

47582

ALTERNATIVES — A SERIES

"FUNDING RESOURCES AND THE PRETRIAL FIELD - 1978"

By
DELORES FITZGERALD
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ASSOCIATE

PRETRIAL SERVICES RESOURCE CENTER
SUITE 200
1010 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

NCJRS

FEBRUARY 1978

JUN 8 1978

ACQUISITIONS

This publication is supported by Grant Number 76-ED-0031 awarded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, United States Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this publication are those of the Pretrial Services Resource Center and do not necessarily represent the official position of the United States Department of Justice.

MONEY '78

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
TRENDS.....	5
SOURCES.....	9
Federal.....	10
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.....	10
Department of Labor.....	11
Department of Health, Education & Welfare.....	13
Veterans Administration.....	15
State and Local.....	15
State Planning Agencies.....	16
Subsidies.....	17
Revenue Sharing.....	17
Private.....	18
Foundations.....	18
Local Community Resources.....	19
Specialized.....	19
Training.....	20
Research.....	20
Technical Assistance.....	20
TECHNIQUES.....	23
SUMMARY.....	29
FOOTNOTES.....	33
APPENDICES.....	35
I. Bibliography.....	37
II. 1978 LEAA Demonstration Projects.....	39
III. Office of Education, HEW.....	40
IV. Specialized.....	41
V. National Technical Assistance Projects Affecting Pretrial.....	43
VI. Addresses of State Planning Agencies.....	44

INTRODUCTION

An extensive array of literature exists which explains how to locate monies for a variety of programs. Despite this ample supply of materials little or no information has been specifically designed for those practicing in pretrial services. Developed as a reference tool, this bulletin addresses the problem of how and where to look for money.

The objectives of this bulletin are to:

- describe the basic principles and techniques of resource development;
- help identify and review the various types of funding resources available to pretrial services agencies; 1/ and
- orient administrators in the pretrial field to the current trends in resource development.

Its audience includes:

- individuals or groups who intend to start a pretrial program; and
- existing agencies which need funds for continuation of their program and/or expansion of some component of their program.

The scope of this bulletin is ambitious, but its limits should be pointed out. Fundraising is a difficult craft, and approaches vary with each individual. Strategies and techniques for securing funds are also directly affected by the immediate political and economic realities of each jurisdiction.

Money '78 offers no magic solutions for obtaining monies. It is the Resource Center's first attempt to catalogue information on funding in the pretrial field. This bulletin reflects both a response to numerous requests by pretrial administrators for advice in this area and a general assessment by the Resource Center of the needs existing in the field. It is our impression that knowledge varies greatly in this area. Many are familiar with some of the traditional funding agencies, but by-pass other possibilities, simply because the ideas never occurred to them. Others have little or no awareness of the various sources of funding and their respective mechanisms. With this in mind, the information included in this bulletin was carefully checked with individuals familiar with the sources described. It is, however, by no means exhaustive. Feedback from readers is essential. This will enable Money '79 to be more informed and to cover in even greater detail monies and techniques available to pretrial program administrators.

TRENDS

TRENDS

Pretrial services programs are at the threshold of a new funding era. Programs approaching termination of federal demonstration monies need to become aware of funding opportunities; programs not yet at the end of their funding cycle also need to know where to look for monies when that cycle is complete. Federal funding is, at best, an ephemeral solution. Uncoordinated and single-shot approaches to subsidizing programs do not provide a lasting solution to the problem of funding. Realizing that institutionalization and funding are integrally related, many administrators are increasingly seeking a permanent position within the criminal justice system. Similarly, whether trying to find monies to start new programs, continue existing programs or expand the services of a program, administrators need to be innovative and persistent in their approach to obtaining funds.

In the first decade of pretrial funding, the majority of pretrial services agencies were supported as demonstration projects with monies appropriated primarily from federal government agencies: The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), The Department of Labor (DOL), and The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). As with any federal funding, these resources were not designed to meet long-term financial needs. The programs were not usually supported for more than a period of three years. During that period administrators were expected to develop a full-fledged operation, demonstrate the programs' effect on the criminal justice system and secure permanent funding. As these demonstration funds were depleted, pretrial administrators became painfully aware of the limitations of single-source and federal funding. Administrators found out that it was increasingly difficult to influence state and local governments to assume the costs of programs initiated with monies from LEAA and DOL. As a result, some of the earlier pretrial programs experienced relatively brief life spans.

A recent survey of pretrial services agencies leads to the following observations about the current status of pretrial funding: 2/

- LEAA remains the primary funding source for the initiation of pretrial programs. These monies often are the basis for establishing pretrial services within local criminal justice systems. Yet the economic and political constraints of many local jurisdictions do not always allow local government agencies to assume support for the program following termination of LEAA funds.
- As the concept of pretrial services becomes more familiar and gains respectability, local and state governments are assuming a larger proportion of the funding for pretrial services agencies. A survey of 109 pretrial release agencies revealed that more than half (56 per cent) were currently funded by local and state governments. "Among those [programs] in operation for five years or more, 80 per cent are locally funded. Among programs less than two years old, only 26 per cent are locally funded." 3/
- Pretrial release agencies have been more successful in obtaining the support of local and state governments for their programs than have pretrial diversion agencies. Pretrial release agencies are most

often viewed as agencies whose chief function is to provide information to the courts, and to assist them in determining conditions of release for defendants arrested and charged in their jurisdiction. Moreover, sufficient information has been gathered to date to demonstrate the effectiveness and viability of services provided by well run release agencies. Diversion programs often lack the empirical data needed to persuade local officials that diversion is making an adequately significant impact on the criminal justice system or on the divertee to justify continuation. Further, diversion may take a variety of approaches. The resulting controversy over legal rights and programmatic issues has prevented the building of uniform and reliable support similar to that which currently exists for release. For these reasons, pretrial release agencies avoid some of the perplexing issues presented in diversion. 4/

- Independent agencies operating outside of the criminal justice system which have no formal link to the existing criminal justice system or local government seemingly experience the greatest difficulty in obtaining funds. These programs either fail or have difficulty in establishing a useful network of communication and cooperation with other agencies, members of the criminal justice system, and local elected officials. Agencies which have no political support or attachment to government agencies invite the inevitable termination of their program.
- Many programs are supported through a combination of funds. Realizing that federal allocations to pretrial services are diminishing, pretrial administrators are looking to non-traditional sources of funding. For example, approximately 300 community organizations and 50 diversion projects in California united to obtain monies for a multi-faceted youth services system. 5/ The combination of funds were drawn from the LEAA, Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) Title XX, Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA), Parks and Recreation, and Mental Health budgets of that state. These funds represented all monies channeled into the State of California for youth projects. The Trumbull County Diversion Program, Warren, Ohio, is another illustration of a successful mixture of revenues. Although primarily funded by LEAA and local funding matches, the program receives additional subsidies from the United Way and donations from the State Bar Association.

SOURCES

SOURCES

"Resourcefulness" is the password to pretrial funding in '78. Money is available, but a diligent effort is necessary to find it. One of the more successful ways to finance a program is to have several different funding sources committed to it. Contributions from various sources within the community such as manpower, correction, prosecutor, and court budgets show an early commitment to the program by that locality and criminal justice system. A pooling of resources with other agencies involved in the criminal justice system can also significantly improve the financial expectations of pretrial services agencies.

This section includes general descriptions of a variety of funding sources, both public and private, which represent potential resources for pretrial agencies. To clarify the narrative:

- Chart I indicates which funding agencies are more likely to fund different program needs.
- Funding mechanisms are divided into four classifications: federal; state and local; private; specialized. Chart II diagrams the allocation process of the various agencies (i.e., LEAA, DOL, HEW).
- Specific information on many of the agencies mentioned is contained in the Appendices.
- Technical details about the funding mechanics of the agency is provided in the box/reduced type sections.

CHART I

Resources available for:

Start-up or Core Funding*	Supplemental**	
	Continuation	Expansion
LEAA: Headquarters SPAs	DOL (CETA) Revenue-Sharing	HEW Veteran's Administration
Subsidies	Subsidies	United Way
Revenue-Sharing	United Way	Foundations
CETA		SPAs
Foundations		

* Core Funding - these agencies often will fund total costs of programs.

** Supplemental funds - these agencies most often will provide limited amounts of money for special components of program or provide a limited source of revenue to support costs of total program.

CHART II

Levels of funding:

<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Local</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Block Grants-----State Planning Agencies (SPAs) -----Criminal Justice Agencies Private Organizations Discretionary funds-----Criminal Justice Agencies Private Organizations Department of Labor (DOL)-----Prime Sponsors (CETA) Department of Health, Education & Welfare (HEW)-----Title XX Office of Education Vocational Rehabilitation Office Department of Health, Education & Welfare (HEW)-----Supplementary Security Income (SSI) Aid to Families/Dependent Children Medicaid Office of Education Revenue Sharing-----Governor-----or-----Unit of local government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsidies-----Criminal justice agencies Foundations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foundations United Way Urban Leagues Junior Leagues Community Action Agencies 		

FEDERAL

The federal government has played an active role in the development of pretrial services agencies. It has contributed to the growth of pretrial programs through allocations of monies to state and local governments and through demonstration monies distributed directly to the criminal justice system. The agencies which now allocate the largest amount of funds for the pretrial community are: The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), the Department of Labor (DOL), the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), and the Veterans Administration (VA).

