

**Serious and Violent Offender
Reentry Initiative**

"Going Home"

Appendixes



Appendix A: Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice

OJP's Bureaus and Offices administer several block, formula, and discretionary grants that are relevant to and could support comprehensive reentry programs.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Formula Grant Programs

Title II, Part B Formula Grants. The goal of this program is to help states develop and implement comprehensive juvenile justice plans that determine priorities for the expenditure of State Formula Grants program funds. States are required to pass through 66 percent of the funds to units of general local government, local private agencies, and Indian tribes that perform law enforcement functions.

Title V—I Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs. The goal of this program is to provide funds for local comprehensive delinquency prevention planning and prevention activities for youth who have had or are likely to have contact with juvenile justice system. The Title V prevention strategy is designed to reduce identified risk factors in a child's environment while strengthening protective factors. States apply to OJJDP for funds which are then transmitted through the state agency to qualified units of local government via a competitive grant selection process.

Part E—State Challenge Activities. The goal of this program is to provide incentives for States participating in the Formula Grants Program to develop, adopt, and improve policies and programs in one or more of ten specified Challenge Areas. For example, Challenge Activities include developing and adopting policies to: provide access to counsel for all juvenile in the juvenile justice system; provide basic health, mental health, and educational services for youth in the juvenile justice system; establish a state ombudsman office for children and families; develop alternatives to school suspension; increase aftercare services; develop policies and procedures to reduce the size of state training schools, and other activities as prescribed by Part E of the JJDP Act. Grants are made directly to state agencies designated to receive OJJDP Formula Grant Funds.

Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAIBG). The goal of this program is to make funds available to states and eligible units of local government, in any of twelve program purposes, to include: building, expanding, renovating, or operating temporary or permanent juvenile corrections or detention facilities, including training of correctional personnel; developing and administering accountability-based sanctions for juvenile offenders; hiring additional judges, probation officers, and court-appointed defenders, and funding pretrial services for juveniles, to ensure the smooth and expeditious administration of the juvenile justice system; hiring additional prosecutors, so that more cases involving violent juvenile offenders can be prosecuted and backlogs reduced; providing funding to enable prosecutors to address drug, gang, and youth violence problems more effectively;

providing funding for technology, equipment, and training to assist prosecutors in identifying and expediting the prosecution of violent juvenile offenders; providing funding to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation offices to be more effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing recidivism; establishing court-based juvenile justice programs that target young firearms offenders through the creation of juvenile gun courts for the adjudication and prosecution of juvenile firearms offenders; establishing drug court programs for juveniles so as to provide continuing supervision over juvenile offenders with substance abuse problems and to provide the integrated administration of other sanctions and services; establishing and maintaining interagency information-sharing programs that enable the juvenile and criminal justice systems, schools, and social services agencies to make more informed decisions regarding the early identification, control, supervision, and treatment of juveniles who repeatedly commit serious delinquent or criminal activities; establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs that work with juvenile offenders who are referred by law enforcement agencies or that are designed, in cooperation with law enforcement officials, to protect students and school personnel from drug, gang, and youth violence; and, implementing a policy of controlled substance testing for appropriate categories of juveniles within the juvenile justice system.

OJJDP Discretionary Programs

The Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP). The goals of this program are to reduce juvenile delinquency and gang participation by at-risk youth; improve academic performance of at-risk youth; and reduce the dropout rate for at-risk youth through the establishment of one-to-one mentoring. JUMP is funded by Congress to address two critical concerns: poor school performance and dropping out of school. This program focuses on the importance of providing youth the support and structure that is often missing from their lives. This program also recognizes the importance of school collaboration in mentoring programs, either as a primary applicant or in partnership with a public or private nonprofit organization. Applicants from local educational agencies (LEA) and public/private nonprofit organizations, or tribal nations that can demonstrate knowledge of and/or experience with mentoring programs, volunteers, and youth organizations are eligible for funding.

Intensive Community-Based Aftercare Program (IAP). The goal of the program is to reduce recidivism among high-risk juvenile parolees. The IAP model posits that effective intervention with serious, chronic juvenile offenders requires not only intensive supervision and services after institutional release, but also a focus on reintegration during incarceration and a highly structured and gradual transition process that bridges institutionalization and aftercare.

Corrections Program Office (CPO) Formula Grant Programs

Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth in Sentencing (VOI/TIS). The goal of this program is to build or expand correctional facilities to increase bed capacity for convicted Part I violent offenders (adult and juvenile). These are state formula grants that go to the Department of Corrections or Byrne

Agency as designated by Governor and up to 15 percent of the award can be passed though to units of local governments. The funds can be used to build, renovate, or expand temporary or permanent correctional facilities to house violent offenders or to free space for violent offenders. Ten percent of the award maybe be used to pay for the cost of offender drug testing and intervention programs during period of incarceration and post-incarceration criminal justice supervision. VOI/TIS funds cannot be used to operate correctional facilities, and the Governor must certify that the State will support, operate, and maintain facilities constructed with grant funds.

Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners (RSAT). The goal of this program is to assist states and units of local government in developing and implementing substance abuse treatment programs within state and local correctional and detention facilities. The Byrne Agency in each state receives these funds that can be used for operations to implement programs that provide individual and group treatment activities - includes staffing, programming, drug testing, and aftercare services. Program requirements include: (a) duration must be 6 to 12 months; (b) must be set apart from general population in a secure facility; (c) should develop inmate's cognitive, behavioral, social, vocational, and other skills to solve abuse issues; and (d) should require drug testing. Note: starting with FY 2002, states may use RSAT funds for treatment after the offender's release.

