



United States  
General Accounting Office  
Washington, D.C. 20548

Health, Education and Human Services Division

B-260974

June 9, 1995

The Honorable Bill McCollum  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Crime  
Committee on the Judiciary  
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This letter is in response to your letter of February 28, 1995, requesting that we estimate formula grant amounts as provided for in H.R. 728, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act. In a subsequent meeting, your staff also asked that we use those estimates to calculate which local governments could trigger the provisions in the Chabot-Lofgren Amendment.

Under separate cover, we have provided computer lists showing all eligible local governments and their estimated grant awards under H.R. 728 and identified those potentially subject to the Chabot-Lofgren Amendment. We found that approximately 6 percent of eligible governments are potentially affected by the amendment. However, these governments would receive approximately 53 percent of the funds allocated under H.R. 728.

In the enclosure, we describe the provisions of the Chabot-Lofgren Amendment and provide a state-by-state summary of the number of governments potentially affected and the percentage of funds allocated to those governments. The amendment would have no effect in nine states and could affect up to 93 percent of total funding in Illinois.

GAO/HEHS-95-169R Law Enforcement Block Grant Awards

154458

If you have any questions or would like further assistance, please contact Jerry Fastrup, Assistant Director, on (202) 512-7211.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "William J. Scanlon". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the typed name.

William J. Scanlon  
Associate Director,  
Health Financing and Policy

Enclosure

GOVERNMENTS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED BY THE CHABOT-LOFGREN  
AMENDMENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK  
GRANT OF 1995 (H.R. 728)

The Chabot-Lofgren Amendment to H.R. 728 would require grant amounts to a county and certain of its cities to be pooled and the distribution agreed upon by the affected local governments. Our analysis of these provisions indicates that nationwide approximately 6 percent of all eligible governments could be affected by this amendment. While the number of governments is small, they account for over half of all funding under the bill. A state-by-state analysis appears in the following table.

BACKGROUND

The Chabot-Lofgren Amendment to H.R. 728 is intended to address a perceived imbalance in the allocations that would go to cities or towns relative to their respective county governments. H.R. 728 provides for funds to be distributed on the basis of the number of reported or estimated crimes for a jurisdiction. County governments often bear the costs of adjudication and corrections connected with arrests for violent crimes within the county, including arrests by police from cities and towns within the county; the violent crime data used in the grant formula, however, reflect the police activity and not courts and corrections functions associated with the police. Reporting of violent crime by county police may be very limited and include only such crimes as those committed in county correctional facilities or crimes in unincorporated areas of the county.

State	Number of eligible governments	Total grant amount	Governments potentially subject to "disparate allocation" provision			
			Number	Percent of total	Grant	
					Amount	Percent of total
Alabama	507	\$34,489,359	56	11	\$25,407,268	74
Alaska	166	5,000,000	0	0	0	0
Arizona	123	26,389,975	33	27	22,883,642	87
Arkansas	564	14,124,983	28	5	9,505,804	67
California	620	338,435,391	172	28	207,793,730	61
Colorado	330	19,776,447	29	9	10,309,135	52
Connecticut	179	16,355,771	0	0	0	0

State	Number of eligible governments	Total grant amount	Governments potentially subject to "disparate allocation" provision			
			Number	Percent of total	Grant	
					Amount	Percent of total
Delaware	60	5,000,000	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	1	16,115,923	0	0	0	0
Florida	459	162,029,434	34	7	39,458,859	24
Georgia	694	49,576,073	50	7	25,560,179	52
Hawaii	5	5,000,000	0	0	0	0
Idaho	247	\$5,000,000	12	5	\$2,388,759	48
Illinois	2,816	115,540,988	166	6	107,731,316	93
Indiana	1,666	28,421,335	41	2	12,266,523	43
Iowa	1,052	8,502,249	27	3	5,969,136	70
Kansas	2,089	12,666,186	39	2	6,713,558	53
Kentucky	554	18,004,978	37	7	4,926,987	27
Louisiana	367	42,840,950	33	9	9,087,857	21
Maine	509	5,000,000	40	8	3,219,788	64
Maryland	178	48,468,696	12	7	2,100,252	4
Massachusetts	364	46,519,178	0	0	0	0
Michigan	1,866	74,468,166	200	11	57,662,137	77
Minnesota	2,754	14,674,162	56	2	8,177,588	56
Mississippi	376	10,794,836	36	10	5,588,222	52
Missouri	1,372	39,006,721	52	4	14,722,623	38
Montana	190	5,000,000	10	5	1,737,940	35
Nebraska	1,085	5,471,076	6	1	3,971,319	73
Nevada	59	10,053,912	4	7	826,427	8
New Hampshire	244	5,000,000	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	588	49,236,344	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	156	14,272,968	26	17	3,178,793	22

