funds are distributed directly to local governments by formula.

Nonprofits may contract with cities, towns, and counties to provide program services.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

Depends on contract.

A public hearing must be held on proposed use of funds.

**FUNDING**

\$377 million over five years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE CENTER AT 1-800-421-6770.**

LOCAL CRIME PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM  
LIST OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

- A. Education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs to prevent juvenile violence, juvenile gangs, and the use and sale of illegal drugs by juveniles.
- B. Programs to prevent crimes against the elderly based on the concepts of the Triad model.
- C. Programs that prevent young children from becoming gang involved, including the award of grants or contracts to community-based service providers that have a proven track record of providing services to children ages 5 to 18.
- D. Saturation jobs programs, offered either separately or in conjunction with the services provided for under the Youth Fair Chance Program, that provide employment opportunities leading to permanent unsubsidized employment for disadvantaged young adults 16 through 25 years of age.
- E. Midnight sports league programs that shall require each player in the league to attend employment counseling, job training, and other educational classes provided under the program, which shall be held in conjunction with league sports games at or near the site of the games.
- F. Supervised sports and recreation programs, including Olympic Youth Development Centers established in cooperation with the United States Olympic Committee, that are offered--
  - i. after school and on weekends and holidays, during the school year; and
  - ii. as daily (or week-long) full-day programs (to the extent available resources permit) or as part-day programs, during the summer months.
- G. Prevention and enforcement programs to reduce--
  - i. the formation or continuation of juvenile gangs; and
  - ii. the use and sale of illegal drugs by juveniles
- H. Youth anticrime councils to give intermediate and secondary school students a structured forum through which to work with community organizations, law enforcement officials, government and media representatives, and school administrators and faculty to address issues regarding youth and violence.

- I. Award of grants or contracts to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, a national nonprofit youth organization, to establish Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing.
- J. Supervised visitation centers for children who have been removed from their parents and placed outside the home as a result of abuse or neglect or other risk of harm to them and for children whose parents are separated or divorced and the children are at risk because--
  - i. there is documented sexual, physical, or emotional abuse as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction;
  - ii. there is suspected or elevated risk of sexual, physical, or emotional abuse, or there have been threats of parental abduction of the child;
  - iii. due to domestic violence, there is an ongoing risk of harm to a parent or child;
  - iv. a parent is impaired because of substance abuse or mental illness;
  - v. there are allegations that a child is at risk for any of the reasons stated in clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), pending an investigation of the allegations; or of competent jurisdiction, point to the existence of such a risk.
- K. Family Outreach Teams which provide a youth worker, a parent worker, and a school-parent organizer to provide training in outreach, mentoring, community organizing and peer counseling and mentoring to locally recruited volunteers in a particular area.
- L. To establish corridors of safety for senior citizens by increasing the numbers, presence, and watchfulness of law enforcement officers, community groups, and business owners and employees.
- M. Teams or units involving both specially trained law enforcement professionals and child or family services professionals that on a 24-hour basis respond to or deal with violent incidents in which a child is involved as a perpetrator, witness, or victim.
- N. Dwelling units to law enforcement officers without charge or at a substantially reduced rent for the purpose of providing greater security for residents of high crime areas.

**GRANT: MODEL INTENSIVE GRANT PROGRAMS**

**PURPOSE**

To develop 15 comprehensive crime prevention programs that involve law enforcement organizations, nonprofit community organizations, and other community resources to relieve conditions that encourage crime and provide alternatives to involvement in crime.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Cities, towns, and counties.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

Cities, towns, and counties submit applications to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Nonprofits contact cities, towns and counties.

Nonprofit organizations, citizen groups, volunteer organizations, and private businesses must be involved in developing applications.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

100% Federal funds.

Funds may be used for public safety services, equipment or facilities; youth programs; community-based substance abuse treatment; street lighting; public transportation; and other public facilities or services.

Federal funds must supplement, not supplant local funds.