Use of VOI/TIS and RSAT Funds in Phase 1 (Institutional) of Reentry Program.

VOI/TIS funds can be used to build or renovate secure facilities designed to complement a state's reentry strategy. Ten percent of VOI/TIS and RSAT funds can be for in-prison drug treatment and testing as part of the offender's pre-release programming.

Use of VOI/TIS and RSAT Funds in Phase 2 (Community Transition) of Reentry Program.

VOI/TIS funds can be used to build or renovate facilities for transitional housing in communities where offenders can be electronically monitored as they reintegrate into their neighborhoods thereby being better positioned to seek employment, housing, and avail themselves to treatment services. Ten percent of VOI/TIS funds and RSAT FY2002 funds can be used for drug testing and aftercare services.

Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)

Formula Grant Programs

Formula grants are awarded to states or local units of government in accordance with a legislatively established formula, based, for example, on population or crime statistics. BJA formula and block grant programs include the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program (Byrne Formula) and the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program (LLEBG).

Byrne formula grants are made through State Administrative Agencies (SAAs) in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and 5 U.S. territories to state agencies, local units of government, and Indian tribal governments. These funds support a comprehensive range of projects to improve the functioning of the

criminal justice system, with an emphasis on drug-related crime, violent crime, and serious offenders. FY 2001 funding is \$498.9 million.

FY 2001 Byrne State Awards

The Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program (LLEBG) directly funds units of local government to support projects that reduce crime and improve public safety under seven comprehensive criminal justice subject areas. Some funds may also be available to state police agencies. Additionally, the LLEBG Program funds training and technical assistance in support of this program. FY 2001 funding is \$521.85 million.

Appendix B: National Institute of Corrections (NIC), U.S. Department of Justice

NIC is an agency within the Federal Bureau of Prisons that is a source of assistance for corrections agencies at the state and local levels. Limited assistance is also provided to federal corrections programs. NIC's legislative mandates are to provide training, technical assistance, and information services, and to undertake policy and program development. All adult corrections agencies are also served by the Academy Division, the NIC Information Center, and the Office of Correctional Job Training and Placement, which works to advance employability and employment of offenders and ex-offenders. The Office of Special Projects coordinates NIC's interagency programs and special projects. The Office of International Assistance coordinates the delivery of assistance requested by foreign corrections agencies.

Jails Division. This office coordinates services to jail systems throughout the country. Its constituency consists of more than 3,300 county or regional jails, as well as state-operated jail systems, tribal jails, and police lockups.

Prisons Division. This office coordinates services to state departments of corrections and prisons. Its constituency includes over 1,400 state prisons, the 50 departments of corrections that oversee them, and the corrections departments and facilities of the District of Columbia and the U.S. commonwealths and territories.

Community Corrections Division. This office coordinates services for community-based corrections programs. Its constituency includes 3,285 probation and parole offices of 861 agencies, 1,200 community residential facilities, and departments of corrections' community corrections programs.

Academy Division. This office coordinates most NIC training activities for executives, administrators, and staff trainers working in state and local prisons, jails, and community corrections. Through interagency agreements, it also provides training and related assistance to those working in juvenile corrections and detention, the federal prison system, and military corrections.

Office of Correctional Job Training and Placement. The Office was created by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 for the purpose of coordinating efforts of Federal agencies and other nationwide organizations to improve job training and placement programs for offenders and ex-offenders. This Office provides training and technical assistance to state and local training and employment agencies to advance offender job training and placement services.

Special Projects Division. This Division is responsible for developing and administering broad

Institute initiatives that involve multiple elements of criminal justice or correctional systems, rather than initiatives that focus on prisons, jails, or community corrections exclusively. The Division works jointly with other governmental or private, nonprofit agencies that are providing funding or professional services that impact the field of corrections. Current special projects include Children of Prisoners, Planning of New Juvenile Institutions, Programs for Women Offenders, Prison Drug Interdiction Programs and Corrections Mental Health Initiatives.

Information Center. This is operated by a contractor and serves as the base for information and materials collection and dissemination for NIC and as a national clearinghouse on corrections topics for the field. You can access this information at <http://www.nicic.org>.

Technical Assistance. You can find information about the wide range of technical assistance that NIC provides at <http://www.nicic.org/services/ta>.

Appendix C: U.S. Department of Education (ED)

Educational deficiencies are serious barriers to the post release success of returning inmates. Since most inmates have these deficiencies and lack foundation education credentials, the period of incarceration presents a compelling opportunity for the development of fundamental educational skills and the attainment of such critical credentials as GED certificates. Ideally, inmates should be prepared for employment before release. When this is not feasible, an appropriate goal is that they will have addressed basic skill deficiencies prior to release and stand ready for specialized employment related training upon release.

Lifeskills for State and Local Inmates Program. This program is funded out of the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) and provides funding for demonstration projects to reduce recidivism through educational services in preparation for release;

Grants to States for Workplace and Community Transition Training for Incarcerated Youth Offenders Program. This program is funded out of the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) and while it provides funds for institutionally based programs, grantees are allowed to expend funds for very broadly defined “related services” in the year following release. Specifically, it funds postsecondary education and postsecondary vocational education and related services to incarcerated persons under age 26 and within 5 years of release.

Workforce Investment Act (Title I, Adult Education and Family Literacy Act). These funds are out of the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) and are for basic skills instruction. Up to 10% can be used for those who are institutionalized, for those in community programs operated by public schools, community colleges, or community-based organizations.

ESEA Title I-Neglected and Delinquent. These funds are to improve educational opportunities for children and youth (up to 21 without a high school diploma) who are involved with the juvenile or adult justice system. These funds go to school systems, schools in juvenile justice facilities, and schools in adult correctional facilities that serve young offenders.