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

The LEAA has been a significant catalyst in the initiation and proliferation of pretrial services programs. By both channeling monies through state and local governments and awarding demonstration funds directly to the criminal justice community, LEAA remains the best single source of federal funding for the start-up of new programs. Although most of LEAA's program funds are planned for and allocated by state and local officials, six major program offices at the national headquarters of LEAA are responsible for developing and funding specific projects with discretionary monies. 6/ The focus of this discussion is limited to funds available to the pretrial community under the discretionary grant program. (See section on SPA's for information on disbursements to state and local governments under the block grant program. Also refer to Chart II.)

It is not certain whether LEAA will be able to maintain the level of financial support in the pretrial field it has exhibited in the past. Appropriations have steadily decreased from 905 million in fiscal '75 to 647.25 million for fiscal '78. However, funding priorities for discretionary programs in fiscal '78 will include monies for the following areas: establishment of court improvement projects and management information systems, assistance to victim/witness programs, and training. Additional funding is expected from the Rehabilitation Division, Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP) for the development and testing of restitution programs. Several grants will also be awarded to programs to demonstrate methods to improve processing of drug and alcohol abusing offenders. These monies will be administered by Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC). (See Appendix II for specific projects and amounts to be awarded.)

Even though discretionary funds seem to be a reliable source for starting a new program, the attractiveness of this funding is somewhat reduced when one considers the conditions which are generally attached. Most discretionary grant awards require matching funds and also require approval of the program from various state or local criminal justice planning agencies. Additionally, LEAA grantees must submit quarterly progress reports. Lastly, discretionary funds are usually limited in time. They are rarely used to maintain existing program operations. The maximum length of a funding period is generally three years.

LEAA administers two basic types of programs-- planning and action. Planning funds are awarded to each state criminal justice planning unit to develop their comprehensive annual plan for crime prevention and control.

Action funds on the other hand, are of two types-- block and discretionary. It is important to recognize the distinction between the two since the strategies used in preparing proposals may differ considerably. Block grants are allocated to states based on population and primarily used to implement the goals outlined by state and local governments in the comprehensive plan. (See section on SPAs) Discretionary monies comprise approximately 15 per cent of the LEAA budget. These funds are used to promote national objectives. LEAA periodically solicits a limited number of proposals for particular programmatic activities to be supported with discretionary funds. Both public and private agencies and organizations are eligible to apply for national discretionary funds. Usually, applicants are requested to submit an extensive grant application prior to the announced deadline. Program announcements are generally listed in government publications such as the Commerce Business Daily, Catalogue of Federal and Domestic Assistance, and the U.S. Government Manual. All these publications can be found in any public library, but more complete program area descriptions can be found in the annual LEAA Discretionary Grant Guidelines which can be obtained from the local state planning agencies (see Appendix VI for addresses) or LEAA's Public Information Office. 7/

Department of Labor

In the early history of pretrial services DOL monies were allocated for the demonstration (start-up) of pretrial diversion programs. Now DOL funds are available to pretrial services programs through CETA. Under CETA, the scope of monies provided to programs has been expanded, and release and diversion programs are both eligible for funds. CETA may be used to support components of existing programs or to hire staff. Unlike the demonstration monies which were solely for start-up purposes, CETA is now most commonly used to subsidize existing pretrial services programs. Sources listed in this section are applicable to both pretrial programs operating within an existing criminal justice agency, and to independent agencies located outside of the criminal justice system.

CETA authorizes designated Prime Sponsors to provide for and fund certain manpower services programs. Monies are available to pretrial programs through Titles I, II, III, and VI of the Act. An examination of the various Titles will give a clearer indication of the type of support existing for specific program needs. (See box/reduced type.) Administrators may obtain funds from either of these Titles independently (example: hire offenders as staff members, Title III; professional or paraprofessional staff, Title II), or consider combining several of them for additional revenue (example: obtain core funding, Title I; and hire staff, Title II, VI or III).

Program administrators can enhance their chances of future fund allocations from CETA by making the Prime Sponsor aware of existing pretrial services' goals and needs. Special knowledge of the services, resources, and needs of the community enables the administrator to provide the Prime Sponsor with fundamental data that may not otherwise be known. To find out who the Prime Sponsor is in each area, one should contact the head of the local government structure (i.e., Mayor, Board of Supervisors, etc.).

Further, administrators need to be aware of the implications of CETA funding. CETA programs are designed to service an indigent population and primarily have a service-oriented, manpower focus. Hence, administrators attempting to obtain funds through CETA may need to tailor the scope of their services to meet the objectives outlined by CETA. This may require programs to exchange their own eligibility criteria for criteria more similar to CETA's.

Under the CETA of 1973, funds are distributed by formula to units of local governments. Local government officials are given authority and funds to operate offender programs as local prime sponsors. Under this assignment, they are responsible for providing manpower training, public service employment and other manpower related services to economically disadvantaged, unemployed and under-employed residents of the communities within their boundaries. Responsibility for the total management of manpower programs is vested in the prime sponsor. Prime sponsors are governed by an advisory council, which is responsible for planning of basic goals, policies and procedures, reviewing and commenting on prime sponsors plans, monitoring and providing for objective evaluations of employment and training programs. The Advisory Council is a primary mechanism to receive advice on the prime sponsors plan from all sectors of its jurisdiction.

CETA funds are available to pretrial programs under Titles I, II, III, and VI.

- Title I authorizes prime sponsors to spend federal money on manpower training programs. In order to qualify, these programs must offer vocationally related services for criminal offenders at any stage of the criminal justice process-- from arrest to incarceration. Included are alternatives to incarceration such as pretrial diversion, and work release programs that emphasize employment, pre-employment training and special training for the ex-offender.
- Titles II and VI of CETA pay for public service employment.
- Title III authorizes additional manpower services to special target groups, including offenders. CETA funds can be used to hire ex-offenders and people released before their trials. CETA monies can also be used to hire professional and paraprofessional personnel to staff pretrial services agencies. 8/

Department of Health, Education & Welfare

While HEW is not generally recognized as a traditional source of revenue by the pretrial community, it has provided, through various offices, monies for services to the defendant and his/her family. The programs identified in this section apply whether the pretrial program is hosted by a parent agency within the criminal justice system or is a private, non-profit agency outside of the criminal justice system. HEW monies are rarely used to fund core-operation costs, but can be used to supplement existing budgets.

HEW administers funds for a variety of social welfare programs including social insurance, health, education, public aid, and other social welfare activities. Disbursements are channeled from the federal government to state and local governments. Although most HEW programs are administered at the local level, some of the programs remain at the state level. Funds available to pretrial agencies are provided through multiple programs under the Office of Education, Social and Rehabilitation Services, the Department of Human Development, and the Social Security Administration. (See box/reduced type section for descriptions of these programs.)

There are a number of ways HEW program funds might be applied to pretrial agencies. One option is to contract with the administering agency of the HEW program to provide services to the target population. For example, a pretrial diversion program may encourage an agency already receiving Title XX funds to subcontract in order to provide services through the diversion program. The pretrial program is then reimbursed by that agency on a per head basis for most of the expenditures. Another alternative is to encourage individual defendants to apply for income support. Once the defendant has been deemed eligible and is receiving the assistance, program administrators may request that the defendant present a small percentage of that income to the program as a fee-for-services. (See box/reduced type section for suggestions on how to obtain HEW funds from specific programs.)

Like other funding resources, HEW also has its limitations. Payments and reimbursements are made on an individual basis, thus may not represent a large source of revenue for the pretrial program. Individual recipients of HEW program funds must meet stringent eligibility criteria. Moreover, financial support is provided for specified periods of time. Any change in an individual's financial or life situation is likely to deem him/her ineligible for further program benefits. Finally, the procedure for obtaining HEW funds may prove rather cumbersome. Periodic reports on each recipient is usually attached as a requirement of funding. Administrators may also find it difficult to keep up with the multitude of Titles that apply to the recipient.

- Office of Education. The Office of Education provides an assortment of funds that are applicable to pretrial services programs. Specific program descriptions are listed in Appendix III. Educational Services are available to fund adult vocational and continuing education programs, alcohol and drug abuse education components. Special funds are available for programs operating in areas which are highly concentrated with bilingual populations. Monies are also available for special needs such as tutoring.

- Office of Social and Rehabilitation Services, Vocational Rehabilitation Services. (VRO) This office provides grants to states and counties for vocational rehabilitation services and special projects. Prior to the Rehabilitation Services Act of 1973 the VRO provided direct services to defendants. However, the revised Act of 1973 required that offenders meet rigid eligibility criteria. Offenders now must have a clearly diagnosable physical or mental disability, and this disability must represent a substantial handicap to employment. These criteria make it difficult for state rehabilitation offices to serve individual offenders. While counseling is generally rendered by the VRO, it is possible for program administrators to contract with the State Rehabilitation Office to provide special counseling services to eligible defendants. These services (in the broadest definition) may include job development, job training and prevocational counseling. Moreover, it is important that the counseling program be of a type that is not generally provided by the VRO.
- Department of Human Development. The Department of Human Development through Title XX now provides states with grants to cover the cost of services that benefit children, the elderly, blind, handicapped, alcoholic, drug addicted, and those with low income. Because of its heavy service orientation, Title XX funds are generally inappropriate for agencies which do not have service-oriented programs. This type of funding may be better suited to pretrial diversion programs.