**FUNDING**

\$626 million over five years (FY96-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1995.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE CENTER AT 1-800-421-6770.**

**\*\*\* FUNDS AVAILABLE IN FISCAL YEAR 1995 \*\*\***

**GRANT:** OUNCE OF PREVENTION

**PURPOSE**

To reduce opportunities for crime by providing summer and after-school education and recreation programs; mentoring and tutoring, job placement assistance, and services to prevent and treat substance abuse, child abuse, and adolescent pregnancy.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Cities, counties, municipalities, school boards, colleges, universities, Indian tribal governments, private nonprofit entities, or consortia of eligible applicants.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

These are discretionary grants. Private nonprofit entities, or consortia of eligible applicants submit applications to the Ounce of Prevention Council.

**TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS**

75% Federal share.

Applicants must demonstrate that a planning process has occurred that included organizations and residents of target areas including young people; a substantial involvement of neighborhood-based entities in carrying out proposed activities; and that a broad base of collaboration and coordination will occur in the implementation of the proposed activities.

Non-federal share may be in cash or in-kind.

**FUNDING**

\$90 million over 6 years (FY95-FY2000). Dollars available beginning October 1, 1994.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:** TO BE SUPPLIED

# APPENDIX

## HEARINGS REVIEWING NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

### MARCH 1 & 2, 1989 -- CONFIRMATION OF DR. WILLIAM J. BENNETT TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

Bennett, William -- Nominee  
Warger, Cynthia -- Association for Supervision and  
Curriculum Development  
De Lara, Jose Garcia, National President, League of United Latin American  
Citizens

### APRIL 3, 1989 -- STEROID ABUSE IN AMERICA

Ashford, Evelyn -- Olympic gold medalist  
Baker, Dorothy -- Member of the Executive Board of the  
U.S. Olympic Committee  
Connoly, Pat -- Olympic athlete, Coach  
Croce, Pat -- Athletic trainer  
Davis, Otho -- Head trainer, Philadelphia Eagles  
Katz, Dr. David -- Harvard Medical School  
Langston, Dr. Edward -- American Medical Association  
Quick, Mike -- All-pro receiver, Philadelphia Eagles  
Williams, Diane -- Former U.S. national track champion  
Yesalis, Dr. Charles -- Professor, Penn State University

**APRIL 10, 1989 -- CRACK TRAFFICKING IN RURAL AMERICA**

Batson, Margie -- Recovering drug abuser  
Carpenter, William -- U.S. Attorney, District of Delaware  
Chalfant, Richard L. -- Plant manager, General Foods Corp.  
Collick, Stephani -- Senior, Cape Henlopen High School  
Dennis, Sgt. Earl -- Maryland State Police  
Dennis, Edward -- Assistant Attorney General, Department  
of Justice  
Dixon, Rev. Walter -- Seaford, Delaware  
Harrison, Larry -- Vice-principal, Laurel High School  
Hutchinson, Chief James C. -- Dover Police Department  
Johnson, Elaine, Director, Office of Substance Abuse  
Prevention  
Kelly, Thomas -- Deputy Administrator, DEA  
Leighty, Sgt. Harvey -- Delaware State Police  
McGlumphy, William -- Assistant Principal, Seaford High  
School  
Oberly, Charles -- Attorney General of Delaware  
Pugh, Capt. Chuck -- Seaford, Delaware Police Department  
Rescigno, Robert -- Principal, Milford High School  
Russell, Paul -- Tunabout Counseling center  
Wood, Greg -- Teacher, Delmar High School

**APRIL 19, 1989 (CAUCUS HEARING) -- U.S. INTERNATIONAL DRUG POLICY**

Arpio, Joe -- Head of DEA's offices in Mexico and Turkey  
in mid 1970's  
Asencio, Diego c. -- Former Ambassador to Brazil  
Bensinger, Peter -- Administrator of DEA, 1976-81  
Boyatt, Thomas D. -- Ambassador to Colombia, 1980-83  
Craig, Richard -- Professor, Kent State University  
Dillon, Robert -- Ambassador to Lebanon, 1980-83  
Jova, Joseph John -- Ambassador to Mexico, Honduras  
Lee, Rennselaer -- Global advisory  
Mullen, Frances "Bud" -- Administrator of DEA, 1981-85  
Reuter, Peter -- Senior Economist, Rand Corp.

