

**DA.05.16**  
**Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention**

***Operating Budget Data***

(\$ in Thousands)

	<b>FY 01</b>	<b>FY 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>		<b>% Change</b>
	<b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>Working</u></b>	<b><u>Allowance</u></b>	<b><u>Change</u></b>	<b><u>Prior Year</u></b>
General Fund	\$7,007	\$7,313	\$7,409	\$97	1.3%
Special Fund	1,322	1,350	1,350	0	0%
Federal Fund	29,489	36,513	36,994	482	1.3%
Reimbursable Fund	<u>200</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
<b>Total Funds</b>	<b>\$38,018</b>	<b>\$45,175</b>	<b>\$45,754</b>	<b>\$578</b>	<b>1.3%</b>

- Most of the increase in federal funding comes from a new grant award for initiatives to combat underage drinking.

***Personnel Data***

	<b>FY 01</b>	<b>FY 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>	
	<b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>Working</u></b>	<b><u>Allowance</u></b>	<b><u>Change</u></b>
Regular Positions	38.00	38.00	38.00	0.00
Contractual FTEs	<u>10.90</u>	<u>10.90</u>	<u>8.90</u>	<u>(2.00)</u>
<b>Total Personnel</b>	<b>48.90</b>	<b>48.90</b>	<b>46.90</b>	<b>(2.00)</b>

***Vacancy Data: Regular Positions***

Budgeted Turnover: FY 03	1.58	4.17%
Positions Vacant as of 12/31/01	1.00	2.63%

- The Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP) reports that the reduction in two contractual FTE positions is part of their overall cost containment plan.

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

For further information contact: Elizabeth Forkin

Phone: (410) 946-5530

## *Analysis in Brief*

---

### Issues

***Sexual Offender Tracking Sanctions:*** The Lychner Sexual Offender Tracking and Identification Act of 1996 required the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to establish a national database for tracking persons convicted of sex crimes. While Maryland has enacted legislation to require registration of sexual predators and participation in the FBI database, how Maryland treats offenders with multiple convictions is not in compliance with federal law. If sanctions are applied, Maryland stands to lose approximately \$900,000 in federal Byrne Grant funds. **The Department of Legislative Services (DLS) recommends that GOCCP brief the budget committees on the status of the potential change to Maryland law and the possible loss of a portion of Byrne grant funding.**

***Two of Three HotSpot Evaluations Are Not Yet Completed:*** Three HotSpot evaluations were expected to be completed in 2001. To date, only one evaluation is complete. Of the remaining two evaluations, one is expected to be completed by late February 2002, and the other is expected in mid-2002. **DLS recommends adoption of committee narrative requesting that the two outstanding evaluations be submitted to the budget committees upon completion.**

***Break the Cycle:*** GOCCP has hired a consulting firm to conduct an outcome analysis of Break the Cycle by comparing recidivism rates of offenders in the Break the Cycle program with demographically similar offenders who live in other counties. The evaluation will be completed in 2002. **DLS recommends that GOCCP brief the budget committees on the status of the program, the source of funds supporting the program, and the anticipated completion date of the evaluation being performed by the Urban Institute. DLS further recommends adoption of committee narrative requiring the submission of the evaluation.**

***Maryland Substance Abuse Prevention Initiative:*** In fiscal 2001, GOCCP received a new \$2.8 million grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to develop a comprehensive, research-based youth drug abuse prevention strategy and to coordinate grant awards based upon it. **DLS recommends that GOCCP brief the budget committees on the grant proposals from the Local Management Boards (LMBs), the grant awards announced December 31, 2001, and the status of the State Prevention Plan. DLS further recommends that committee narrative be adopted requesting an update on the progress of the initiative.**

***Victim Information and Notification Everyday Installation Not Yet Completed:*** The contract for the automated Victim Information and Notification Everyday (VINE) system was to have required statewide installation by the end of calendar 2000. GOCCP reports that the project has still not been completed. **DLS recommends that GOCCP brief the budget committees on the status of the implementation of the VINE system.**

## **Recommended Actions**

1. Adopt budget bill language restricting expenditure of \$500,000 of general funds until submission of the two outstanding HotSpot evaluations.
2. Adopt budget bill language restricting expenditure of \$500,000 of general funds pending receipt of an outcome analysis of Break the Cycle.
3. Adopt budget bill language restricting expenditure of \$500,000 of the general fund appropriation pending receipt of a status report of the Maryland Substance Abuse Initiative.