IDEA-Special Education. These resources are to assist schools in meeting the unique needs of handicapped students. The funds go to schools serving handicapped students, in the community or in an institution and the target population is those under age 22 without a high school diploma and with an educational handicap.

Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 State Grant Program. These funds go to public schools and community colleges and states have discretion to use up to 1% of the funds to serve those in institutions. They assist students in developing knowledge and skills relevant to labor market demands.

Pell Grants, SEOG Work Study Grants, Perkins Loans, Stafford Loans. These are all federal funds for postsecondary education. They go to individuals involved in post secondary education. They are not for those who are incarcerated and certain drug convictions also limit eligibility.

Vocational Rehabilitation Program, Funds for Basic Vocational Rehabilitation. They are used by State Vocational Rehabilitation agencies to assist individuals with disabilities in preparing for and engaging in employment. Individuals in the correctional population who are disabled and who meet vocational rehabilitation eligibility criteria should be identified and referred, and some of the intake process at least should be completed prior to release so that they move smoothly into that service system.

Appendix D: U.S. Department of Labor

Focus on Workforce Investment. The Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998 establishes comprehensive reform of federal job-training programs, with amendments affecting service delivery under the Wagner-Peyser Act, the Adult Education and Literacy Act, and the Rehabilitation Act. WIA, which supersedes the Job Training and Placement Act (JTPA), provides a framework for creating a national, workforce-development system for businesses, as well as for individuals seeking to further their careers.

Central to WIA implementation is America's Workforce Network (AWN), a nationwide system of workforce-development organizations that provides information and services to help youth and adults manage their careers and employers find skilled workers. Services include skills training and job placement for adults, dislocated workers, and youth; employee locator and certification; income maintenance; and employer incentive programs. Partners in AWN include governments of all levels, businesses, labor, and local communities. Linking these partners gives job seekers and employers easier access to a range of services—services that are available to offenders even before they return to the community.

One-Stop Centers. WIA requires local areas to establish one-stop-delivery systems to help adults and youth negotiate their way into the world of work. One-Stop Centers provide young people and adults with access to core services, information, resources, and intensive training for developing career strategies that are appropriate for the user's age and situation. Community organizations refer youth to One-Stop Centers, Youth Opportunity Grant (YOG) Programs, and other service providers. Youth offenders who participate in programs supported through a Reentry grant can use local One-Stop Centers to access AWN services.

Adult Services. Adult offenders may obtain core services and intensive training, depending on their need. Core services include assessments of ability, aptitude, skills, and service needs; assistance with unemployment compensation; access to employment services funded through the Wagner-Peyser Act (e.g., the states' public-labor exchange and labor-market information); career counseling; job-search and placement assistance; and information on training, education, and related support (e.g., child care and transportation services). Eligible adults (ages 18 and older) may obtain more intensive services and training, including Individual Training Accounts, from approved local providers.

Youth Services. WIA emphasizes serving young people ages 14 to 21, with a more systematic, comprehensive range of coordinated programs and strategies that are available year round. Because WIA requires local areas to spend at least 30 percent of their youth funds on out-of-school youth, court-involved and reentry youth may constitute a significant population who can benefit from WIA services. WIA also requires local areas to conduct at least a year of followup after a youth completes the program and secures a job or returns to school.

Through One-Stop Centers young offenders will have access to an array of support services that includes occupational training, internships, job placements, summer employment, counseling, mentoring, tutoring, vocational and academic education, and leadership-development services. Depending on their needs, youth may be referred to other youth-employment programs funded by the U.S. Department of Labor, such as, Job Corps, YOG programs, and continuing local school-to-work partnerships.

WIA emphasizes a comprehensive and integrated approach to preparing young people for the workplace by requiring its youth programs to have a “youth-development” focus. In addition, several model, employment programs for youth offenders, including programs recognized by the Promising and Effective Practices Network (PEPNet), are locally supported with WIA funds and incorporate mentoring, community and service learning, leadership training, and similar strategies.

Youth Councils. WIA establishes state and local Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) to focus on strategic planning, policy development, and oversight of the workforce system. Youth Councils are subgroups of local WIBs and are required to develop sections of the local plan relating to youth, to recommend providers of youth services, and to coordinate local youth programs and initiatives. WIA and the Youth Councils allow local areas to see how services for in-school and out-of-school youth are blended and deployed. The Councils provide the framework that local areas can use to realign, enhance, and improve youth services to ensure they are closely coordinated, better used, and more effective.

Youth Opportunity Grants. In 2000, the U.S. Department of Labor awarded Youth Opportunity Grants (YOGs) to 36 communities. The YOG Program is part of a discretionary effort that provides comprehensive services primarily to out-of-school youth ages 14 to 21 in high-poverty areas. Funds are used to address school-drop-out rates, joblessness, skills and youth development, and related issues.

An initial investment of \$250 million authorized under WIA represents the U.S. Department of Labor’s efforts to improve youth programs in underserved Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities nationwide. Sites develop partnerships with juvenile-court and corrections systems to identify youth offenders who may return to YOG communities and could benefit from the program.

Federal Bonding Program. Through its innovative Federal Bonding Program the Labor Department helps offenders overcome barriers to joining the workforce by providing insurance policies to businesses to protect them in case of loss of money or property as a result of employee dishonesty.