**MAY 9, 1989 -- STEROIDS IN COLLEGE AND PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL**

Courson, Steve -- Former NFL player  
Fralic, Bill -- All-pro guard, Atlanta Falcons  
Moyer, Jay -- NFL executive vice-president  
Noll, Chuck -- Head coach, Pittsburgh Steelers  
Paterno, Joe -- Head coach, Penn State University

Purzycki, Joe -- Head coach, James Madison University  
Raymond, Harold -- Head coach, University of Delaware  
Rozelle, Pete -- NFL commissioner  
Schembechler, Bo -- Head football coach and athletic  
director of the University of Michigan  
Schottenheimer, Marty -- Head coach, Kansas City Chiefs  
Upshaw, Gene -- Exec. Director, NFL Players Assoc.

**MAY 16, 1989 -- HEARING ON CHILD ABUSE**

Schudson, Hon. Charles B. -- Wisconsin Circuit Court  
Judge, Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
Gooch, Denise -- Mothers Against Raping Children, Clifton, New Jersey  
Toth, Patricia A. -- Director, National Center for  
Prosecution of Child Abuse  
Sugarman, Dr. Muriel -- Assistant in Psychiatry,  
Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts  
Burnley, Jane -- Director, Office for Victims of Crime,  
Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of  
Justice  
Stewart, Betty -- Associate Commissioner, Children's  
Bureau, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
Cramer, Robert E. -- District Attorney, Madison County,  
Huntsville, Alabama  
Dell'Olio, Joseph M. -- Executive Vice President, Child,  
Inc., Wilmington, Delaware  
McDonald Tom -- President, National Court Appointed  
Special Advocate Association, Louisville, Kentucky  
Crisp, Jayne -- Director, Victim Witness Assistance  
Program, Thirteenth Judicial Circuit Solicitor's  
Office, Greenville, South Carolina

**JUNE 6, 1989 -- REGGIE WALTON NOMINATION**

Walton, Reggie -- Nominee  
Besteman, Karst -- Exec. Director, Alcohol and Drug  
Problems Association of North America  
Gruber, Charles -- Vice President, International  
Association of Police Chiefs  
Olson, Lois, National Association of State Alcohol and  
Drug Abuse Directors  
Slaby, Lynn -- President Elect., National Attorneys Assoc.  
Stokes, Dewey -- President, Fraternal Order of Police

**JUNE 19, 1989 --(CAUCUS HEARING) U.N. TREATY AGAINST DRUG TRAFFICKING**

Bunting, Frank -- Lieutenant, NY City Police  
Constantine, Thomas -- Superintendent, NY State Police  
Mochler, Bill -- Assistant Special Agent NY division, DEA  
Pickering, Thomas -- U.S. Ambassador to the U.N.  
Stutman, Robert -- DEA, Special Agent in Charge, New York  
Thornburgh, The Hon. Richard -- Attorney General, U.S.  
Voelker, Anthony -- Chief, Bureau of Organized Crime  
Control, NY City Police

**JULY 25, 1989 -- INCARCERATION AND ALTERNATIVE SANCTIONS FOR DRUG OFFENDERS**

Castle, Michael -- Governor of Delaware  
Buchanan, John -- Lieutenant, Phoenix Police Department  
Coughlin, Thomas -- Commissioner, NY State Dept. of  
Corrections  
Dolente, Addis -- Program Manager, Substance Abuse Unit,  
Florida  
James, Alan -- Director, Career Development Fortune  
Society NYC, Ex-heroin and cocaine addict  
Wald, Bruce -- Director of the Key Program at Gander Hill  
Prison, Wilmington, Delaware

**AUGUST 17, 1989 -- INTERNATIONAL DRUG CONTROL**

Bailey, Norman -- Former National Security Council Senior  
staff Member  
Duncan, Stephen -- Asst. Secretary of Defense for Reserve  
Affairs and Coordinator of Drug Enforcement  
Gray, Gen. Alfred Jr. -- Marine Corps Commandant  
Gregorie, Richard -- Former Chief Asst. U.S. Attorney,  
Miami, Florida  
Merkle, Robert -- Former U.S. Attorney  
Mermelstein, Max -- Former Drug Trafficker