## **Updates**

***Report on the Funds Distributed to Local Law Enforcement Agencies as Emergency Assistance for Entry of Protective Order Date:*** GOCCP awarded \$1 million in December 2000 to local law enforcement agencies to improve the entry of protective order information. Of this award, \$800,000 was from federal funding and \$200,000 was appropriated from general funds. Under statute, a report from the GOCCP on the result of these efforts is due on October 1, 2002.

***Cost of Prosecution of Inmate Crimes:*** As per committee narrative in the 2001 *Joint Chairmen's Report*, a study made in conjunction with the GOCCP and other State agencies was submitted addressing the cost of the prosecution of inmate crimes and a plan for increasing State funding for inmate prosecution.

***DA.05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention***

**DA.05.16**  
**Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention**

***Operating Budget Analysis***

---

**Program Description**

The Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP) provides the staff support to the Cabinet Council on Criminal and Juvenile Justice. The agency is responsible for coordinating the efforts of multiple agencies in all areas of policy, planning, and implementation of criminal and juvenile justice programs and initiatives. Federal and State criminal justice and law enforcement grant programs, which are distributed to State and local government agencies and nonprofit organizations, are administered by the agency. The agency also has the responsibility of program administration for the Maryland Victims of Crime Fund and the Police Corps Training Program.

**Cost Containment**

GOCCP is subject to both the Governor's hiring freeze and the 1.5% reduction in operating expenses. There was a fiscal 2002 reduction to the agency's operating budget for these cost containment measures. The total contribution for fiscal 2002 cost containment is \$15,000: \$7,500 from office supplies and \$7,500 from software upgrades. GOCCP reports that these measures have forced them to place on hold a number of software upgrades for improving web-based access to reports and forms by grantees. Further, GOCCP reports that a reduction in two contractual full-time employee (FTE) positions is the result of their overall cost containment plan.

**Governor's Proposed Budget**

As illustrated in **Exhibit 1**, the fiscal 2003 allowance is \$45,753,508, which represents a \$578,475, or 1.3% increase over the fiscal 2002 working appropriation. \$481,627 results from an increase in federal funds. GOCCP reports that the State was awarded a new federal grant for initiatives to combat underage drinking. The general fund increases by only \$96,644, or 1.3%.

**Exhibit 1**

**Governor's Proposed Budget  
Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention  
(\$ in Thousands)**

<b>How Much It Grows:</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>Special Fund</b>	<b>Federal Fund</b>	<b>Total</b>
2002 Working Appropriation	\$7,313	\$1,350	\$36,513	\$45,176
2003 Governor's Allowance	7,409	1,350	36,994	45,753
Amount Change	\$96	\$0	\$481	\$577
Percent Change	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%
<b>Where It Goes:</b>				
<b>Personnel Expenses</b>				
Fiscal 2003 increments				\$26
Annualize fiscal 2002 general salary increase				43
Employee and retiree health insurance cost increase				23
Retirement contribution cost increase				30
Workers' compensation				3
Other adjustments				137
<b>Other Changes</b>				
Increase in federal grant money for initiatives to combat underage drinking				313
Increase in rent from acquisition of additional space and anticipated rate increase				67
Indirect costs charged against federal funds (formula based)				53
Increase in technical and special fees				24
Reduction in additional equipment				(54)
Reduction in overall travel costs				(34)
Reduction in contractual services				(25)
Reduction in motor vehicle costs				(22)
Reduction in office supplies				(3)
Miscellaneous adjustments				(4)
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$577</b>

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

## **Performance Analysis: Managing for Results**

### **Improved Managing for Results Submission**

Last year, the Department of Legislative Services (DLS) criticized the GOCCP Managing for Results (MFR) submission because it lacked comprehensive goals and relevant performance data. This year's submission shows marked improvement. For the first time, the GOCCP's MFR submission contains goals for the current budget year. **Exhibit 2** shows some of the performance measures found in the agency's MFR. Performance measurements for most goals are not provided due to the fact that either a baseline has not been established or data is not yet available. While current information is being processed into the agency's computer system, archived information is still being processed. Temporary employees have been hired to help with this task. GOCCP reports that it anticipates that the archived data will be entered into their system in early 2002.