Young Offender Reentry: Demonstration Grant Program. This solicitation is available to communities seeking funding for reentry programs for offenders ages 14 to 24 who are already in the criminal-justice system, are gang members, or are at risk of gang or criminal involvement. The \$11.5 million Demonstration Grant Program targets an age-related subset of the Young Offender Initiative’s target population and retains the goal of providing reentering offenders with job-training and employment opportunities, education, substance-abuse treatment and rehabilitation, mental health care and aftercare, housing assistance, family-support services, and criminal-justice supervision. Potential applicants may apply to both programs but are eligible to receive only one award for programs targeting the same or similar populations. For more information about the *Young Offender Initiative:*

Demonstration Grant Program or for a copy of the solicitation, see the U.S. Department of Labor's Web site at wdsc.doleta.gov/sga/.

Appendix E: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)

Community Action Grant Program. This program supports the adoption and implementation of exemplary practices related to the delivery and organization of services for children with serious emotional disorders, such as substance abuse and other mental, emotional, or behavioral disorders. This program is made up of two types of grants: Phase I grants focusing on consensus building and decision support, and Phase II grants focusing on implementation support.

Targeted Capacity Expansion Program. This program is intended to expand substance abuse treatment capacity in targeted areas for a targeted response to treatment capacity problems and/or emerging trends. This program is designed to address gaps in treatment capacity by supporting rapid and strategic responses to demands to problems as well as communities with innovative solutions to unmet needs.

Recovery Community Support Program (RCSP). These grants, administered by the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT), foster the participation of people in recovery, their family members, and other allies (the recovery community) in the public dialogue about addiction, treatment, and recovery, and to build their capacity to identify, develop, and support treatment and recovery policies, systems, and services that meet their needs as they define them. Applications for two separate tracks will be funded under the RCSP. Track I solicits applications for new recovery community organizing initiatives, and Track II is designed to enable existing organizations that have demonstrated their capacity in recovery community organizing to expand or intensify their current program, or to replicate their promising program model in another setting.

Administration of Children, Youth, and Families (ACF)

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families—State Programs (TANF). The Office of Community Services administers this program to provide time-limited assistance to needy families with children to promote work, responsibility, and self-sufficiency. States receive a block grant to design and operate their TANF programs to accomplish the purposes of TANF. These are: to provide assistance to needy families with children so that children can be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives; to end the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage; to prevent and reduce out-of-wedlock pregnancies; and to encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families. (States determine which services/benefits to provide and whom to serve.)

Child Welfare Services. These programs, administered by the Children's Bureau at ACF, are funded by formula grants that assist state public welfare agencies in keeping families together. Services are available to children and their families without regard to income and include: preventive intervention aimed at keeping children within the home; services to develop alternative placements, such as foster care or adoption, if children cannot remain at home; and reunification services so children can return home if possible.

Social Services Block Grant. The Office of Community Services administers this block grant to provide social services directed toward achieving economic self-support or self-sufficiency; preventing or remedying neglect, abuse, or the exploitation of children and adults; preventing or reducing inappropriate institutionalization; and securing referral for institutional care, where appropriate.

Community Food and Nutrition. These funds, out of the Office of Community Services, will provide programs that: (1) coordinate existing private and public food assistance resources to better serve low-income communities, (2) help low-income communities identify potential sponsors of child nutrition programs, and initiate new programs in underserved or unserved areas, and (3) develop innovative approaches to meet the nutrition needs of low-income people.

Community Services Block Grant. These funds, also out of the Office of Community Services, provide funding to grantees for the amelioration of poverty by addressing its causes. This program assists low-income individuals with employment, education, and adequate housing. Grantees assist individuals to make better use of their income, solve problems that are blocking the achievement of self-sufficiency, and obtain emergency health services, food, housing, and employment-related assistance.

Family Violence Prevention and Services. The Office of Community Services also administers discretionary and formula grants to support the establishment, maintenance, and expansion of programs/projects to prevent incidents of family violence and to provide immediate shelter and related assistance for victims of family violence and their dependents. These grants are competitive for which non-profit organizations may apply.

Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals. The Office of Community Services offers discretionary funding to non-profit organizations to support programs that create new employment opportunities for certain low-income individuals through (1) self employment, (2) micro-enterprise, (3) technical and financial assistance to private employers, (4) new business development, and (5) nontraditional projects.

Runaway and Homeless Youth. The Family and Youth Services Bureau administers a comprehensive program that provides comprehensive services for youth in at-risk situations and their families that include positive alternatives for youth, ensure their safety, and maximize their potential to take advantage of available opportunities. Services include the Basic Center Program (funds emergency shelters, food and clothing needs); The Transitional Living Program (addresses the longer term needs of older homeless youth); The Education and Prevention Grants to Reduce Sexual Abuse of Runaway, Homeless, and Street Youth Program (provides additional resources to organizations serving runaway, homeless, and street youth); and The Youth Development State Collaboration Grants (provides demonstration grants to state for the purpose of developing effective youth development strategies).

Child Support Enforcement. These programs, funded by the Office of Child Support Enforcement, ensure that parents provide emotional and financial support as well as health insurance for their children by providing the following services: locating non-custodial parents, establishing paternity, establishing child support obligations (including health insurance), visitation and access to children, modification and enforcement of child support orders, securing and distributing regular and timely child support payments, and penalties for non-support. The program is a federal/state/local partnership, with

services available automatically for families receiving funds under Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

Developmental Disabilities. The Administration on Developmental Disabilities administers this program, intended to assist people with developmental disabilities to reach maximum potential through increased independence, productivity, and community integration. The first three state-based program address all elements of the life cycle: prevention, diagnosis, early intervention, therapy, education, training, employment, and community living and leisure opportunities.