**AUGUST 31, 1989 -- DRUGS IN THE 1990'S**

Binney, David -- Chief, Drug Section, FBI  
Dunbar, Bryon -- U.S. Attorney., Montana  
Escalderon, Audrey -- Director, Crash Golden Hill House,  
San Diego, California  
Faggett, Dr. Walter -- Director, Substance Abuse Services, D.C. General Hospital

Halikas, Dr. James -- Professor of Psychiatry, University  
of Minnesota  
Hall, James -- Executive Director, Upfront Drug Info.  
Center, Miami, Florida  
Hopkins, William -- Director of Street Research, NY State  
Division of Substance Abuse Services  
Kaemingk, Dennis -- Captain of Detectives, Mitchell, SD  
Kosten, Dr. Thomas -- Acting Director, Substance Abuse  
Treatment Unit, Yale University  
Peck, Dr. Carl -- Director, Drug Evaluation & Research,  
FDA  
Schuster, Dr. Charles -- Director, National Institute on  
Drug Abuse

**SEPTEMBER 7, 1989 -- CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL  
STRATEGY**

Bennett, William -- Director, National Drug Control Policy

**SEPTEMBER 8, 1989 -- ORGANIZED CRIME STRIKE FORCES**

Bonner, Robert -- U.S. District Judge  
Harmon, James -- Atty., Bower & Gardner  
Helfrey, David -- Former Strike Force Chief, Kansas City  
Heymann, Phillip -- Professor, Harvard Law School  
Hogue, Eades -- Former Strike Force Chief, New Orleans  
Methvin, Eugene -- Senior Editor, Reader's Digest, Member  
of Commission on Organized Crime  
Morgenthau, Hon. Robert -- District Atty., NYC  
Mullenberg, Kurt -- Former Chief, Organized Crime and  
Racketeering Section, DOJ  
O'Sullivan, Jeremiah -- Former Exec. Director, Commission  
on Organized Crime  
Roller, Douglas -- Former Strike Force Chief, Cleveland  
and Chicago  
Skinner, Samuel -- Secretary of Transportation of the U.S.  
Slaby, Lynn -- President, National District Attorney's  
Assc.  
Thornburgh, Richard -- Atty. General of the United States  
Vaira, Peter -- Former Strike Force Chief, Chicago and  
Philadelphia

**SEPTEMBER 11, 1989 -- WISCONSIN RESPONDS TO THE PRESIDENT'S ANTI-DRUG POLICY (KOHL)**

Hyler, Queen -- President, People United Assc., Wisconsin  
Fineberg, Francine -- Executive Director, Meta House for Women and Children  
Vann, Michael -- Clinical Director, two youth clinics,  
Wisconsin  
Hanaway, Don -- Attorney General, State of Wisconsin  
McCann, Mike -- District Attorney, Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
Small, Steve -- Professor, University of Wisconsin  
Gardner, Judge Bill -- U.S. District Court, Milwaukee County  
Peterkin, Robert -- Superintendent, Milwaukee Public Schools  
Pnazek, Karl -- CEO, CAP services  
De Lorm, Sarah -- Senior, Appleton West High School  
Tyson, Dylan -- Student Body President, Appleton West H.School  
Kramer, Staffert -- Freshman, University of Wisconsin  
Williams, Vernell -- Student, Rufus King High School

**SEPTEMBER 12, 1989 -- REVIEW NATL. DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY**

Blue, Dan -- State Representative, NC  
Gustafson, John -- President, National Assoc. of State  
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors  
Johnson, Sterling -- Special Narcotics Prosecutor  
Meeks, Charles -- Exec. Director, National Sheriffs Assc.  
Quinn, Thomas -- Exec. Director, Delaware Criminal Justice Council  
Riley, Joseph -- Mayor of Charleston, SC  
Ugast, Fred -- Chief Judge, Superior Court, D.C.  
Travisano, Anthony -- Exec. Director, American  
Correctional Association