Title XX grants provide funds to states for programs such as child care services, training and related services, information, referral and counseling services, and appropriate combinations of services designed to meet the needs of youth. Programs supported through Title XX must meet at least one of five specific goals: 1) achieve or maintain economic self-support or reduce/eliminate dependency; 2) achieve or maintain self-sufficiency including reduction or prevention of dependency; 3) prevent or remedy neglect, abuse, exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interests; 4) prevent or reduce inappropriate institutional care by providing community-based care, home-based care, or other forms of less intensive care; 5) secure referral, or admission to institutional care when other forms of care are not appropriate.

Each state must develop and submit to HEW for approval and funding an annual plan outlining the provision of services to eligible groups of people. States have considerable latitude in identifying the services they may provide, but services which the states wish to render must be in keeping with the goals identified by HEW. Each state also must make its plans available to the public at least 90 days prior to the beginning of the program year. Participation in the local and state planning sessions allows an opportunity to reinforce the inclusion of the program in the state Title XX plan. 9/

Pretrial administrators interested in obtaining Title XX monies might do well to contact the state agency responsible for administering these funds and discuss with them the funding possibilities available under this program.

- Social Security Administration

Supplementary Security Income (SSI) support for individuals is available through the local welfare offices under the Social Security Administration. Although payments are made directly to individuals and the individuals must meet certain eligibility criteria, these supporting incomes may provide the defendant with an opportunity to have more money available to meet his/her immediate financial or personal emergency needs. Additionally, if a defendant is deemed eligible, perhaps a percentage of his/her payment could be used as fee-for-services. While fees for services may generally represent an unattractive source of revenue for many programs, and may in all likelihood be more burdensome on the defendant than is profitable to the agency, fees can represent a limited source of income for some pretrial programs. Among the services available to the individual under SSI are money payments, medical assistance, and various social services.

Aid to Families/Dependent Children can provide support to the families of many defendants who lose their jobs as a consequence of pretrial detention.

Medicaid, like SSI, provides third party payments for some drug and alcohol abuse treatment of offenders.

Veterans Administration

The VA is becoming increasingly concerned about the growing number of veterans who become involved with the criminal justice system. While not yet providing funds for the operation of existing programs or start-up of new programs, local VA offices may be influenced to cooperate in joint ventures with other agencies in supporting pretrial programs. It is reasonable to assume that unless the VA has launched its own pretrial programs, existing pretrial services programs which experience heavy intake of veterans may be able to negotiate contractual agreements for services with local VA offices.

STATE AND LOCAL

In the previous section a number of programs were reviewed in which federal monies were channeled to state and local government agencies. States may also provide financial support to pretrial programs which the states finance alone, or in collaboration with local governments and/or private agencies. Various state agencies such as State Planning Agencies (SPA) develop plans which define their criminal justice needs and identify programs and services designed to meet these needs. At the local level, funds are available that originate from federal, state and local sources. Of course, the local agencies are the preferred financiers for long-term support for pretrial programs.

This section combines state and local funding resources because the strategies employed in obtaining these monies are quite similar. And while the actual amount of support is uncertain, the areas discussed represent a potentially strong source of funds for pretrial programs. Two of the options discussed here exist only at the state level, i.e., state planning agencies and subsidies. However, the third, revenue sharing (though also utilized at the state level) is more often available at the local level.

State Planning Agencies

The LEAA assists state and local governments develop and implement a comprehensive criminal justice planning process. This is accomplished through designated state criminal justice planning agencies. Each state has a planning agency. Their titles vary from state to state; for instance, some are known as "Justice Planning Units", "Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils" or "Governor's Commissions on Criminal Justice". For consistency the term "State Planning Agencies" will be used throughout the text. (Refer to Chart II for federal, state and local outlines.) SPA functions include: developing comprehensive state plans; dispensing of LEAA block grants to local and regional planning units within the state; and funding categorical projects at the state level.

Priorities identified by the SPA have a significant impact on the types of programs and direction of funds in the state. State plans, in principle, are supposed to take into account the needs and requests of the units of local governments and agencies, and encourage local initiative in the development of programs and projects. Administrative procedures and operations of SPAs vary from state to state. Some states have not identified pretrial services as a problem or priority area and have therefore allocated no monies to fund them. Others have identified pretrial services as a priority but have no monies available to fund the programs. The remaining states have identified pretrial services as a priority and have funded local pretrial programs.

When approaching SPAs for funding, the following should be remembered:

- Most SPAs prefer to have applications come through local or state agencies which in turn may subcontract with the independent agency to provide the services. This process ensures accountability for monies spent and consistent audit procedures for the SPA. It would be advantageous, therefore, for pretrial administrators to coordinate their plans through these channels.
- An SPA reviews applications for LEAA funds to verify that the program is consistent with the objectives identified in the state plan. It is often a good idea to meet first with staff at the SPA to find out whether monies are available and to preliminarily discuss if the proposed program is consistent with objectives outlined in the comprehensive plan. SPAs are required to comment on an application and have the authority to place special conditions on a grant.
- The SPA staff will provide technical assistance to applicants in writing proposals for funds and ensuring compliance with state plans.

- Most SPAs disburse only monies that are channeled to them by LEAA. However, SPAs are allowed by law to manage monies appropriated by their own state legislature for criminal justice activities. In essence, local variations exist in the amount and type of funding available and how that money is to be used by each SPA.

Subsidies

A resource which has seldom been tapped by the pretrial field are subsidy programs initiated by state governments. Subsidies have two objectives:

- To reduce the commitment to state operated adult and juvenile institutions.
- To encourage local correctional institutions to meet certain minimum operating standards.

Subsidies are awarded to local governments through the direct transfer of money from the state budget. The local government designates the agency which will administer the funds. A recent survey reveals that there are 41 correctional programs operating in 23 states. ^{10/} Although most subsidies have been allocated for post-conviction and juvenile programs, a few mixed pre- and post-conviction alternatives have been identified. Examples of comprehensive pre- and post-dispositional programs can be found in Iowa and Virginia. The Des Moines, Iowa, project received subsidy funds under the Department of Corrections. State funding support was provided to locally administered programs for pretrial release, probation, presentence investigation and residential facilities. ^{11/} Additionally, Virginia has funded, with subsidies, a court services program which includes intake/diversion components. ^{12/}

Spending authority for state subsidies to local governments is provided through legislation. Therefore, strategies need to be developed for influencing the state legislature. Administrators who have access to a legislator may be able to get him/her to introduce a bill. It is important to mobilize public support at state and local levels. Judges, county or city officials, other community and criminal justice personnel can endorse the program and be instrumental in helping to pass legislation. The collective support embodied in state associations of pretrial services agencies can be an effective vehicle in getting legislation passed.

Since the main recipients of subsidies are usually existing units of local governments, an administrator may have to try "piggybacking" his/her program onto an existing agency, or linking with another agency to obtain funds. Another option is to have pretrial programs unite to form a state association and collectively encourage and enlist support of appropriate state agencies to act as a conduit to channel funds into local pretrial programs.

Revenue Sharing

Under the General Revenue Sharing Act, the federal government returns to local units of governments certain revenues collected from them. Until the enactment of the Amendment of 1972, the primary restriction on spending the money was that

the funds be spent according to priority categories. ^{13/} Many localities used these monies to fund special projects that fell within the categories but could not be funded through local budgets. The Amendment requires the recipient to comply with strong anti-discrimination provisions and eliminates priority categories. Now revenue sharing funds may be used for any purpose not forbidden by state or local law.

Local governments generally treat revenue sharing funds in a discretionary fashion. Therefore, these monies can be used for support of local social programs, if local officials can be persuaded that this would be desirable. However, some localities incorporate revenue sharing monies into their local budgets.

When these funds are not incorporated into the government's budget, pretrial administrators can encourage localities to use their revenue sharing funds to fund total or partial operation costs of the pretrial program. Information about the availability of revenue sharing money is best secured from local units of governments.

PRIVATE

Additional avenues to be explored are private sources of funding such as foundations, businesses, corporations, and even local community resources. Although sources of this type generally provide a limited amount of money, they afford existing agencies a good opportunity to expand some components of their programs.

Foundations

It is believed that private foundations represent a strong funding resource for pretrial programs, yet current information is to the contrary. Large foundations usually fund programs which are national in scope and represent innovative and unique methods of operation. Small foundations, on the other hand, generally are limited to serving specific geographical boundaries. They support local projects and usually have limitations on the amounts they are willing to award.

- Where to look for foundations:

- (a) An excellent source of factual information on foundations is compiled by the Foundation Center, which operates two national offices located in New York (888 Seventh Avenue) and Washington, D.C. (1028 Connecticut Avenue). The Center's libraries are open to the public without charge. They contain virtually all the public records and printed publications relating to private foundations. In addition, a reference collection includes multiple copies of the Center's publications, current directories on private funding sources, and books and articles on proposal writing. The Foundation Center also makes information available in regional offices. (The Foundation Center provides a list of those offices upon request.)

The Foundation Center publishes several manuals which give information on where to look for foundations and identifies the kinds of programs foundations can support. The Foundation News, and Foundation Grants Index are publications which list and cross reference grants of \$5,000 or more. Some 250 major foundations are reported in this index. Grants are also listed in the center section of the bi-monthly magazine, Foundation News.

- (b) Any of the publications listed in the bibliography in Appendix I will also be useful in locating information about foundations.