GOCCP also reports that the agency sought help from the University of Baltimore in creating this year's MFR submission. All staff were required to participate in the training. Further, a grant managing system was also instituted during the 2001 interim. GOCCP anticipates having data available for most of its performance measures identified in this year's MFR for inclusion in the fiscal 2004 submission.

**DLS recommends that GOCCP advise the budget committees as to the status of the entry of archived data into their computer system, as well as the status of the development of performance data.**

### **Managing for Results Should Reflect a Broad Sample of the Agency's Functions**

GOCCP's MFR program description lists its functions as:

- administering federal and State grant programs;
- serving as a clearinghouse for information, research, analysis, and other materials necessary for formulating crime control and prevention policy; and
- assisting in the development of legislation, policies, programs, and budgets relating to crime control and prevention.

Almost all of the agency's goals relate to the reduction, prevention, or control of crime and substance abuse. While this may be the end result of the agency's work, the goals should relate more to the functions of the agency which will accomplish the reduction, prevention, or control of crime and substance abuse.

**Exhibit 2**

**Program Measurement Data  
Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention  
Fiscal 1999 through 2003**

	<u>Actual 1999</u>	<u>Actual 2000</u>	<u>Est. 2001</u>	<u>Actual 2001</u>	<u>Est. 2002</u>	<u>Est. 2003</u>	<u>Ann. Chg. 99-01</u>	<u>Ann. Chg. 01-03</u>
Total applications received	1,049	1,028	1,081	1,069	1,184	1,184	0.9%	5.2%
Total grants awarded	760	754	800	714	967	967	-3.1%	16.4%
# of grants awarded to GOCCP	n/a	*	*	*	*	*	n/a	n/a
# of VINE evaluations completed	n/a	0	0	0	0	1	n/a	n/a
% of reduction in violent crime	n/a	*	*	*	25%	*	n/a	n/a
% of grantees having maintained compliance with performance measure requirements	n/a	*	*	*	*	*	n/a	n/a
% of reduction in recidivism among high-risk offenders	n/a	*	*	*	*	*	n/a	n/a

\* Baseline and data is not yet available.

Note: A complete list of applications received and granted by grant program appears in the Governor's Budget Books, Part I, 199.

VINE = Victim Information and Notification Everyday

Source: Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention; Governor's Budget Books (Maryland Operating Budget: Fiscal 2003)

During the 2001 session, GOCCP reported that its focus was on improving the monitoring of its grants. The agency reported that it intended to increase the number of site visits to grant recipients by grant monitors, which was reflected in the purchase of two new vehicles. Further, a business consultant was to be hired to review the administration of grants, and all grant recipients were to provide performance goals and measures to evaluate the success of funded programs. New grant management software that would provide better monitoring of grants was also reported as installed. There are only a few goals or objectives dealing with grant monitoring and none which measure the number of site visits.

*DA.05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

Further, the mission of GOCCP is "to provide leadership and support efforts to make Maryland's communities safer by insuring the coordination of State policy and grant funds to support and to control, reduce, and prevent crime." The functions of GOCCP and its mission should be more clearly reflected in its MFR submission, particularly in its goals and objectives.

**DLS recommends that GOCCP include additional performance measures in their MFR submission relating to their administrative and coordination functions.**

## Issues

---

### 1. Sexual Offender Tracking Sanctions

The Lychner Sexual Offender Tracking and Identification Act of 1996 required the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to establish a national database for tracking persons convicted of sex crimes. While Maryland has enacted legislation to require registration of sexual predators and participation in the FBI database, how Maryland treats offenders with multiple convictions is not in compliance with federal law. If sanctions are applied, Maryland stands to lose approximately \$900,000 in federal Byrne grant funds.