**SEPTEMBER 19, 1989 -- DEATH PENALTY**

Anders, James -- Solicitor, Columbia, SC  
Dennis, Edward -- Acting Deputy Atty. General  
Gradess, Jonathan -- Exec. Director, NY State Defenders  
Association  
Hampton, Ronald -- Exec. Director, Natl. Black Police Ass.  
Kliesmet, Robert, President, International Union of Police Assc.  
McCann, Michael -- Dist. Atty., Milwaukee, WI  
Radelet, Michael -- Prof. of Sociology  
Summers, Wanda -- Pawley's Island, SC  
Vaughn, C. Roland -- Vice President, International Assoc.  
of Chiefs of Police

**SEPTEMBER 20, 1989 -- NOMINATION, STANLEY MORRIS TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR, NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY**

Morris, Stanley -- Nominee

**SEPTEMBER 27, 1989 -- FEDERAL DEATH PENALTY**

Cassell, Paul -- Asst. U.S. Atty  
Ellis, Jim -- Professor of Law, American University  
Epps, Sterling -- President, Federal Law Enforcement Officers Assc.  
Fight, Edward Lone -- Chairman, Three Affiliated Tribes; Fort Berthold Reservation  
Indritz, Tova -- Federal Public Defender, District of New Mexico  
Kamenar, Paul -- Washington Legal Foundation  
Kinnard, Steve -- Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue  
McKerrow, Nancy -- Asst. Public Defender  
Mello, Michael -- Professor of Law  
Roessel, Faith -- Staff Atty., Native American Rights Fund  
Tso, Tom -- Chief Justice, Navajo Nation

**OCTOBER 2, 1989 -- DEATH PENALTY**

Baldus, David -- Professor of law  
Chambers, Julius -- Director Counsel, NAACP Legal Defenses and Education Fund  
Dennis, Edward -- Acting Deputy Atty. General, United States  
Hill, William -- Deputy Atty. General, GA  
Kamenar, Paul -- Exec. Director, Washington Legal Foundation  
Katz, Dr. Joseph -- Professor, Georgia State University  
Lowrey, Dr. Joseph -- President, South Christian Leadership Conference  
Simmons, Althea -- Director, NAACP  
Tabak, Ronald -- American Bar Association

**OCTOBER 3, 1989 -- SUPPLY OF DRUGS**

Allsbrook, Billy -- Past President, National Alliance of  
State Drug Enforcement  
Atwood, Donald -- Deputy Sec'y, Defense Department  
Burgreen, Robert -- Police Chief, San Diego, California  
Lawn, John -- Administrator, DEA  
Sessions, William -- Director, FBI

**OCTOBER 31, 1989 -- CREATIVE DRUG PREVENTION**

Goldsmith, Herbert -- President, Members Only  
Green, Darrell, Defensive back, Washington Redskins  
List, Shelly -- Writer  
Winfield, David -- Player, New York Yankees

**NOVEMBER 6, 1989 (JOINT CAUCUS/JUDICIARY) -- MULTI-NATIONAL STRIKE  
FORCE**

Manley, Hon. Michael -- Prime Minister of Jamaica

**NOVEMBER 9, 1989 -- (JOINT LABOR/JUDICIARY) IMPACT OF DRUGS ON  
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**

Duran, Mike -- Specialized Gang, Supervision Unit, CA  
Lewis, Johnnie -- Red Hook Apartments, South Brooklyn  
Stewart, Dave -- MVP, 1989 World Series  
Tuckson, Dr. Reed -- Commissioner of Public Health, D.C.  
Vaughn, Robert -- Student, University of Kansas

**DECEMBER 12, 1989 -- CHALLENGE OF DRUG ABUSE IN OUR CITIES**

Dinkins, David -- Mayor-Elect, NYC  
Berkley, Richard -- Mayor, Kansas City, Missouri and past  
president of U.S. Conference of Mayors  
Stutman, Robert -- Special agent in charge, DEA  
Vines, Mack -- Chief of Police, Dallas, Texas  
Stewart, Dave -- Pitcher, Oakland A's, MVP, 1989 World  
Series