- How to approach foundations:

There is no simple formula on the correct way to approach foundations. Strategies which work with some may be inappropriate for others. Successful attempts at obtaining funds from foundations incorporate techniques similar to those listed below. 14/

- (a) Research the foundations which seem to have some interest in the program. Annual reports, newsletters, and news releases generally provide a wealth of factual information on a foundations' activities.
- (b) Find out the financial capacity of the foundation. Knowing the average size of the foundation's grants will help avoid submitting an inadequate or overly ambitious proposal.
- (c) Establish a track record which demonstrates ability to implement the program. Existing programs should be able to produce documentation that they have been performing effectively. Accurate records and reporting procedures additionally enhance the proposal and let the funding source know that the organization is reliable.
- (d) Have a well-written proposal. Most foundations have their own proposal formal. (See "Techniques" for further discussion of proposal guidelines.)

Local Community Resources

Administrators should also explore the funding capabilities of other local social services-related agencies located within their communities. Frequently, these agencies can make available limited amounts of money for pretrial services agencies. For example, pretrial administrators are discovering that local United Way agencies distribute funds for a variety of social service programs. 15/ They generally award funds for the expansion of existing programs. Recent experiences show that some United Way agencies are becoming more receptive to making contributions for start-up of new programs and continuation of existing programs. A few other known examples are: The Junior League, Urban League, and Community Action Agencies. Only an exploration of the different community agencies in the area where the pretrial program is located can yield data about these and other community resources.

SPECIALIZED

There is a wide variety of resources available to the pretrial practitioner which may be helpful but fall short of direct financial assistance. Most of these funds are allocated to training, research, and technical assistance. These funds are often used to improve the services or to solve specific problems of the agency.

Training

Several federal government agencies offer training sessions to staff members of public and private pretrial services programs. Funds may be obtained to set up a component within an existing agency, or to send staff members to receive training from other sources. Some of these agencies provide financial support for staff members who attend national or local training workshops and conferences. (See Appendix IV for listing of resources providing training.)

Research

Public and private pretrial agencies are not generally the recipients of funds for research and evaluation programs. Universities, private research corporations, professional organizations and individuals are the primary recipients of research and evaluation funds. Pretrial administrators may, nevertheless, have some access (directly or indirectly) to these sources of funding. In fact, consideration can be given to joint research efforts with local universities or professional organizations. A further discussion of the options available for the funding of research and a description of the funding agencies are included in Appendix IV.

Technical Assistance

A number of national technical assistance projects are available to pretrial programs. In addition to the national projects, there is usually local, or at least in-state, technical assistance provided by SPAs or local justice agencies. Technical assistance can range from short-term to extended effort lasting a number of days or weeks. Some projects may provide services through a technical assistance team composed of in-house staff only, of outside consultants only, or a combination of staff and consultants. Examples of assistance might include: evaluating the progress of an activity; performing a management study; diagnosing systematic problems and making recommendations; helping draft a request for proposal (RFP). A listing of technical assistance projects is provided in Appendix V.

TECHNIQUES

TECHNIQUES

Throughout this publication suggestions have been made to enhance the probabilities for obtaining monies for pretrial programs. It needs to be reiterated that there is no single solution to raising money. Specifically, developing a reservoir of funds for a program includes more than just requesting money from a funding source. The process of creating ample funding resources for any agency does not begin and end with the writing and submitting of a proposal to a funding agency. While not providing the answer to financial problems, this section includes some techniques that have proven helpful, and together with political savvy and ingenuity can lead to more effective fundraising. 16/

- **Start Early:**

One of the greatest problems for busy administrators is they rarely have the time to actively pursue funds for the agency. Inadvertently, not enough time gets allocated to planning and preparation for obtaining monies. As a result, administrators sometimes submit proposals which are poorly written and inadequately documented. This severely weakens the chances of obtaining funds for their project. Planning allows adequate time for preparation and affords an administrator an early opportunity to define what he/she wants to do, why he/she wants to do it, and why it is needed. It is often a good idea to start a search for future funding resources at least one year prior to the termination of the present grant.

- **Build a Broad Base of Community Support:**

An important corollary to starting planning early is the administrator's ability to build a solid and broad base of community support for a program. Administrators should identify key persons in their community who can lend support or be instrumental at the decision making level. An informal investigation of the community is helpful in determining: Who makes decisions? Who influences whom? Who can offer leadership and assist in getting the program funded? Administrators should also identify those persons who may not be instrumental in decision making but whose support of the program would be effective. This process serves as a good opportunity for introducing community leaders to the program. Administrators interested in locating a program within the court structure would do well to enlist the support of judges, prosecutors, defense counsel, other service agency personnel, etc. Another way to create a strong advocacy for the program is to form an advisory committee consisting of diverse representatives from the courts, social services agencies and the community-at-large. Moreover, administrators can use this chance to find out as much as possible about the probable level of funding and where any large amounts of money are.

- **Document your proposal:**

Many programs are unable to secure additional funds because they cannot demonstrate their effectiveness. Increasingly, programs are

being assessed on their ability to demonstrate that the services rendered will provide the stated benefits to the target system, and that the program has the support of various persons and organizations within its constituency. Administrators should prepare documentation of their program's performance or of the need for the program if new funding is desired.

The information included in the documentation may be prepared in some written form, i.e., as a concept paper, and perhaps used later in the formal proposal. The necessary information should be available and answer all the important questions prospective funders will have about the program. A checklist might include the following: What is the problem? What do you intend to do about it? What is the audience? Is it a ready-made constituency or do you have to create a constituency? What policies are involved? What is the scope of the operation, in terms of how much there is to do and how far the project must reach? What are the time factors on start-up, duration and closing date? Where do you turn for authority or approvals and for help and advice? How much will it cost? 17/

- Have a Well-Developed and Well-Written Proposal:

It is difficult to give guidance in preparing proposals. The specific approach taken in writing the proposal will depend on the type of funding being sought. A demonstration grant may address an issue in a different way than a research or training grant. The proposal writer should be aware of the various viewpoints of the different funding agencies. Additionally, each funding agency has its own program interests and its own application procedures.

Further, while each proposal may have a different orientation or purpose, there are some elements that are essential to any proposal. The Foundation Center suggests that the proposal include the following sections:

(a) Purpose and Definition of Project:

- *What is the basic purpose of the program? (statement of problem)*
- *How long will the program last?*
- *Is this a new activity? Has the field been researched to find similar programs? Has a similar program failed? Succeeded? What has been learned from previous programs of this nature?*
- *Is this a continuation of a program or project? How well has it succeeded? Is it a modification? Why?*
- *What provision has been made for client participation, if applicable? If the proposal is to do a study, what plans, if any, have been made to implement the findings? Will the results be made available to others? What new methods and techniques will be tested?*

(b) Priority of Project:

- *How serious is the need?*
- *Why does this project deserve aid more than others competing for funds in the same field?*
- *Is this request in effect competing with other requests from the same organization? If so, what priorities would the organization establish among these requests?*
- *What is the target population? How large is it? How and to what extent will the program benefit the target population?*
- *What immediate and long range results are expected? Will these results help other organizations?*

(c) Financial Information:

- *What is the current operating budget of the organization? Itemize income and expenses.*
- *What is the anticipated budget for this program? Is the budget large enough? Is it too large for the results anticipated? Give a complete budget breakdown. What provisions have been made for independent audit of budget expenditures?*
- *Will the program continue beyond the funding period? If so, who will provide the funding? How firm a commitment for this future funding has been made? Will this ensure ongoing funding?*
- *Have requests for financial support of this program been submitted to other foundations, governmental agencies, or other funding sources? Has the program secured funding commitments from any of these sources? If so, for how much and from which source(s)?*
- *Are requests by this organization for other programs currently pending before other funding organizations? How are they related to this proposal?*

(d) Background of Applicant:

- *How long has the requesting organization or agency been in existence? What has been the performance to date of the requesting organization? List previous foundation supported programs.*
- *Is the organization tax exempt - 501(c)(3)? Attach exemption form if it is a new organization.*
- *What other organizations are active in the same or similar activities? What are the cooperating organizations, if any?*

(e) Personnel:

- *Who are the trustees and officers of the requesting organization? What financial support do the trustees give to the organization? What part do they take in policy formation and program direction? How, and to what extent, do the trustees participate in the programs of the organization?*
- *How many staff are needed? What are the professional qualifications for doing the proposed work?*
- *Will additional staff be required for this program? Are these persons readily available? To whom will they be responsible?*

(f) Evaluation:

- *By what criteria will the success or failure of this project be measured?*
- *Has adequate provision been made for the preparation of a final report? What type of progress reports are planned? How often will they be prepared? Who will get them?*
- *What provision has been made for objective evaluation of the results, short and long range? What techniques will be used in making evaluations? Who will do the evaluating?*

All grant applications should start with a summary letter outlining purpose, background, amount requested, and time limits. Detail may be included in Appendices.

Once the proposal is written it is strongly suggested that a knowledgeable third party read and criticize the descriptive materials. Very often proposals have gaps of information in them that are not readily apparent to those who have labored on the project.

Additionally some useful practices to follow when writing the proposal include: 18/

1. Keep the proposal short and clear;
2. Avoid broad and sweeping generalizations;
3. Test the proposal on others before submitting it to a funding source;
4. Use a minimum of professional jargon;
5. Be prepared to rewrite; and
6. Be creative: the more ways the program can be presented the greater the odds are of attracting a number of different funding sources.