Maryland first enacted sexual offender registration legislation under the federal Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Program in 1995 as Chapter 142, Acts of 1995. Revisions in State law occurred in 1997 under Chapter 754, Acts of 1997 and in 1998 under Chapters 473 and 521, Acts of 1998 due to changes in the federal laws. Legislation enacted in Chapter 317, Acts of 1999 brought Maryland in compliance with Wetterling guidelines by extending lifetime registration to individuals convicted of aggravated or subsequent offenses.

For a number of years, states that receive federal grants from the Edward J. Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Fund have been required to register all sexual offenders for life or risk the loss of 10% of their annual grants. In June 2001, Maryland was among 14 states advised by the U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance that the 10% cuts would be made beginning with fiscal 2002 starting October 1. Since Maryland receives approximately \$9 million in Byrne grant funds, \$900,000 is at risk. **Appendix 3** shows the history of the Byrne grant. Maryland asked the U.S. Department of Justice to delay imposing such penalties until after this legislative session in order to propose legislation that would bring it into compliance with federal guidelines.

Maryland's lack of compliance with federal guidelines falls into three areas:

- **Sexually violent predators:** Under the federal guidelines, any individual who commits a sexually violent offense (even a first offender) is subject to sexually violent predator status. That is not the case under Maryland law. An additional area of potential noncompliance in the sexual predator guidelines relates to the procedure for making the sexually violent predator determination. Maryland allows a court to make the determination, while the federal law calls for a board of experts to be created.
- **Aggravated sexual offenses:** The federal law requires all persons convicted of an aggravated sexual offense to register annually for life. Aggravated sexual offenses under federal law essentially encompass: (1) engaging or attempting to engage in sexual acts involving penetration with victims of any age through the use of force or threat of serious violence; and (2) engaging or attempting to engage in sexual acts involving penetration with victims under the age of 12. Maryland law requires lifetime registration for persons convicted of: first degree rape; second degree rape; first degree sexual offense; second degree sexual offense; and third degree sexual offense. There are two areas of aggravated sexual offense that Maryland's law omits from lifetime registration. In order to be in compliance with the federal law, Maryland must include offenses under the State's criminal code that involve a sexual act involving penetration with a victim under the age of 12 and include attempted rape in the first and second degree and attempted sexual offense in the first and second degree as offenses

*DA.05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

requiring lifetime registration.

- **Subsequent/recidivist offenders:** Federal guidelines require lifetime registration of a subsequent offender regardless of whether the first offense was committed after registration statutes were enacted or whether the offense was committed in the same state in which the registrant committed the latest offense. In contrast, Maryland requires lifetime registration for subsequent offenders but does not explicitly require this registration if the prior crime occurred before Maryland's registration requirement took effect or if the crime occurred in another state. In addition, Maryland law requires lifetime registration for a registrant who has been previously required to register and has been convicted of a subsequent crime as a child sexual offender or a sexual offender, or has been convicted of a subsequent sexually violent offense.

Bills are proposed in the Senate and the House which, if enacted, would prevent the loss of expected federal fund revenue from the Byrne grant fund.

**DLS recommends that GOCCP brief the budget committees on the status of the potential change to Maryland law and the possible impact of the loss of a portion of Byrne Grant funding.**

## **2. Two of Three HotSpot Evaluations Are Not Yet Completed**

GOCCP oversees this intensive community supervision initiative in 62 communities experiencing high crime and high fear of crime. Community supervision teams composed of local police officers, parole and probation agents, and Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) agents supervise local probationers. Started in 1997 in 36 communities with federal funds, the program was expanded to 62 communities in 1999. Currently, approximately \$3.5 million in general funds is appropriated annually.

Three evaluations of this initiative were anticipated in 2001. To date, only one evaluation has been completed. Of the two uncompleted evaluations, one is expected to be completed by late February 2002 and the other is expected in mid-2002.

The completed report, overseen by the University of Maryland, College Park, examined recidivism rates in HotSpot communities to determine program effectiveness.