**JANUARY 18, 1989 (JOINT JUDICIARY/CAUCUS HEARING) -- DRUG POLICY IN THE ANDEAN NATIONS**

Crespo-Velasco, His Excellency Jorge -- Ambassador,  
Embassy of Bolivia  
Mosquera-Chaux, His Excellency Victor -- Ambassador,  
Embassy of Colombia  
Atala-Nazal, His Excellency Cesar -- Ambassador, Embassy  
of Peru

**FEBRUARY 2, 1990 -- CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY**

Bennett, William -- Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy

**FEBRUARY 21, 1990 -- CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM REFORMS**

Robertson, The Honorable James -- Justice, Mississippi Supreme Court  
Chauvin, Stanley L. -- President, American Bar Association  
Bright, Steve -- Director, Southern Prisoners Defense Committee  
Martinez, the Hon. Bob -- Governor, State of Florida  
Hill, William B. -- Deputy Attorney General, State of Georgia  
Carnes, Ed -- Assistant Attorney General, State of Alabama

**MARCH 1, 1990 -- NOMINATION OF ROBERT SWEET TO HEAD THE OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION**

Sweet, Robert

**MARCH 20, 1990 -- HIGH-TECHNOLOGY WEAPONS IN THE WAR ON DRUGS**

Bayse, Dr. William -- Assistant Director, Technical Services Division, Federal  
Bureau of Investigation  
Baker, William -- Asst. Director, Criminal Investigative Division, Federal Bureau  
of Investigation  
Mintz, Ray -- Director, Research and Engineering Division, U.S. Customs Service  
Immele, Dr. John E. -- Director, Conventional Defense  
Technology, Los Alamos National Laboratory  
Brandenstein, Dr. Al -- Special Assistant to the Director for Law Enforcement,  
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency

**MARCH 27, 1990 -- JOINT CAUCUS/JUDICIARY HEARING ON RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE ANDEAN NATIONS**

Murphy, James M., Jr. -- Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for Latin America

Doria Medina, Samuel -- Economic Advisor to the President of Bolivia

Boecklin, George E. -- President, National Coffee Association of USA, Inc.

**APRIL 3, 1990 -- OVERSIGHT OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND DRUG CONTROL**

Thornburgh, The Hon. Richard -- U.S. Attorney General

**APRIL 19, 1990 -- CREATIVE DRUG PREVENTION PROGRAMS**

Frank, Richard -- President, Walt Disney Studios

Agoglia, John -- Executive Vice-President of TV Business Affairs and Production for NBC

Disney, Roy -- Former Executive Producer of Disney Animated Special

Barun, Kenneth -- Vice President, Ronald McDonald Children's

**MAY 8, 1990 -- OVERSIGHT OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT**

Thornburgh, The Hon. Richard -- U.S. Attorney General

**JULY 11, 1990 -- NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. BONNER TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION**

Bonner, Robert C. -- Nominee

**JULY 17, 1990 -- NEW DRUG REPORTS: DO THEY POINT TO A VICTORY IN THE WAR ON DRUGS?**

Caffrey, Ron -- Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, Drug Enforcement Administration

Musto, Dr. David -- Yale Medical School

Moore, Dr. Mark -- Harvard University

**JULY 31, 1990 -- MURDER RATES: WHY THE RECENT RISE?**

Williams, Willie L. -- Commissioner, Philadelphia Police Department  
Cogan, Lawrence J. -- Chief Medical Examiner, Los Angeles County  
Richardson, Dr. Lynn -- Associate Chief of Emergency Services, Harlem  
Hospital  
Fox, Dr. James -- Northeastern University

**AUGUST 21, 1990 -- ASIAN GANGS, HEROIN, AND THE DRUG TRADE**

Bryant, Robert -- Deputy Assistant, Federal Bureau of Investigation  
Stern, James -- Supervisory Special Agent, Federal Bureau of  
Investigation  
Doyle, Jeff -- Senior Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation

**SEPTEMBER 6, 1990 -- ONE YEAR REVIEW OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL  
STRATEGY**

Bennett, William -- Director, National Drug Control Policy

**FEBRUARY 6, 1991 -- REVIEW OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY**

Walters, John -- Acting Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy  
Walton, Reggie -- Associate Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy  
Morris, Stanley -- Deputy Director for Supply Reduction  
Kleber, Herbert -- Deputy Director for Demand Reduction  
Carnes, Bruce -- Director, Office of Planning, Budget, and Administration