Appendix F:

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

HUD's Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) has a variety of resources that might be tapped, by state and local governments and non-profit grantees, to support Initiative sites in their own states and localities. A brief description of the major CPD programs that could be used locally to support the Initiative follows.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program. The primary objective of CDBG is the development of viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons. Funds are allocated by formula to states and communities for such activities as rehabilitation of residential structures and public services. Grantees have significant discretion as to how the funds are used. CDBG is funded at approximately \$4.5 billion annually.

HOME Program. The HOME program is used to provide decent, safe, and affordable housing and to alleviate the problems of excessive rent burdens, homelessness, and deteriorating housing stock. Funds are allocated by formula to states, cities, and urban counties. Funds can be used for a variety of activities, including developing housing and providing rental assistance. As with other formula programs, HOME provides maximum program flexibility and decision-making to grantees. HOME is funded at approximately \$1.8 billion annually.

Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Grant Program. HUD administers a variety of homeless assistance programs. The Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG) Program is a formula program that can be used to provide for emergency shelter as well as homeless prevention, a feature that could be used to serve offenders leaving an institution who are at risk of becoming homeless. Funds are allocated by formula to states and cities. ESG is funded at approximately \$150 million annually.

HUD's other homeless assistance programs *only* serve homeless persons. Homeless persons are those who live in a homeless shelter or in a place not meant or human habitation, such as the streets, or would spend the night in such a place without assistance from HUD homeless resources. In addition to ESG, HUD administers 3 competitive programs: Supportive Housing, Shelter Plus Care, and Section 8 SRO Moderate Rehabilitation Programs. Funds are allocated, for all three programs, through a single national competition. Eligible applicants include states, public housing authorities, local governments, and non-profit organizations. To secure funding, communities develop a Continuum of Care plan for addressing homelessness and submit with this plan to HUD their locally prioritized list of proposed projects they want assisted. Funding for the annual Continuum of Care competition is approximately \$900 million.

Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA). HOPWA provides states and localities with the resources and incentives to devise long-term strategies for meeting the housing needs of persons with AIDS or related diseases and their families. Funds may be used to provide a variety of assistance, including: housing information services such as counseling, development of facilities to provide housing and services, rental assistance, and supportive services. Funds are provided to states and localities through a formula to 108 jurisdictions, as well as being provided competitively through a

national competition for model projects. Previous competitions have identified special outreach efforts to post-incarceration persons in targeting underserved populations. HOPWA is funded at approximately \$277 million.

Appendix G: Essential Elements of Reentry Programs

The models for reentry programs that the federal partners seek to enhance, develop, and replicate are just beginning to emerge. A Reentry Court is one type of model that has initially been found to be promising. The Reentry Court design incorporates all of the following essential elements of a successful reentry program outlined in the Program Overview:

- Establishment of a clear and ongoing authority to hold the offender accountable so long as there is legal jurisdiction. Sanctions should be appropriate and graduated, including return to confinement status.
- Implementation of a full diagnostic and risk assessment process. This assessment should help with identification of various categories of special needs populations and that allows them to link with appropriate service providers that are prepared to help offenders with disabilities, mental illness, substance abuse problems, and serious medical needs.
- Development of a Reentry Plan that clearly addresses all issues identified in the assessment phase and becomes the guide by which the offender must manage reentry into the community and throughout their participation in the Reentry Initiative.
- Utilization of existing community resources to implement the plan which affords continuity and availability of service delivery and ensures familiarity by the offender with the service system and also increases potential for sustainability of the program and the offender in the community.
- Application of graduated levels of supervision and sanctions to offenders—highly structured housing, electronic monitoring, team supervision, and consistent and equitable responses to lack of compliance or reoffending.
- Involvement of local law enforcement, probation, parole, and the community in tracking the activities and behaviors of offenders.
- Involvement of local leadership in designing the model for the Reentry Program to be implemented in the particular community.
- Utilization of faith-based and community-based service systems to mentor and provide services to the offenders.
- Coordination of an extensive employment network to assist returning offenders in finding adequate employment including the state/local Workforce Investment Boards, One-Stop Centers, the local Chamber of Commerce, and other business ties.

**Appendix H:
The Three Components of Reentry Programs**

PHASE I: INSTITUTION	PHASE II: TRANSITION	PHASE III: SUSTAIN
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selection of eligible participants (high-risk) 2. Needs assessments; Develop plan for all three phases of the reentry process to address identified needs. 3. Implementation of Phase I of Plan Plan Categories (a) Basic needs- medical, food, shelter, clothing and subsistence (b) Education, Employment, Support, Mental Health, Substance Abuse Treatment, Legal Issues, Monitoring Compliance. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reception from prison 2. Revision and modification of Plan by transition team and offender 3. Transition team outlines their duties re the Plan 4. Offender and transition team develop a schedule for the offender 5. Court formalizes and authorizes Plan with offender, team and service providers 6. Ongoing assessment; Team reviews and modifies Phase II of Plan as needed 7. Court/ authority regularly reviews offender's progress and compliance and responds accordingly. 8. Adjustment and review of Phase III of Plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continued support of community and community-based organizations <i>(including faith-based groups)</i> 2. Continued involvement of relevant support services to address specific needs <i>(i.e., substance abuse)</i> 3. Encouraged contact with their personal social support network; Ongoing community support

Appendix I: Program Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Prevent reoffending.

- Objective 1: Begin the reentry planning process within the correctional setting and initiate contacts with key service providers, law enforcement, and community corrections agencies prior to discharge of the offender.
- Objective 2: Ensure the offender is fully engaged in the planning process and clearly understands expectations and consequences.
- Objective 3: Identify needs and provide support and services designed to promote successful reentry.
- Objective 4: Exercise active supervision of the offender, ensuring accountability and/or appropriate graduated sanctions for non-compliance or criminal behavior.