One of the uncompleted evaluations is a federally funded outcome evaluation. It is currently being performed by the Jerry Lee Center of Criminology at the University of Pennsylvania. This evaluation will measure changes in crime trends, effectiveness, and displacement in the first 36 HotSpots. The evaluation, initially due in summer 2001, is anticipated to be completed by the end of February 2002. The final evaluation, a process evaluation, is being performed by the Urban Institute. It is also federally funded. This process evaluation will document strategies employed by 12 of the 36 original HotSpots, with more detailed case studies of two of the 12 HotSpots locations. This evaluation, also initially expected in 2001, is expected to be completed in mid-2002.

**DLS recommends the addition of the following restrictive language:**

*DA.05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

, provided that \$500,000 of the general fund appropriation may not be expended until the Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention has submitted to the budget committees copies of both the outcome and process evaluations of the HotSpots communities, both of which are outstanding. The budget committees shall have 45 days to review and comment upon the evaluations.

### **3. Break the Cycle**

Implemented in 1998, Break the Cycle is a proactive community supervision program. The goal of the program is to ensure treatment and recovery for drug addicts on parole or probation through intensified supervision by the Division of Parole and Probation (DPP) within the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services. The program is currently operating in six regions: Baltimore, Howard, Montgomery, Prince George's and Washington counties, and Baltimore City. Until the end of fiscal 2001, Break the Cycle was supported by federal funds.

During the 2001 legislative session, a series of local newspaper articles, prompted by the tragic murder of a Maryland State Trooper by a probationer involved in the Break the Cycle program, questioned the effectiveness of this program. A December 1999 study of the first year of the program was conducted by the University of Maryland, Bureau of Governmental Affairs. It found that drug use and failures to appear declined by 53% over the first six weeks of intensive urine testing provided by the program. The likelihood of rearrest during the first 90 days on supervision dropped by 23%. These positive indicators, however, were offset by the finding that only 3% of probationers were sanctioned for positive drug tests. By 2000, the number had increased to only 18%.

Performance evaluations revealed that excessive caseloads for an insufficient number of probation officers prevented officers from providing the intensive level of individualized supervision necessary for the program's success. In addition, DPP does not appear to have the information technology to facilitate officers' communication from the field, tying agents to their offices and desks when the program requires intensive field work. In response, GOCCP has provided additional federal funding for rapid sanctions, agent overtime, quality assurance staffing, agent training, and network development to DPP. These additional funds total approximately \$3.5 million in fiscal 2001.

#### **Program Evaluation Due in 2002**

GOCCP initially hired the RAND Corporation to conduct an outcome analysis of Break the Cycle by comparing recidivism rates of offenders in the Break the Cycle program with demographically similar offenders who live in other counties. This analysis is now being performed by the Urban Institute. The evaluation will be completed in 2002.

**DLS recommends that a representative from GOCCP brief the budget committees on the status of the program; the source of funds supporting this program, and the anticipated completion date of the evaluation being performed by the Urban Institute.**

**DLS further recommends the addition of the following restrictive language:**

#### *DA.05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

, provided that \$500,000 of the general fund appropriation may not be expended until the Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention has submitted to the budget committees the outcome analysis of Break the Cycle which is being performed by the Urban Institute. This analysis should include a comparison of recidivism rates of offenders in the Break the Cycle program with demographically similar offenders who live in other counties. The budget committees shall have 45 days to review and comment upon the analysis.

#### **4. Maryland Substance Abuse Prevention Initiative**

Maryland receives a substantial amount of federal funding for a variety of substance abuse prevention programs. In fiscal 2001, GOCCP received a new \$2.8 million grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services for a new substance abuse initiative. Called the Maryland Substance Abuse Prevention (MSAP) Initiative, this initiative seeks to coordinate the efforts of all the State's federally supported substance abuse programs focused on youth which have grants administered through GOCCP. The goal of this award is to ensure that the federally-supported youth prevention programs are coordinating their efforts to insure maximum effectiveness of federal funding and that these programs use research-based prevention strategies.