● Follow-through:

Contacts (personal and telephone) with representatives of the funding agency prior to the submission of the proposal are an important component of successful proposal writing. The primary benefit of this approach is that administrators can more effectively "tailor" their proposal to the goals and priorities identified by the agency. Sometimes additional funding sources may be revealed; and occasionally, it is discovered that the agency is not awarding money just to that particular type of program. 19/

Once the proposal is submitted, the administrator should be sure to follow it through the decision making process of the funding agency by phone calls or meetings. For many of these agencies, a personal interview is often a part of the formal application process. When it is not, a useful strategy is to set up an interview with the appropriate representative of the funding agency to discuss the application. This is a good time for administrators to further "firm-up" their request for monies by personally discussing the program, and any special needs or conditions with reviewers of the application. One should be aware of the levels of decision-making for the specific funding sources so that time is aptly spent with the proper agency officials.

SUMMARY

SUMMARY

In conclusion, the challenge of securing money for pretrial programs is both frustrating and exciting. Many of the traditional funding resources are diminishing their allocations to pretrial services, and no single source is appearing to replace them. Pretrial programs have grown through the experimental phase; and the concerns aroused for the pretrial defendant are being shared by other criminal justice practitioners. Thus, pretrial programs no longer need to operate as distinct, separate entities but rather the scope of their services can be integrated into many existing concerns, i.e., jail overcrowding, etc. Of course, this makes the job of obtaining financial support difficult but, at the same time, should stimulate administrators to be imaginative in their pursuits for money.

The present and future funding forecast includes a kaleidoscope of opportunities. Communication and coordination with criminal justice personnel, related social service agencies and elected officials about the goals and needs of pretrial services are essential. Of course, the worth of this bulletin lies in its use by administrators. But beyond that, we hope administrators will be stimulated to share their experiences with us. Only in this way can new ideas and suggestions on how to obtain money be disseminated throughout the pretrial community.

FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES

- 1/ A discussion of funding resources existing in the juvenile field has not been included in this bulletin. Generally, there are more monies available in this area and the subject is better covered in other publications. An exceptionally useful reference is Stalking the Large Green Grant published by National Youth Alternatives Project. For copies write NYAP, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
- 2/ Information was compiled as a result of a random survey of approximately 150 pretrial services agencies conducted by the Resource Center.
- 3/ Galvin, John, Instead of Jail: Pre- and Post-Trial Alternatives to Jail Incarceration, Vol. 5, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, LEAA, 1977, p.82.
- 4/ For full discussion of legal issues affecting diversion, see Pretrial Intervention Legal Issues, Washington, D.C.: American Bar Association, February 1977.
- 5/ As quoted by Saif Ullah during the 1977 National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies Annual Conference, Arlington, Virginia, May 10-13.
- 6/ Those offices which have some responsibilities for pretrial activities include: Office of Criminal Justice Planning; Office of Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service; National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice; Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; Community Crime Prevention.
- 7/ For further discussion of LEAA responsibilities and activities refer to Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, 1968 (Public Law 90-351) as Amended by Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-644), as Amended by The Crime Control Act of 1977 (Public Law 93-83).
- 8/ Refer to Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973; also Employment and Training Programs for Offenders: A Guide for Prime Sponsors prepared by the Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, July 1977.
- 9/ For more information, see "Social Service Programs for Individuals and Families", Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Federal Register Vol. 40 No. 125, Washington, D.C., June 1975. Also, Berman, Jules, "Regulations Implementing Title XX of the Social Security Act", Washington, D.C.: Washington Bulletin Vol 24, Issue 19, Social Legislation Information Service, Inc. October 1975.
- 10/ A study was conducted of states correctional subsidy programs by The Council of Governments. A full discussion of the study is contained in two publications: State Subsidies to Local Corrections and State Subsidies to Local Corrections: A Summary of Programs. Copies may be obtained by writing The Council of State Governments, Iron Works Pike, Lexington, Kentucky 40511.
- 11/ In 1973, the State of Iowa initiated a subsidy program to fund a comprehensive community-based corrections program offering a coordinated range of services to the offender from the pretrial stage to post correction, State Subsidies to Local Corrections: A Summary of Programs.

- 12/ The subsidy program in Virginia is one of the oldest operating programs in the country. Court services subsidies supplemented salaries of all employees in locally administered court services districts. The subsidy program is administered by the Department of Corrections, Division of Youth Services. State Subsidies to Local Corrections: A Summary of Programs, pp. 50-52.
- 13/ Refer to State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972. For further explanation on use of revenue sharing, see Chamberlain, Norman, Funding Sources and Reference Resources, Washington, The Center for Urban Programs, St. Louis University, 1976.
- 14/ Allen, Herb., The Bread Game, New York: Glide Publications, p.10.
- 15/ The Community Release Agency, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania receives a percentage of its funding from the local United Way Agency, as does the Trumbull County Diversion Program, Warren, Ohio.
- 16/ These guidelines are modeled after those suggested by: Seymour, Harold, Design For Funding, New York: McGraw Hill, 1966; Jacquette, F. Lee, and Jacquette, Barbara, What Makes A Good Proposal?, New York: The Foundation Center, 1973; Mayer, Robert, What Will A Foundation Look For When You Submit A Grant Proposal: New York: The Foundation Center; Hill, William, A Comprehensive Guide to Successful Grantsmanship, Colorado: Grant Development Institute; conversations with various agency administrators.
- 17/ Seymour, Harold, Designs for Funding, New York: McGraw Hill, 1966, p.38.
- 18/ Jacquette, F. Lee, and Jacquette, Barbara, What Makes A Good Proposal?, New York: The Foundation Center, January/February 1973. (pamphlet)
- 19/ Sladek, Fred "Personal Contacts - Is It Really Necessary?", New York: Foundation News, Council on Foundations, September/October 1977, pp. 36-37.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

A Bibliography of Sources*

GOVERNMENT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance and Updates. 1975. Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Lists and describes many of the financial assistance programs of the federal government. Information is included on the purpose of the programs, types of assistance provided, eligibility requirements, application and award process, matching requirements, appropriations for the programs and program accomplishments. The Catalog also lists references to literature about the program and places to contact for more information. Updates to the Catalog are issued periodically; there is, however, a delay from the time the changes are made until the time the information gets published. Consequently any information obtained from the Catalog should be checked out with the agency administering the program to insure its accuracy.

Commerce Business Daily, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Commerce Business Daily is a publication in which the Federal Government announces bids for contracts and contract awards. An agency wishing to bid on a contract must submit a statement of its qualifications to the funding source.

Federal Register, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The Federal Register includes rules and regulations governing programs as well as announcements of funding priorities, guidelines for applying for programs, closing dates for the receipt of applications, and information on the distribution of funds to state and local agencies.

NEWSLETTERS OF THE FOLLOWING GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

National Drug Reporter, National Coordinating Council on Drug Education, 1526 18th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Prevention Resource Bulletin, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation and the National Coordinating Council on Drug Education, 39 Quail Court, Walnut Creek, California 94596.

American Education, Office of Education, Public Affairs Office, HEW North Building, 330 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20201.

ETA Interchange, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor 601 D Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20213.

Health Resources News, Health Resources Administration, Public Health Service, HEW, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

LEAA Newsletter, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Public Affairs Office, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20531.

Soundings on Youth, National Center for Youth Development, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 411 Hackensack Avenue, Hackensack, New Jersey 07601.

Advocate for Human Services, The National Association of Social Workers, 1425 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C.

Youth Alternatives, National Youth Alternatives Project, 1830 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20009.

GRANTSMANSHIP

Allen, Herb, Editor, The Bread Game: The Realities of Foundation Fundraising, Glide Publications, 330 Ellis Street, San Francisco, California 94102.

Church, David M., Seeking Foundation Funds, The National Public Relations Council of Health and Welfare Services, Inc., 815 Second Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

Hill William J., A Comprehensive Guide to Successful Grantsmanship, Grant Development Institute, 2552 Ridge Road, Littleton, Colorado 80120.

MacIntyre, Michael, How to Write a Proposal, Volt Information Sciences, Inc., 1828 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Margolis, Judith B., About Foundations: How to Find the Facts you Need to Get a Grant, The Foundation Center, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019.

Mirkin, Howard R., The Complete Fund Raising Guide, Public Service Materials Center, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

The Grantsmanship Center, P.O. Box 44759, 1015 W. Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90015.

The Grantsmanship Center conducts week-long training seminars in large cities across the country. Participants represent non-profit organizations lacking grant-seeking expertise.

National Self-Help Resource Center, Inc., 1800 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20007.

The National Self-Help Resource Center helps voluntary groups find resources in their own communities, including sources of funding. The Center also provides technical assistance in fundraising.

The Support Center, 1822 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 and Pier 5 South, San Francisco, California 94111.

The Support Center provides charitable, educational, service, and community groups with a full range of management support services. The services include financial management, management planning, office management, communications, financial development, personnel, and management systems. For more details, write for their brochure.

FOUNDATION GRANTS

Foundation Annual Reports. Available from individual foundations; free. Also can be purchased from The Foundation Center 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019 on microfiche cards.

Reports on each foundation's grants, including the amount, recipient, and purpose. Approximately 300 foundations publish annual reports.

The Foundation Center Source Book, 1975/1976, Columbia University Press, 136 So. Broadway, Irvington, New York 10533.

Contains profiles of approximately 200 foundations, including all grants made in the year of record plus detailed statements of policies, programs, application procedures, and recent fiscal data under each foundation's name.

The Foundation Grants Index 1974, Columbia University Press, 136 So. Broadway, Irvington, New York, 10533. 1975.

Lists approximately 10,000 grants of \$5,000 or more from about 250 mostly large national foundations, cross referenced by subject, foundation and recipient. Information about each grant includes: amount of the grant, recipient name and location, grant authorization date, grant description (in most cases), grant identification number (for cross reference purposes). Many of the grants also are coded by type of recipient, population group benefiting from the activity, phase of activity, site of activity, if other than the recipient location, program, geographic or other limitation set by the foundation and source of grant data.