State	Number of eligible governments	Total grant amount	Governments potentially subject to "disparate allocation" provision			
			Number	Percent of total	Grant	
					Amount	Percent of total
New York	1,612	\$203,385,531	335	21	\$177,852,120	87
North Carolina	618	46,143,372	64	10	30,464,866	66
North Dakota	1,774	5,000,000	20	1	3,311,504	66
Ohio	2,343	58,562,360	114	5	40,361,785	69
Oklahoma	697	19,725,671	51	7	14,535,512	74
Oregon	285	15,111,768	17	6	10,173,029	67
Pennsylvania	2,636	51,909,748	30	1	3,331,526	6
Rhode Island	40	5,000,000	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	315	35,386,284	12	4	1,795,654	5
South Dakota	1,354	5,000,000	12	1	2,612,395	52
Tennessee	432	37,576,986	43	10	19,971,740	53
Texas	1,433	142,148,763	193	13	118,412,206	83
Utah	264	5,325,764	23	9	1,160,979	22
Vermont	301	5,000,000	20	7	1,935,186	39
Virginia	325	23,893,283	2	1	69,397	0
Washington	333	26,963,873	18	5	12,713,918	47
West Virginia	286	5,000,000	12	4	2,328,737	47
Wisconsin	1,932	13,645,955	22	1	7,977,724	58
Wyoming	121	5,000,000	14	12	2,070,847	41
Total	39,341	\$1,961,015,457	2,201	6	\$1,042,266,961	53

RESOLUTION OF DISPARATE ALLOCATIONS

Referred to in the bill as "Resolution of Disparate Allocations," the Chabot-Lofgren Amendment requires that, under certain circumstances, the allocations to a county and certain other eligible units within the county would be withheld until a joint application is submitted by the county and those units. The joint application must specify how funds would be distributed among the county and other affected units.

The disparate allocation provision applies under the following circumstances:

- (1) June 7, 1995 the attorney general of the state certifies that the county bears more than 50 percent of the costs of prosecution or incarceration that arise from the part 1 violent crimes reported by an underlying city, township, or tribe and
- (2) the amount allocated to the county government and other eligible local governments within the county boundaries would satisfy either a 200-percent or 400-percent test for disparate allocation amounts.

The 200-percent test would be met if any underlying local government unit would receive a formula allocation amount that exceeds 200 percent of what the overlying county government's allocation amount would be. The 400-percent test would be met if the sum of formula allotments to underlying units (excluding amounts subject to the 200-percent test) exceeds 400 percent of the amount allotted to the overlying county.

We lack the data necessary for the certification required by the attorney general of the state, and so we cannot fully simulate where the Chabot-Lofgren Amendment would apply. However, we have applied the 200- and 400-percent tests to the simulated H.R. 278 grant amounts to show jurisdictions that could potentially be subject to the amendment. The above table summarizes those results by state.

(118110)

---

### **Ordering Information**

**The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.**

**Orders by mail:**

**U.S. General Accounting Office  
P.O. Box 6015  
Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015**

**or visit:**

**Room 1100  
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)  
U.S. General Accounting Office  
Washington, DC**

**Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000  
or by using fax number (301) 258-4066, or TDD (301) 413-0006.**

**Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (301) 258-4097 using a touchtone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.**

---

**United States  
General Accounting Office  
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001**

<p><b>Bulk Mail Postage &amp; Fees Paid GAO Permit No. G100</b></p>
---

**Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

**Address Correction Requested**

---