Goal 2: Enhance public safety.

- Objective 1: Work with local law enforcement to ensure joint supervision and accountability.
- Objective 2: Provide active ongoing management and supervision designed to hold the offender accountable and protect the public interest.
- Objective 3: Utilize technology (electronic monitoring, etc.) to ensure that the offender's whereabouts are appropriate and do not pose an undue threat to the community or the victim.
- Objective 4: Exercise a zero tolerance for new criminal activity.
- Objective 5: Develop and implement individual reintegration plans with appropriate levels of supervision.

Goal 3: Redeploy and leverage existing community resources by fostering linkages and accessing currently provided services (e.g., community-based corrections agencies, social services providers, local police, faith-based organizations, educational services, the business community, civic organizations, family/parent organizations, domestic violence, sexual assault, and other victim advocates, etc.).

- Objective 1: Use federal funds only to design, build, test and improve a system utilizing ongoing resources so that reentry programs are not dependent upon temporary federal funding.

- Objective 2: Use federal funds only to enhance existing state or local resources and provide previously options not otherwise available or sufficient.
- Objective 3: Increase communities' leveraging and allocation of resources to provide for the sustainability of the reentry initiative.
- Objective 4: Enhance partnerships among government agencies and community organizations.
- Objective 5: Enhance the availability and quality of reentry services.

Goal 4: Assist the offender to avoid crime, engage in pro-social community activities and meet family responsibilities.

- Objective 1: Promote productive engagement between the offender and community organizations, (e.g., law enforcement, community groups, schools, substance abuse treatment providers, mental health providers, training centers, employers, victim advocates, civic and faith-based organizations).
- Objective 2: Provide for and expect the offender to be a contributing productive citizen.
- Objective 3: Increase involvement between members of offenders support networks and returning offenders.

Goal 5: Ensure program sustainability.

- Objective 1: Ensure current community and government resources are utilized and will remain accessible once federal funds are unavailable.
- Objective 2: Ensure broad government and community support and that relationships are enhanced and built.
- Objective 3: Ensure that this initiative is viewed as integral to community and public safety.

Appendix J: The Facts

Adults. The growth of the Nation's adult prison population is a well known fact. Nationally, by the end of 2000 there were over 1.3 million prisoners in Federal and State custody. Of the 1.3 million prisoners held in State facilities, 51% were convicted of violent crimes, a growing number of which are being released into the community each year. In fact, as the trends have predicted, there were 725,000 offenders under parole supervision across the country at 2000's end. Only 42% of State parole discharges in 1999 successfully completed their term of supervision, relatively unchanged since 1990. 43% of returning serious felony offenders were returned to jail or prison for violations of release or committing a new offense, and 10% absconded. If the trend from 1990 to 1999 stays constant, as it has in those nine years, over 350,000 of those offenders on parole will either be returned to jail or prison or abscond from supervision. What this translates to, is that contemporary parole practices have less than a 50/50 chance of impacting the recidivism rate nationally.

This increase in the movement from prison to the community emphasizes the weakness of the current system of managing serious and violent offender reentry. Alarmingly, despite the growth in parole populations, one in five State prisoners leaves prison with no post-release supervision. Furthermore, in many States duration of post-release supervision has been scaled to 15 percent of the imposed sentence for violent offenders. In many jurisdictions parole has become more a legal status than a process of reintegrating returning prisoners.¹

More must be one to prevent inter-generational patterns of offending and violence. We must attempt to promote healthy parenting and to curb learned patterns of criminal behavior, abuse of intimate partners and children, the use of violence to manage frustrations, or the use of violence as an exercise of power. This initiative should also seek to bring agencies (corrections, local law enforcement, domestic violence or sexual assault victim advocates and children's service providers, etc.) together to work with offenders returning to the community.

Juveniles. In recent years, youth violence has placed the issue of reentry squarely in the minds of the public, law enforcement officials, schools and the community. The upward trend in violent juvenile crime that occurred in the late 1980's and into the 90's, tragic shooting events at high schools throughout the country, and other acts of gang-related youth violence have heightened the urgency to focus on youth violence with comprehensive juvenile justice prevention and intervention strategies.

¹ U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, August 2001, NCJ 188208, *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2000*.

Juveniles represent a serious part of the reentry issue throughout the country. Juveniles were involved in 16% of all violent crimes² and 32% of all property crime³ arrests in 1999. Nationally in 1999, 371 juveniles were in custody for every 100,000 in the population. OJJDP's Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement reported 108,931 juvenile offenders being held in residential placement facilities on October 29, 1999. Of this amount, 77,895 juvenile offenders were being held in secure facilities on that day. The majority of juveniles in residential placement were adjudicated and placed there as part of a court ordered disposition. Juvenile courts had adjudicated and placed most of these committed juveniles (95%), while criminal courts placed the remaining 5% of committed juveniles following conviction. Based on this number, it is estimated that approximately 100,000 youth are released from these facilities every year and returned to the community. In addition, there is an indication that a small percentage of juvenile offenders are responsible for the overwhelming majority of juvenile crime. Finally, due to the fact that the length of incarceration is shorter for juveniles than adults, a relatively greater number of juveniles return to the community each year.

Richard Mendel reports in the publication entitled "Less Hype, More Help: Reducing Juvenile Crime, What Works—and What Doesn't," the lack of support and supervision for youth returning home from juvenile correctional institutions is a critical weakness in local juvenile justice programming. Throughout the country, aftercare and reintegration efforts have been crippled by a lack of coordination between staff at juvenile correctional institutions and those working within the community.