Foundation Grants Index-Bimonthly Edition, published in Foundation News, Council on Foundations, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019.

Published as a removable center section of the six-times-a-year Foundation News magazine. At the end of the year, the six issues are combined and become the following year's Foundation Grants Index.

Funding Sources Clearinghouse, Inc., 2600 Bancroft Way, Berkeley, California 94704. Available only to members, open only to non-profit organizations.

Conducts searches of foundations for member organizations seeking grants. Prepares a complete list and supplies an analysis of the 5 to 10 foundations which it feels to be the most likely sources of support. Membership fee includes one free project-grant search, a free monthly digest of current grant-seeking news, and a funding alert. Additional project-grant searches and biographical profiles on foundation officials are also available.

Grantsmanship Center News, The Grantsmanship Center, P.O. Box 44759, 1015 W. Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90015.

Includes information on foundation funding patterns.

Foundation News, Council on Foundations, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019.

Contains articles on new developments in foundation program areas as well as the Foundation Grants Index-Bimonthly Edition (see above).

State Directories of Foundations Bibliography, The Foundation Center, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019. Free

This bibliography provides information on where to obtain state directories of foundations. States now publishing these directories include: California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Where America's Large Foundations Make Their Grants, 1974-75 Edition, Public Service Materials Center, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

Gives a select sampling of grants awarded by 750 foundations having at least \$1 million in assets.

*References adapted from: Utech, Ingrid, Stalking the Large Green Grant, Washington, D.C.: National Youth Alternatives Project, 1976.

APPENDIX II

1978 LEAA DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Program Area	Est. Total \$	Project Ceilings	# Of Projects	Deadline Date	LEAA Office	Other
Restitution Programs (includes Pretrial) <u>1/</u>	\$2 Million	\$50,000 to \$250,000	up to 12	April 3, 1978	Rehabilitation Division, OCJP* (202)376-3647	18 month grants no continuation
Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) <u>2/</u>	\$4.7 Million	\$100,000 to \$450,000	Est. 12 new and 9 continuation	Feb. 1, 1978 and June 1, 1978	Rehabilitation Division, OCJP (202)376-3647	15 months 200,000 population (alcohol/drug)
Replication of Montgomery Co. Md. Pre-Release/Work Release Program <u>3/</u>	Info. not available at time of printing	Info. not available at time of printing	Info. not available at time of printing	Test design available in early 1978	Office of Development, Testing and Dissemination NILECJ, LEAA	Write to be on mailing list
Victim/Witness Projects <u>4/</u>	\$3 Million	\$50,000 to \$400,000	4 to 5	Mar. 15, 1978	Special Programs Division, OCJP (202)376-3550	Applicant should be police or prosecutor.
Jail Overcrowding and Pretrial Detainee Program <u>5/</u>	\$2 Million	Info. not available at time of printing	Info. not available at time of printing	None	Adjudication Division, OCJP (202)376-3891 (202)376-3615	Concept papers; may include court-based responses such as delay - reduction and release alternatives
Court Delay Reduction <u>6/</u>	\$2.6 Million	\$250,000	up to 12	June 2, 1978	Adjudication Division, OCJP (202)376-3891 (202)376-3615	Statewide and local; must be comprehensive; concept paper of 3-6 pages
De-institutionalization of Status Offenders and Juvenile Diversion	Info. not available at time of printing	Info. not available at time of printing	Info. not available at time of printing	Info. not available at time of printing	OJJDP Special Emphasis	Additional funding in FY '78 will be provided to states in this area from National LEAA; contact OJJDP and cognizant SPA
Community Crime Prevention <u>7/</u>	\$6 Million	\$250,000	up to 60	Mar. 31, 1978	Office of Community Anti-Crime (202)376-3985	Funding for period of 12-18 months. Applicant must be non-profit community/neighborhood organization, grants will not be awarded to state and local units of government or their agencies

* Note that the Special Emphasis Division of OJJDP will soon issue guidelines on a major demonstration program for juvenile diversion.

- 1/ Discretionary Funds Guide pp. 44-53
2/ Discretionary Funds Guide pp. 53-55
3/ Discretionary Funds Guide p. 52
4/ Discretionary Funds Guide pp. 75-80

- 5/ Discretionary Funds Guide p. 63
6/ Discretionary Funds Guide pp. 21-28
7/ Discretionary Funds Guide pp. 1-11

APPENDIX III
Federal Funding

OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE

- Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act provides grants in amounts of \$1,000 for each project which provides school components for neglected and/or delinquent children.
- Section 123 of this Act provides monies for neglected and delinquent children who are in institutions. Any person is eligible who is below the age of the majority as set in that state. These programs are administered by State Board of Education. These grants should be used to supplement services normally provided by state or local Board of Education. For more information contact Division of Education for the Disadvantaged, Bureau of Schools, 7th & D Streets, SW, Washington, D.C. 20202.
- Under Title III the Office of Education provides formula grants to state educational agencies for innovative and exemplary programs such as supplementary education centers, vitally needed educational services. Agencies may apply for these funds through Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20202. Pretrial agencies may receive these funds on a contractual basis from state or local government if their school component is of an experimental nature.
- Right to Read Program. The Office of Education provides project grants to stimulate institutions, governmental agencies and private organizations to develop and improve reading related activities for the functionally illiterate of all ages. Funds are awarded to state and local (public) education agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public and private non-profit agencies. Funds are to be used to plan and implement exemplary programs to disseminate information on effective reading programs and successful teacher training programs. For more information contact the National Right to Read Office, Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20202.
- Vocational Education Programs. The Office of Education funds state boards of vocational education which in turn fund local (public) educational agencies for the following kind of vocational education programs: construction of area vocational education school facilities; vocational guidance and counseling; vocational training through arrangements with private vocational training institutions; and ancillary services and activities such as teacher training and supervision, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, improved state administration and leadership and program evaluation. For additional information contact Director, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.
- Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education. The Office of Education awards limited grants to institutions of higher education, state and local (public) educational agencies, public and private education or community agencies, institutions and organizations to: organize and train alcohol and drug education leadership teams at state and local levels; provide technical assistance to these teams; develop programs and leadership to combat causes of alcohol and drug abuse. For additional information contact The Division of Drug Education, Nutrition and Health Programs, Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20202.
- Vocational Programs for Persons with Special Needs. The Office of Education allocates funds to State Boards of vocational education which in turn fund local (public) educational agencies to provide vocational education for persons who have academic, socio-economic, or other social handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational educational programs. Agencies should apply for these funds through their state Department of Education.
- Bilingual Vocational Training. The Office of Education provides funds to assist in conducting bilingual vocational training programs. Funds are awarded to states and local (public) education agencies, institutions of higher education, and non-profit organizations and private for profit organizations. For additional information contact the Director, Division of Research and Demonstration, Demonstration Branch, Bureau of Occupational & Adult Education, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.
- Career Education. The Office of Education awards grants to demonstrate the most effective methods and techniques in career education and to develop exemplary career education models. Funds are awarded to state and local education agencies, institutions of higher education and other non-profit organizations. For additional information contact the Director, Office of Career Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.
- Educational Opportunity Centers. The Office of Education provides funds to institutions of higher education, combinations of such institutions, public and private agencies and organizations and, in exceptional cases, secondary schools and secondary vocational schools for the following purposes: to provide area residents seeking post-secondary education with basic information concerning financial aid applications. Centers also provide tutoring and counseling for enrolled post-secondary students and coordinate resources and staff efforts in recruiting and counseling for admission to post-secondary institutions. Further information may be obtained by writing Division of Student Support and Special Programs, Bureau of Post-secondary Education, Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20202.
- Adult Education Act makes formula grants available to states for adult education programs through the secondary level.

APPENDIX IV
Specialized Funding

TRAINING

- National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, HEW

Alcoholism Training Programs: The Training Branch, Division of Resource Development, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) provides funds to public and private non-profit organizations to develop alcoholism training programs and programs may be designed to train a variety of staff with various backgrounds. For more information, contact the Training Branch, Division of Resource Development, NIAAA, 5600 Fisher Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

- National Institute of Drug Abuse, HEW

The Prevention Branch, Division of Resource Development, National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), awards contracts for the provision of technical assistance to drug abuse prevention personnel.

The Manpower and Training Branch, Division of Resource Development, NIDA, supports a variety of training programs. First, it provides funds for the operation of five Regional Training Centers. The Centers provide training to both paraprofessionals and professionals working in drug-related fields. Training includes courses in short-term counseling skills, fundamental facts and insights about drug abuse, methadone treatment programs. For more information about courses offered by Regional Training Centers, for the center located in your area contact the Training Division, NIDA, 11400 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

The Branch provides financial support and technical assistance to states so that they can develop their own training programs. For more information about state activities, contact your Drug Abuse Agency. The address and phone number can be obtained from Division of Community Assistance, NIDA, 11400 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

Courses offered by Regional Training Centers and the states are free to persons who participate in them. However, travel costs must be borne by the agency sponsoring the participants or by the participants themselves.

- National Institute of Mental Health, HEW

The Division of Manpower Training Programs, National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) provides support for two types of training: clinical training and research training. For pretrial services agencies grants are available to train professional and paraprofessional staff.