**FEBRUARY 26 & 27, 1991 -- CONFIRMATION OF ROBERT MARTINEZ TO BE  
DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY**

Martinez, Robert -- Nominee  
Graham, Robert -- Senator from Florida  
Mack, Connie -- Senator from Florida  
Coughlin, Lawrence -- Representative from Pennsylvania  
Ashcroft, John -- Governor of Missouri  
Foote II, Edward T. -- Chairman, Miami Coalition for a Drug  
Free Community, Miami, Florida  
Weber, Ellen -- Legislative Counsel, Legislative Action Center  
Dow, John W. -- Chief Executive Officer, The Crossing Rehabilitation Centers,  
Miami, Florida  
Sonnnett, Neal R. -- Immediate Past President, National Association of Criminal  
Defense Lawyers

Austin, James -- Executive Vice-President, National Council on Crime and Delinquency  
Shaw Jr., E. Clay, Representative from Florida  
Butterworth, Robert A. -- Attorney General of Florida  
Cahill, Donald L. -- Legislative Chairman, Fraternal Order of Police

April 11, 1991 -- **DRUG PRODUCTION AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

Cousteau, Jean-Michel -- Founding Director, The Cousteau Society  
Thompson, Frank -- Special Agent, California Department of Justice  
Pearce, Paul -- President, Clandestine Laboratory Investigators Association, Camas, Washington  
Brown, Robert -- Resident, Cherry Hill, New Jersey

April 18, 1991 -- **CRIME & DRUG CONTROL -- THE ADMINISTRATION'S VIEW**

Thornburgh, Richard L. -- United States Attorney General

April 23, 1991 -- **VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL -- THE LOCAL PERSPECTIVE**

Daley, Richard M. -- Mayor of Chicago, Illinois  
Flynn, Raymond L. -- Mayor of Boston, Massachusetts and Vice President, U.S. Conference of Mayors  
Thorton, Paul -- Council Member, Vienna, West Virginia; and Chairman, Small Cities Council, National League of Cities  
Bishop, Steven C. -- Chief of Police, Kansas City, Missouri  
Vaughn III, C. Roland -- Chief of Police, Conyers, Georgia, and First Vice President, International Association of Chiefs of Police

May 15, 1991 -- **VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL LEGISLATION: THE LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSPECTIVE**

Stokes, Dewey R. -- National President, Fraternal Order of Police, Galloway, Ohio  
Meeks, Charles -- Executive Director, National Sheriffs Association, Alexandria, Virginia  
David, Robert L., -- President, Delaware State Troopers Association, Dover, Delaware  
Preate Jr., Ernest D. -- Attorney General of Pennsylvania  
Charron, Thomas J. -- President-Elect, National District Attorneys Association, Alexandria, Virginia

May 16, 1991 -- **COCAINE KINDERGARTNERS: PREPARING FOR THE FIRST WAVE**

Howard, Judy -- Professor, University of California at Los Angeles  
Davis, Evelyn -- Child Development Specialist and Clinical Professor of Pediatrics, Harlem Hospital Center, New York, New York  
Powell, Diane -- Director, Project DAISY, Washington, D.C.

September 26, 1991 -- **THE PRESIDENTS DRUG STRATEGY: TWO YEARS LATER -- IS IT WORKING**

Martinez, Robert -- Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy

May 19, 1992 -- (JOINT JUDICIARY/CAUCUS HEARING) **THE NEW HEROIN CORRIDOR: DRUG TRAFFICKING IN CHINA**

Bonner, Robert C. -- Administrator, Drug Enforcement Agency  
Levitsky, Melvin -- Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters, Department of State

August 11, 1992 -- **RE-AUTHORIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS**

Dillingham, Steven D. -- Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice  
Mullaney, Lt. Timothy P. -- Fraternal Order of Police, Grand Lodge Legislative Committee, Dover, Delaware  
Rosenblat, Dan -- Executive Director, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Arlington, Virginia  
Meeks, Charles -- Executive Director, National Sheriffs' Association, Alexandria, Virginia  
Blumstein, Dr. Alfred -- President, The American Society of Criminology, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
Callaway, Robbie -- Assistant National Director, Boys & Girls Clubs of America, Rockville, Maryland