Representatives of the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Maryland State Department of Education, Office for Children, Youth, and Families, and DJJ, among others, participated with the GOCCP in the work group which prepared the grant proposal. These agencies will also participate on a new State substance abuse prevention advisory board to develop a comprehensive State youth prevention strategy. All prevention funding ultimately will be re-directed in support of this strategy. Eighty-five percent of this award must be used for grant awards to local communities for substance abuse prevention and will be distributed through the State's Local Management Boards (LMB). The remaining 15% may be used for administrative costs and evaluation. GOCCP will employ seven, full-time-equivalent, additional contractual employees to support this grant program.

Based on the budget committees' concern that the strategies used to accomplish these goals do not undermine other substance abuse initiatives or legislative mandates, committee narrative in the 2001 *Joint Chairmen's Report* required the GOCCP to submit a status report on MSAP by October 1, 2001. The resulting report included a list of members of both the State Advisory Board (SAB) and the Community-Based Prevention, Early Intervention and Family Support Committee, a status of the development of the comprehensive strategy, a listing of events that had taken place to further the initiative, and the status of the program evaluation component. However, at the time of the report, the grant proposals from the LMBs had not been received and thus no awards had been given. The State Prevention Plan to address improved coordination of prevention activities had also not yet been completed. It was anticipated in the report that this Plan would be presented to the SAB by January 2002. Further, no information on the relationship of the initiative as compared to other substance abuse programs was discussed. As to the information on the status of the program evaluation component, the report noted that there would be two levels of evaluation: systems change evaluation and program outcome evaluation. The former was underway as of the date of submission of the report, but the latter was not to begin until July 2002. It is apparent that this report, while useful and informative, did not address the concerns of the budget

*DA.05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

committees. It is anticipated that once the awards have been given and the State Prevention Plan completed, more information will be available.

**DLS recommends that GOCCP brief the budget committees on the grant proposals from the LMBs, the grant awards announced December 21, 2001; and the status of the State Prevention Plan.**

**DLS further recommends the addition of the following restrictive language:**

, provided that \$500,000 of the general fund appropriation may not be expended until the Governor's Office of Crime Control and prevention has submitted to the budget committees a status report of the Maryland Substance Abuse Initiative which includes:

- (1) a description of the comprehensive strategy of the initiative;
- (2) a discussion of the initiatives relationship to other substance abuse programs;
- (3) a list of all funds awarded to date;
- (4) a list of fund recipients;
- (5) a discussion of the State Prevention Plan; and
- (6) a discussion as to the anticipated dates the first systems change evaluation and program outcomes evaluation will be completed.

The budget committees shall have 45 days to review and comment upon the status report.

## **5. Victim Information and Notification Everyday Installation Not Yet Completed**

The Victim Information and Notification Everyday (VINE) is an automated telephone system that provides crime victims with dial-up information about offender case and custody status. Upon request, a victim can receive automatic updates whenever an offender's case or custody status changes. The system was initially to be available statewide by the end of calendar 2000. However, only four county detention centers were on-line by December 2000/January 2001: Howard, St. Mary's, Worcester, and Talbot (pilot projects in Carroll and Montgomery counties were also completed). GOCCP expected to bring the remaining detention centers on-line by the end of fiscal 2001.

During the 2001 legislative session, DLS advised the budget committees that the VINE project was behind schedule. GOCCP reported that there were several technological issues which caused unanticipated delays, the most demanding of which was the initial assessment of the current technological systems utilized. At that time, GOCCP also reported that the Judicial Information Systems would not be on line until the spring 2001 and that the entire project may not be implemented until May 2001. GOCCP currently report that the project has still not been fully implemented.

**DLS recommends that GOCCP brief the budget committees on the status of the implementation**

*DA.05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

**of the VINE system.**

## Recommended Actions

---

1. Add the following language:

. provided that \$500,000 of the general fund appropriation may not be expended until the Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention has submitted to the budget committees copies of both the outcome and process evaluations of the HotSpots communities, both of which are outstanding. The budget committees shall have 45 days to review and comment upon the evaluations.

**Explanation:** This language restricts \$500,000 of the general fund appropriation until submission of the two outstanding HotSpots evaluations which were initially anticipated in calendar year 2001.