Grants are available to both public and private, non-profit organizations. Applications are received on three deadlines each year - March 1, July 1, and November 1. Prospective applicants are invited to seek early consultation on the development of training proposals and are urged to submit an outline or draft of a proposed project for staff comments and feedback. For more information contact, Chief, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, National Institute of Mental Health, 5600 Fisher Lane, Rockville, MD, 20857.

RESEARCH

- National Institute on Drug Abuse Treatment Demonstration Research Programs.

The Services Research Branch, Division of Resource Development, NDA awards grants and contracts for surveys of existing treatment programs to recommend ways the programs can be improved, modified, extended or expanded. Contact the Division of Research, NIDA, 11400 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, LEAA (OJJDP)

(a) Technical Assistance: OJJDP provides technical assistance to federal, state and local governments, courts, public and private agencies, institutions and individuals in the planning, establishment, funding, operation and evaluation of juvenile justice programs. OJJDP awarded two technical assistance contracts - one to provide technical assistance to diversion (10 exemplary projects) and deinstitutionalization grant recipients, and to provide technical assistance to recipients of state LEAA funds for action programs.

(b) Personnel training and research monies are also available. For further information contact National Institute of Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, LEAA, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20513.

- National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILECJ)

The NILECJ is LEAA's research component. Each year the Institute solicits applications from universities, private research firms, professional associations, other federal, state or local agencies to undertake research projects for which the Institute provides funds. Staff members review the proposals for substance and compliance with research guidelines. NILECJ then awards research funds to those independent external organizations whose skills and resources indicate that they can accomplish stated objectives, and who are in accordance with the Institutes designated priorities. The Institutes pretrial activities include the evaluation of release and diversion programs, field testing research findings and techniques that exhibit substantial potential, the training of criminal justice practitioners and the like.

NILECJ often funds research projects which require studies in a variety of sites. Generally these studies are conducted in the context of national and research purposes, but they often provide a good deal of information and data for the locality. They are conducted by some of the finest researchers and consultants available. Furthermore, if the project is having difficulties finding sites, it may be possible for the program to extract further services. For example, if a research project is going on, a program may be able to get the consultant to also develop a management information system. Although a national report is being developed, the consultant might be willing to develop a shorter report on the jurisdiction for the program. The following provides three examples of different types of programs funded by NILECJ.

1. The best source of assistance from NILECJ is directly from one of their consultants or companies which has been designated for a contract. Generally the contractors are looking for jurisdictions in which they can test the research hypotheses or policy implications of particular activities. A case study is provided by the Phase II study of Pretrial Release. NILECJ through its National Evaluation Program offered to fund a \$600,000 study to examine various aspects of pretrial release. This meant that the evaluator was to look at the outcomes of clients under pretrial release versus other forms of bail, which included studying failure-to-appear and rearrest rates; examination of the point scale; examination of the cost-effectiveness of the pretrial release program; etc. The study included a considerable number of cases in each jurisdiction; and in addition, there will be a qualitative analysis of the service delivery system, not only of the release agency but of the larger criminal justice system. The Phase II contract was awarded to the Lazar Institute of Washington, D.C., and Mary Toborg is the program director. This Study was reported both in the LEAA Newsletter and in the Pretrial Reporter. The Lazar study will be examining eight cities throughout the country. The Lazar study offers fantastic opportunities for a program, not only because of the extensive data gathering employed, but because of the great deal of competence on the part of the investigators.
2. Often NILECJ accepts unsolicited proposals. Generally these unsolicited proposals get funded if they meet the national and research objectives of NILECJ. The suggestion is that the pretrial release or diversion agency contact a local university professor; and work with him in developing an unsolicited proposal. It would probably be worthwhile for either the researcher from the university or someone from the pretrial agency to spend a day in Washington, D.C. talking to NILECJ to find out generally the types of proposals they will fund; the types of activities they are currently involved in; and their schedule for considering unsolicited proposals. The unsolicited proposal is good in that much smaller projects would be considered; however, it probably will not answer the broader evaluation questions as through the kinds of studies cited in 1 above. It must be remembered that this type of proposal must deal with a national programmatic concern rather than just a concern of the local release or diversion agency.
3. Still another possibility is to work with a university researcher, private consultant, etc., to bid for the RFP issued by NILECJ. Generally the RFP states the nature of the activity or research that must be done. Various contractors are then expected to submit a proposal dealing with that problem and to make a bid with their proposal. Generally, a proposal which includes both researchers and programmatic officials may have a greater chance of being funded. In addition, it is suggested that perhaps nationally known program officials in release or diversion might be named consultants to the project. As with any proposal, it is worthwhile to follow up your RFP by having politically astute persons who you contact LEAA. Discussions with LEAA officials on the topic prove to be exceptionally useful. RFP's are announced in many governmental journals such as Business Commerce Daily or U.S. Government Manual and by special announcements published by NILECJ.

- National Institute of Mental Health

The Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency is the focal point in NIMH for research, training and related activities in the areas of crime and delinquency. Program activities of the Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency include the development of needed scientific knowledge on sources and patterns of crime and delinquency-related behaviors.

The Center does not customarily fund service projects or projects which are essentially intended to improve the programs of a particular agency or jurisdiction. The Center is interested in funding primarily projects which benefit national efforts provided these projects also involve careful development, testing and evaluation models, or which have benefit to other agencies and jurisdictions with similar needs.

Grants are available to both public and private, non-profit organizations. Research applications are received on three deadlines each year - March 1, July 1 and November 1. Prospective applicants are invited to seek early consultation on the development of research and training proposals and are urged to submit an outline or draft of a proposed project for staff comments and feedback. For more information contact, Chief, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, National Institute of Mental Health, 5600 Fisher Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20857.

- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA)

The Division of Extramural Research, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, funds the majority of research programs on alcoholism and alcohol abuse. For more information contact NIAAA, 5600 Fisher Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

APPENDIX V

NATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS AFFECTING PRETRIAL

Subject Matter Area	National Project	LEAA Office	Who to Contact	Conditions
Pretrial services: diversion, release	Pretrial Services Resource Center Washington, D.C.	Adjudication Division OCJP	Pretrial Services Resource Center	To be negotiated with project staff
General Courts TA (emphasis on court management and delay)	American University Criminal Courts TA Project	Adjudication Division OCJP	LEAA Program Office or SPA	New contract to be awarded in 1978
Prosecution Management	National District Attorneys Assn. TA Project, Chicago	Adjudication Division OCJP	SPA, LEAA, or NDAA	Roughly 3-4 days of comprehensive management assistance
Court Delay	National Center for State Courts Pretrial Delay Project (San Francisco)	Adjudication Division OCJP	LEAA or Project Staff	To be determined
Pretrial detainee and overcrowded jail problems	American Justice Institute (Sacramento)	Rehabilitation Division, OCJP	LEAA	Principally central intake notion and alternatives to jail
	University Research Corp. Corrections TA Project	Rehabilitation Division, OCJP	LEAA	URC handles a variety of TA needs in corrections area
	National Institute of Corrections (Bureau of Prisons) Jail Center, Boulder, Colorado	None	NIC Jail Center	NIC Jail Center can provide quick turn-around TA; also small planning grants
	Pretrial Services Resource Center Washington, D.C.	Adjudication Division OCJP	Pretrial Services Resource Center	To be negotiated with project staff
Jail Accounting Micro-computer System (JAMS)		National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service (NCJISS)	NCJISS	Small grants to improve jail management
Restitution/Sentencing	SUNY/Albany and University Research Corp.	Rehabilitation Division, OCJP	LEAA	
	American University Criminal Courts TA Project	Adjudication Division OCJP	SPA/LEAA	Some assistance has been provided in the area of sentencing reform and alternatives
Juvenile diversion, restitution, and de-institutionalization of status offenders	National Office of Social Responsibility (Arlington, VA)	Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, LEAA	LEAA	Diversion and status offenders
	Arthur D. Little, Inc	Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, LEAA	LEAA	Developing local capacity in entire juvenile justice area
Defense system improvement	National Center for Defense Management (NLADA), Washington, D.C.)	Adjudication Division OCJP	NCDM and LEAA	NCDM works with state and local defense system improvement
Witness notification and management		Special Programs Division, OCJP	LEAA	
Community anti-crime	National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs	Office of Community Anti-Crime	LEAA	Assistance to neighborhood groups in project development and other assistance
	Center for Community Change	Office of Community Anti-Crime	LEAA	

APPENDIX VI

ADDRESSES OF STATE PLANNING AGENCIES (Dec. 2, 1977)

ALABAMA

Robert G. Davis, Director
Alabama Law Enforcement Planning Agency
2863 Fairlane Drive
Building F, Suite 49
Executive Park
Montgomery, AL 36115
205/277-5440 FTS 534-7700

ALASKA

Charles G. Adams, Jr., Executive Director
Office of Criminal Justice Planning
Pouch AJ
Juneau, AK 99801
907/465-3535 FTS 399-0150
Thru Seattle FTS 206/442-0150

AMERICAN SAMOA

Judith A. O'Connor, Director
Territorial Criminal Justice Planning Agency
Office of the Attorney General
Government of American Samoa
Box 7
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799
633-5222 (Overseas Operator)

ARIZONA

Ernesto G. Munoz, Executive Director
Arizona State Justice Planning Agency
Continental Plaza Building, Suite M
5119 North 19th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85015
602/271-5466 FTS 765-5466

ARKANSAS

Gerald W. Johnson, Executive Director
Arkansas Crime Commission
1515 Building
Suite 700
Little Rock, AR 72202
501/371-1305 FTS 740-5011