October 1, 1992 -- **CHILDREN & GUNS: WHY THE RECENT RISE?**

Chafee, Hon. John H. -- U.S. Senate (R-RI)  
Byrne, Lt. Thomas G. -- Head of Chicago Police Department School Patrol  
Unit, Chicago, Illinois  
Stephens, Ronald -- Executive Director, National School Safety Center,  
Westwood Village, California  
Vinokur, Jack -- Director of Instruction, Brandywine School District, Brandywine,  
Delaware

March 9 & 10, 1993 -- **NOMINATION OF JANET RENO TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF  
THE UNITED STATES**

Reno, Janet -- Nominee  
Graham, Hon. Bob -- U.S. Senate (D-FL)  
Mack, Hon. Connie -- U.S. Senate (R-FL)  
Meek, Hon. Carrie -- U.S. House of Representatives (D-FL)

April 29, 1993 -- **HEARING ON AMERICA'S DRUG STRATEGY**

Kleber, Dr. Herbert D. -- Executive Vice-President, Center on Addiction and  
Substance Abuse and Professor of Psychiatry, Columbia University  
Kleiman, Dr. Mark -- Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy  
School of Government, Harvard University  
Reuter, Dr. Peter -- Co-Director of RAND's Drug Policy Research Center, Santa  
Monica, California

May 25, 1993 -- **NOMINATION OF DR. LEE BROWN TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE  
OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY**

Brown, Dr. Lee Patrick -- Nominee  
Krueger, Hon. Bob -- U.S. Senate (D-TX)  
Moynihan, Hon. Daniel P. -- U.S. Senate (D-NY)  
Brooks, Hon. Jack -- U.S. House of Representatives (D-TX)  
Rangel, Hon. Charles B. -- U.S. House of Representatives (D-NY)

**July 29, 1993 -- NOMINATION OF JUDGE LOUIS J. FREEH TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION**

Freeh, Judge Louis J. -- Nominee  
Moynihan, Hon. Daniel P. -- U.S. Senate (D-NY)  
D'Amato, Hon. Alfonse M. -- U.S. Senate (R-NY)  
Nunn, Hon. Sam -- U.S. Senate (D-GA)  
Bradley, Hon. Bill -- U.S. Senate (D-NJ)  
Lautenberg, Hon. Frank R. -- U.S. Senate (D-NJ)

**October 20, 1993 -- REVIEW OF INTERIM NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY -- "BREAKING THE CYCLE OF DRUG ABUSE"**

Bennett, Dr. William -- Former Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy and Co-Director of "Empower America"  
Brown, Dr. Lee Patrick -- Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy

**February 10, 1994 -- REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY**

Brown, Dr. Lee Patrick -- Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy

**March 2, 1994 -- NOMINATION OF THOMAS A. CONSTANTINE TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION**

Constantine, Thomas A. -- Nominee  
Moynihan, Hon. Daniel P. -- U.S. Senate (D-NY)  
D'Amato, Hon. Alfonse M. -- U.S. Senate (R-NY)  
McNulty, Hon. Michael R. -- U.S. House of Representatives (D-NY)  
Quinn, Hon. Jack -- U.S. House of Representatives (R-NY)

**April 19, 1994 -- MEDICINES FOR DRUG ABUSE -- REVIEWING THE STRATEGY**

Earley, Dr. Laurence E. -- Senior Associate Dean, Francis C. Wood Professor of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania  
Kleber, Dr. Herbert D. -- Executive Vice President, Medical Director, Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, Professor of Psychiatry, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons  
O'Brien, Dr. Charles -- Chief of Psychiatry, Philadelphia Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Professor and Vice-Chair of Psychiatry, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine  
Crout, Dr. J. Richard -- Former Vice President, Medical and Scientific Affairs, Boehringer Mannheim Pharmaceuticals Corp., Institute of Medicine Scholar-in-Residence