<b>Information Request</b>	<b>Authors</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
Two HotSpots evaluations: outcome and process evaluations.	Various on behalf of GOCCP	Upon completion.

2. Add the following language:

. provided that \$500,000 of the general fund appropriation may not be expended until the Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention has submitted to the budget committees the outcome analysis of Break the Cycle which is being performed by the Urban Institute. This analysis should include a comparison of recidivism rates of offenders in the Break the Cycle program with demographically similar offenders who live in other counties. The budget committees shall have 45 days to review and comment upon the analysis.

**Explanation:** This language restricts \$500,000 of the general fund appropriation until submission of the outcome analysis being performed by the Urban Institute.

<b>Information Request</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
Outcome analysis of Break the Cycle	The Urban Institute on behalf of GOCCP	Upon completion

3. Add the following language:

. provided that \$500,000 of the general fund appropriation may not be expended until the Governor's Office of Crime Control and prevention has submitted to the budget committees a status report of the Maryland Substance Abuse Initiative which includes:

*DA.05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

- (1) a description of the comprehensive strategy of the initiative;
- (2) a discussion of the initiatives relationship to other substance abuse programs;
- (3) a list of all funds awarded to date;
- (4) a list of fund recipients;
- (5) a discussion of the State Prevention Plan; and
- (6) a discussion as to the anticipated dates the first systems change evaluation and program outcomes evaluation will be completed.

The budget committees shall have 45 days to review and comment upon the status report.

**Explanation:** This language restricts \$500,000 of the general fund appropriation until submission of the status report of the Maryland Substance Abuse Initiative.

<b>Information Request</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
Status report of the Maryland Substance Abuse Initiative	GOCCP	Upon completion

## ***Updates***

---

### **1. Report on the Funds Distributed to Local Law Enforcement Agencies as Emergency Assistance for Entry of Protective Order Date**

GOCCP awarded \$1 million in December 2000 to local law enforcement agencies to improve the entry of protective order information into the Maryland Integrated Law Enforcement System. Of this total, \$800,000 was federal funding and \$200,000 was matching general funds appropriated through Chapter 572, Acts of 2000, which created the Domestic Violence Unit Pilot Program Fund to provide emergency assistance for this data entry. The 24 grant awards ranged from \$7,200 to \$171,000, providing data entry personnel, computer equipment, training, and operating expenses to local police departments and sheriff's offices. The statute requires reports from GOCCP on the results of these efforts on October 1, 2002.

### **2. Cost of Prosecution of Inmate Crimes**

Pursuant to committee narrative in the 2001 *Joint Chairmen's Report*, GOCCP, in conjunction with the Maryland Association of Counties, the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, the Department of Budget and Management, the Office of the Attorney General, and the Office of the State's Attorney's Coordinator, a study addressing the cost of prosecuting State inmates crimes and a plan for increasing State funding for inmate prosecution was to be submitted to the budget committees. The submitted report stated that a reliable study could not be performed due to the fact that:

- the majority of State's Attorney's offices do not track inmate prosecutions;
- the Internal Investigation Unit only tracks the number of investigations that they conduct, not whether a charge is brought; and
- there is no method of determining inmate prosecution by reviewing the docket or court caseload.

## ***Current and Prior Year Budgets***

---

**Current and Prior Year Budgets  
Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention  
(\$ in Thousands)**

	<b><u>General Fund</u></b>	<b><u>Special Fund</u></b>	<b><u>Federal Fund</u></b>	<b><u>Reimb. Fund</u></b>	<b><u>Total</u></b>
<b>Fiscal 2001</b>					
Legislative Appropriation	\$6,997	\$1,251	\$35,877	\$0	\$44,125
Deficiency Appropriation	0	0	0	0	0
Budget Amendments	10	200	2,828	200	3,238
Reversions and Cancellations	0	(129)	(9,217)	0	(9,346)
<b>Actual Expenditures</b>	<b>\$7,007</b>	<b>\$1,322</b>	<b>\$29,488</b>	<b>\$200</b>	<b>\$38,018</b>
<b>Fiscal 2002</b>					
Legislative Appropriation	\$7,328	\$1,350	\$36,513	\$0	\$45,191
Budget Amendments	(15)	0	0	0	(15)
<b>Working Appropriation</b>	<b>\$7,313</b>	<b>\$1,350</b>	<b>\$36,513</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$45,176</b>