Until now, the juvenile justice system's response to the issue of reentry has been ineffective and inadequate. Between 1987 and 1996, the volume of adjudicated cases resulting in court-ordered residential placements rose 51%. The steady increase of youth exiting residential placement has resulted in an increased strain on the juvenile justice aftercare system due to increased case loads for aftercare and parole officers, and the inability to provide the appropriate level of required supervision. OJJDP's research on aftercare systems for youth exiting juvenile boot camps (OJJDP, September, 1997) demonstrates the serious negative consequences of an overburdened, underfunded system. Without structured aftercare supervision and services, youth are likely to relapse, recidivate and return to confinement in either juvenile or adult correctional facilities.

² Violent crime includes criminal homicide, sexual assaults, robbery and aggravated assault.

³ Property crime includes burglary, larceny-theft, auto theft and arson.

Appendix K: Institutional Models and Approaches

Classification and Assessment. Reentry planning should ideally start at the onset of incarceration. For almost all inmates, this begins with classification and assessment. The results of classification and assessment can greatly influence how long inmates will be confined, where they will be held, the programs and services they will receive, and the conditions under which they will be released. Classification can protect public safety by linking decisions on custody and control to valid predictors of offenders' future risk. Improved classification and assessment practice is at the core of Phase I of this Initiative. Improved assessment practices and information sharing will enable correctional staff to decrease the likelihood of recidivism, improve offender success, decrease victimization and enhance public safety by informing decisions pertaining to:

- Classification and reclassification.
- Reentry Plans.
- Release decision making.
- Community supervision and services.
- Revocation decisionmaking.
- Discharge from supervision or sentence.

Risk Principle. This states that criminal behavior can be predicted based on the presence of specific factors and that the risk of committing criminal acts increases in direct proportion to the number and severity of these risk factors that are present. 'Static' factors do not change via provision of treatment or services, and are used primarily to make initial decisions about custody levels and tentative release dates.

Static risk factors include such things as:

- Age at first conviction.
- Number of prior convictions.
- Severity of prior criminal convictions.
- History of childhood abuse and neglect.
- History of substance abuse.
- History of education, employment, family and social failures.

Need Principle. This holds that when 'dynamic' risk factors, or criminogenic needs, are effectively treated, offenders' probability of recidivism declines. Treatment decisions should be based on individual offender's dynamic risk factors discerned through objective assessment processes. Offenders should be re-assessed periodically on dynamic risk factors to inform decisions about changes in custody, placement, service or supervision. Dynamic risk factors include:

- Antisocial attitudes, values and beliefs.

- Anti-social peers and associations.
- Substance abuse.
- Educational deficiencies.
- Vocational deficiencies.
- Mental health.
- Life skills and social skill deficiencies.
- Characterological defects (anger, aggression, egocentrism, impulsivity, etc.).

Responsivity Principle. This requires that the delivery of treatment programs based on identified dynamic risk factors should be consistent with offenders' abilities and learning styles. Assessment tools and institutional programming should take into account the following factors:

- Learning ability and style.
- Motivation to change.
- Personality type.
- Level of interpersonal and communication skills.

General assessment instruments should gather information in the aforementioned areas and flag areas of concern that will be addressed through the administration of specialized assessment tools. Reception staff should have access to specialized instruments that assess the areas of mental health, substance abuse and dependency, sex offending, gambling, educational ability and vocational needs. Staff should be properly trained in the use and interpretation of specialized assessment instruments. Assessments should take offenders' gender, age, culture and cognitive functioning into consideration and assess an offender's risk of violence, re-offending and flight. These measures should be assessed at differing intervals to measure changes in offender's dynamic risk factors during their terms of confinement.

All tools should be normed and validated for predictiveness for the population on which it will be administered. To norm an instrument means to assure the standardized test (e.g. LSI-R) has the same statistical properties (i.e. normal distribution) for this population as it did for the population on which it was originally tested and designed. Validation is a process that ensures that an instrument is measuring what it is intended to measure. Ideally, validation will occur before assessment instruments are applied to a specific population. If that is not possible, jurisdictions should immediately begin collecting data that will enable them to validate (and revise, if necessary) prediction instruments as quickly as practical. In addition, inter-rater reliability should be maintained through training, supervision and monitoring. If inter-rater reliability is low, the predictive power of assessments will decline, and the safety of inmates and staff will be diminished.

Skill based training, which tests the assessor's understanding of the language and the intent of the assessment instrument, their competence in understanding offender logic or criminal thinking, their ability to discern discrepancies in self-report data, and their interviewing skills should be implemented in the training program. Quality control can be achieved through regular supervision and monitoring of staff assessments. Computerized assessment instruments should have event-driven help and definitions, as

well as built-in error and logic checking.

Beyond the training provided by the Department of Corrections to its reception and classification staff, clinicians should provide technical assistance regarding the proper or intended administration of specialized assessment tools. Department policy should require that the state incur these additional costs and/or that vendors wishing to contract with the State incorporate the cost of technical assistance into the per form fee.

Participating jurisdictions should begin with a comprehensive review of current practices. They should inventory current reception procedures, classification and assessment instruments in use, the level of training and supervision for staff who perform classification and assessment intake function, and document current and projected work-loads. States should document the information that is currently being collected as well as what information is lacking. Ultimately, the system should be changed to gather the needed information and make it available to other decision makers at key points.