CALIFORNIA

Douglas R. Cunningham, Executive Director
Office of Criminal Justice Planning
7171 Bowling Drive
Sacramento, CA 95823
916/445-9156 FTS 465-9156

COLORADO

Paul G. Quinn, Executive Director
Division of Criminal Justice
Department of Local Affairs
1313 Sherman Street, Room 419
Denver, CO 80203
303/839-3331 FTS 327-0111

CONNECTICUT

William H. Carbone, Executive Director
Connecticut Justice Commission
75 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06115
203/566-3020

DELAWARE

Christine Harker, Executive Director
Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice
1228 North Scott Street
Wilmington, DE 19806
302/571-3431

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Arthur Jefferson, Executive Director
Office of Criminal Justice Plans and Analysis
Munsey Building, Room 200
1329 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
202/629-5063

FLORIDA

Charles R. Davoll, Bureau Chief
Bureau of Criminal Justice Planning and Assistance
620 S. Meridian Street
Tallahassee, FL 32304
904/488-6001 FTS 946-2011
(Auto. Tel. 487-1725)

GEORGIA

Jim Higdon, Administrator
Office of the State Crime Commission
3400 Peachtree Road, NE, Suite 625
Atlanta, GA 30326
404/894-4410 FTS 285-0111

GUAM

Alfred F. Sablan, Director
Territorial Crime Commission
Office of the Governor
Soledad Drive
Amistad Bldg., Room 4, 2nd Floor
Agana, GU 96910
472-8781 (Overseas Operator)

HAWAII

Irwin Tanaka, Director
State Law Enforcement and Juvenile Delinquency
Planning Agency
1010 Richards Street
Kamamalu Building, Room 412
Honolulu, HI 96813
808/548-3800 FTS 556-0220

IDAHO

Kenneth N. Green, Bureau Chief
Law Enforcement Planning Commission
700 West State Street
Boise, ID 83720
208/384-2364 FTS 554-2364

ILLINOIS

James B. Zagel, Executive Director
Illinois Law Enforcement Commission
120 South Riverside Plaza, 10th Floor
Chicago, IL 60606
312/454-1560

INDIANA

Frank A. Jessup, Executive Director
Indiana Criminal Justice Planning Agency
215 North Senate
Indianapolis, IN 46202
317/633-4773 FTS 336-4773

IOWA

Allen Robert Way, Executive Director
Iowa Crime Commission
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
515/281-3241 FTS 863-3241

KANSAS

Thomas E. Kelly, Executive Director
Governor's Committee on Criminal Administration
503 Kansas Avenue, 2nd Floor
Topeka, KS 66603
913/296-3066 FTS 757-3066

KENTUCKY

Ronald J. McQueen, Executive Director
Executive Office of Staff Services
Kentucky Department of Justice
State Office Building Annex, 2nd Floor
Frankfort, KY 40601
502/564-3251 FTS 352-5011

LOUISIANA

Wingate M. White, Director
Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement
and Administration of Criminal Justice
1885 Wooddale Boulevard, Room 615
Baton Rouge, LA 70806
504/389-7515

MAINE

Ted T. Trott, Executive Director
Maine Criminal Justice Planning
and Assistance Agency
11 Parkwood Drive
Augusta, ME 04330
207/289-3361

MARYLAND

Richard C. Wertz, Executive Director
Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement
and Administration of Justice
Executive Plaza One, Suite 302
Cockeysville, MD 21030
301/666-9610

MASSACHUSETTS

Robert J. Kane, Executive Director
Committee on Criminal Justice
110 Tremont Street, 4th Floor
Boston, MA 02108
617/727-5497

MICHIGAN

Noel Bufo, Administrator
Office of Criminal Justice Programs
Lewis Cass Building, 2nd Floor
Lansing, MI 48913
517/373-6655 FTS 253-3992

MINNESOTA

Jacqueline Reis, Executive Director
Crime Control Planning Board
444 Lafayette Road, 6th Floor
St. Paul, MN 55101
612/296-3133 FTS 776-3133

MISSISSIPPI

Latrelle Ashley, Executive Director
Miss. Criminal Justice Planning Division
Suite 400, 723 North President Street
Jackson, MS 39202
601/354-4111 FTS: 490-4211

MISSOURI

Jay Sondhi, Executive Director
Missouri Council on Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 1041
Jefferson City, MO 65101
314/751-3432 FTS 276-3711

MONTANA

Michael A. Lavin, Administrator
Board of Crime Control
1336 Helena Avenue
Helena, MT 59601
406/449-3604 FTS 587-3604

NEBRASKA

Harris R. Owens, Executive Director
Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement
and Criminal Justice
State Capitol Building
Lincoln, NE 68509
402/471-2194 FTS 867-2194

NEVADA

James A. Barrett, Director
Commission on Crime, Delinquency
and Corrections
430 Jeanell - Capitol Complex
Carson City, NV 89710
702/885-4404

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Roger J. Crowley, Jr., Director
Governor's Commission on Crime
and Delinquency
169 Manchester Street
Concord, NH 03301
603/271-3601

NEW JERSEY

John J. Mullaney, Executive Director
State Law Enforcement Planning Agency
3535 Quaker Bridge Road
Trenton, NJ 08625
609/477-5670

NEW MEXICO

Charles E. Becknell, Executive Director
Governor's Council on Criminal
Justice Planning
425 Old Santa Fe Trail
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505/827-5222 FTS 476-5222

NEW YORK

William T. Bonacum, Director
Division of Criminal Justice Services
80 Centre St.
New York, NY 10013
212/488-3896

NORTH CAROLINA

Gordon Smith
N.C. Dept. of Crime Control and Public Safety
P.O. Box 27687
Raleigh, NC 27611
919/733-7974 FTS 672-4020

NORTH DAKOTA

Oliver Thomas, Director
North Dakota Combined Law Enforcement Council
Box B
Bismark, ND 58505
701/224-2594 FTS 783-4011

OHIO

Bennett J. Cooper, Deputy Director
Ohio Dept. of Economic and Community Development
Administration of Justice
30 East Broad Street, 26th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
612/466-7610 FTS 942-7610

OKLAHOMA

O. Ben Wiggins, Acting Executive Director
Oklahoma Crime Commission
3033 North Walnut
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
405/521-2821 FTS 736-4011

OREGON

Keith Stubblefield, Administrator
Law Enforcement Council
2001 Front Street, NE
Salem, OR 97303
503/378-4347 FTS 530-4347

PENNSYLVANIA

Thomas J. Brennan, Executive Director
Governor's Justice Commission
Department of Justice
P.O. Box 1167
Federal Square Station
Harrisburg, PA 17108
717/787-2040

PUERTO RICO

Flavia Alfaro de Quevedo, Executive Director
Puerto Rico Crime Commission
G.P.O. Box 1256
Hato Rey, PR 00936
809/783-0398

RHODE ISLAND

Patrick J. Fingliss, Executive Director
Governor's Justice Commission
197 Taunton Avenue
E. Providence, RI 02914
401/277-2620

SOUTH CAROLINA

John S. Parton, Acting Executive Director
Office of Criminal Justice Programs
Edgar A. Brown State Office Building
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
803/758-3573 FTS 677-5011
(Manual Tel. 758-8940)

SOUTH DAKOTA

Elliott Nelson, Director
Division of Law Enforcement Assistance
200 West Pleasant Drive
Pierre, SD 57501
605/224-3665 FTS 782-7000

TENNESSEE

Harry D. Mansfield, Executive Director
Tennessee Law Enforcement Planning Agency
4950 Linbar Drive
The Browning-Scott Building
Nashville, TN 37211
615/741-3521 FTS 852-5022

TEXAS

Robert C. Flowers, Executive Director
Criminal Justice Division
Office of the Governor
411 West 13th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-4444 FTS 734-5011

TRUST TERRITORIES OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Dennis Lund, Administrator
Office of the High Commissioner
Justice Improvement Commission
Saipan, Mariana Islands 96950

UTAH

Robert B. Andersen, Director
Utah Council on Criminal Justice
Administration
255 South 3rd Street - East
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
801/533-5731 FTS 588-5500

VERMONT

William H. Baumann, Executive Director
Governor's Commission on the Administration
of Justice
149 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05602
802/832-2351

VIRGINIA

Richard H. Harris, Director
Division of Justice and Crime Prevention
8501 Mayland Drive
Parham Park
Richmond, VA 23229
804/786-7421

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Troy L. Chapin, Administrator
Virgin Islands Law Enforcement Planning Commission
Box 280 - Charlotte Amalie
St. Thomas, VI 00801
809/774-6400

WASHINGTON

Donna Schram, Acting Administrator
Law and Justice Planning Office
Office of Community Development
General Administration Bldg., Rm. 206
Olympia, WA 98504
206/753-2235 FTS 434-2235

WEST VIRGINIA

Ray N. Joens, Director
Criminal Justice and Highway Safety Division
Morris Square, Suite 321
1212 Lewis Street
Charleston, WV 25301
304/348-8814

WISCONSIN

Charles M. Hill, Sr., Executive Director
Wis. Council on Criminal Justice
122 West Washington
Madison, WI 53702
608/266-3323 FTS 366-3323

WYOMING

William Penn, Administrator
Governor's Planning Committee on
Criminal Administration
Barrett Building, 4th Floor
Cheyenne, WY 82002
307/777-7716 FTS 328-9716



NATIONAL ARCHIVES RECORDS SERVICE

1900 RELEASE UNDER E.O. 14176 Was. 10-1-10



END