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

---

*DA.05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

**Fiscal 2001**

**Reversions/Cancellations**

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Program</u>
Special	\$128,630	Returned to the MVOC Fund
Federal	\$9,216,618	The difference between the federal grant award cycle and State fiscal year results in cancellations of funds which are reappropriated in the next fiscal year. Particular programs are the Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth in Sentencing (\$5.4 million); State Incentive Grant Program (\$2.7 million); Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Services (\$.7 million); and various other federal programs (\$.4 million).

**Fiscal 2002**

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
General	(\$15,000)	Cost containment

DA.05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention

Appendix 2

Object/Fund Difference Report  
Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention

Object/Fund	FY01		FY02		FY03	FY02 - FY03	Percent
	Actual	Working Appropriation	Allowance	Amount Change			
<b>Positions</b>							
01 Regular	38.00	38.00	38.00	0		0	0%
02 Contractual	10.90	10.90	8.90	(2.00)		(2.00)	(18.3%)
<b>Total Positions</b>	<b>48.90</b>	<b>48.90</b>	<b>46.90</b>	<b>(2.00)</b>		<b>(2.00)</b>	<b>(4.1%)</b>
<b>Objects</b>							
01 Salaries and Wages	\$ 2,073,568	\$ 2,304,054	\$ 2,565,878	\$ 261,824		\$ 261,824	11.4%
02 Technical & Spec Fees	342,480	410,841	434,834	23,993		23,993	5.8%
03 Communication	87,185	78,623	79,459	836		836	1.1%
04 Travel	224,012	120,176	86,250	(33,926)		(33,926)	(28.2%)
07 Motor Vehicles	9,078	38,322	16,780	(21,542)		(21,542)	(56.2%)
08 Contractual Services	561,371	251,655	227,014	(24,641)		(24,641)	(9.8%)
09 Supplies & Materials	43,229	76,959	73,628	(3,331)		(3,331)	(4.3%)
10 Equip - Replacement	71,139	39,290	36,800	(2,490)		(2,490)	(6.3%)
11 Equip - Additional	192,622	54,081	0	(54,081)		(54,081)	(100.0%)
12 Grants, Subsidies, Contr	33,922,817	41,511,489	41,824,091	312,602		312,602	0.8%
13 Fixed Charges	490,534	289,543	408,774	119,231		119,231	41.2%
<b>Total Objects</b>	<b>\$ 38,018,035</b>	<b>\$ 45,175,033</b>	<b>\$ 45,753,508</b>	<b>\$ 578,475</b>		<b>\$ 578,475</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
<b>Funds</b>							
01 General Fund	\$ 7,007,021	\$ 7,312,566	\$ 7,409,210	\$ 96,644		\$ 96,644	1.3%
03 Special Fund	1,322,339	1,349,796	1,350,000	204		204	0%
05 Federal Fund	29,488,675	36,512,671	36,994,298	481,627		481,627	1.3%
09 Reimbursable Fund	200,000	0	0	0		0	0.0%
<b>Total Funds</b>	<b>\$ 38,018,035</b>	<b>\$ 45,175,033</b>	<b>\$ 45,753,508</b>	<b>\$ 578,475</b>		<b>\$ 578,475</b>	<b>1.3%</b>

Note: Full-time and contractual positions and salaries are reflected for operating budget programs only.

### History of the Byrne Grant Funding

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Grant Funding</u>
1987	\$3,226,000
1988	1,004,000
1989	2,186,000
1990	7,303,000
1991	7,858,000
1992	7,965,000
1993	7,983,000
1994	6,851,809
1995	8,517,766
1996	8,953,323
1997	9,374,865
1998	9,476,435
1999	9,426,000
2000	9,155,362
2001	9,128,369
2002	9,009,474
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$117,418,403</b>