Risk Instruments on General Criminality

Within the past twenty years or so, several individual states have begun testing and using a diverse array of risk assessment instruments that assess criminal behavior, likelihood of recidivism, and the success of rehabilitative programs. Many states, like Iowa and Oklahoma incorporate existing instruments into their own evaluative measures; both states are currently validating the use of the LSI-R in decisions regarding probation, custody level, and case management. Other states, have measurement tools that are used to enhance supervision and treatment of sex offenders (Colorado and Pennsylvania); evaluate risk of criminality and recidivism for both general offenders and violent offenders (Iowa); predict the success or failure of probationers or parolees (Illinois); and to determine the likelihood of battered women removing themselves from a violent living situation (Illinois)⁴. What follows is a summary of the most commonly cited instruments that are now being used by these (and other) jurisdictions.

The **Level of Service Inventory-Revised** (LSI-R) risk assessment system was initially developed by the Canadian Service of Canada as part of its overall effort to adopt a cognitive skills approach to rehabilitation. Over time, the early proponents and developers of LSI formed a private consulting firm to market the system within the U.S. and other non-Canadian markets. The current system consists of 54 items, which are sorted into the following ten substantive areas believed to be related to future criminal behavior:

1. Criminal History (10 items).
2. Education and Employment (10 items).
3. Financial (2 items).
4. Family and Marital (4 items).

⁴ The Justice Research and Statistics Association Forum, October 2001, Vol. 19, No. 4

5. Accommodations (3 items).
6. Leisure and Recreation (2 items).
7. Companions (5 items).
8. Alcohol and Drugs (9 items).
9. Emotional and Personal (5 items).
10. Attitude and Orientation (4 items).

Offenders are rated on each item through an interview process that requires either a yes or no answer or a response to a structured scaled ranging in value from 0-3. It is expected that parole and probation officers can be sufficiently trained to properly assess offenders on each of these items, though the training is intensive and requires staff to have strong interpretation skills. Based on these responses, the interviewer is to score the offender on each item and then determine the offender's overall risk level. Since many of the items have to do with the person's social situation within the community, this system is best suited for probationers and parolees as opposed to those incarcerated. There have been few independent evaluations of the system in terms of its reliability and predictive attributes. Most studies have been done by researchers with a direct financial interest in the profitability of LSI-R. One recent independent study conducted for the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole though, found a low level of inter-rater reliability in the scoring process.⁵

This system is a privately owned risk and needs assessment system for adult corrections. It aims to support placement decisions, as well as treatment and case management planning, particularly for offenders entering community settings. There are four major risk assessment scales included in the **COMPAS** (The Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) design (Violence, Recidivism, Flight, and Community Non-Compliance), which, in addition to the assessment of an offender's appropriateness for community corrections, can be used in decisions regarding release and case management supervision. Such risk assessments in COMPAS are based on a comprehensive set of over twenty well validated criminogenic factors including: criminal history, violence history, early onset of delinquency, substance abuse, criminal associates, criminal attitudes, criminal personality (impulsivity, low self-control), and criminal opportunity (high risk lifestyle). The assessment also includes several psychosocial stressors (e.g. living in a high crime community, poverty, vocational problems, social isolation and low social supports) that may be useful in designing case plans.

There have not been any independent studies conducted on COMPAS. The Northpointe Institute for Public Management, Michigan (the owner of the COMPAS program) reports that all risk factors were developed using standard factor analytic and psychometric procedures and most reach highly acceptable levels of reliability (Cronbach's alphas above 0.70). Validation studies in over 30 separate jurisdictions across the U.S. have accumulated considerable statistical evidence supporting the concurrent, predictive and construct validity and generalizability of COMPAS scales across diverse jurisdictions. For example, a recent 12-month outcomes study of recidivism in a sample of over 600

⁵ Austin, James and Garth Davies. 2001. PBPP Inter-Rater Reliability Analysis of the LSI-R: Preliminary Analysis. Washington, D.C.: The Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections, The George Washington University.

New York State probationers using ROC analysis found an “Area under the Curve” statistic of close to 0.80, which is comparable or superior to predictive validity of most existing risk assessment systems.

Jurisdictions can customize the COMPAS assessment to fit their specific interests or staffing and timing constraints by deleting selected scales or questions from the assessments. For example, if an agency requires only the recidivism risk screening scale, the time requirement is reduced to about eight minutes. At the other extreme the full comprehensive test battery may require about 45 to 60 minutes of assessment. In addition, the COMPAS program maintains database information that allows for the quick generation of reports and outcomes. There is little if any research however, showing that it has been independently tested by persons with no financial interests in the COMPAS.

Parole Guidelines were first established by the U.S. Board of Parole (now referred to as the U.S. Parole Commission) in the early 1970s. These early guidelines used two sets of factors to enhance the U.S. Board of Parole’s decision-making process. One set of factors, referred to as the **Salient Factor Score**, seeks to classify parole candidates according to their likelihood of success or failure under parole supervision. The second criteria reflects the seriousness of the offense committed. The original goals of the guidelines utilized by the U.S. Board of Paroles were as follows:

1. Enhance the reliability and validity of parole release decisions.
2. Reduce disparity in sentencing decisions.
3. Reduce recidivism rates by denying parole to high risk offenders and/or by enhancing their level of supervision and services to such offenders.
4. Provide stability in projecting correctional system resources.

These four goals were to be accomplished by developing objective and explicit guidelines. In particular, a limited number of factors were found to be associated with the recidivism rates of inmates released from federal prisons. These variables were translated into an additive point scoring scale that classified inmates by their risk level. This system was and continues to be used by the U.S. Parole Commission for those cases it still has jurisdiction over and other states that have retained the use of discretionary parole (Texas, Michigan, Georgia, Delaware, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and the District of Columbia).

States that have adopted parole guidelines rely on two complementary sets of criteria, with one set focused on relevant risk factors – that is, items that are known to be associated with success or failure on parole supervision (i.e., recidivism). The most common items analyzed in current guidelines are:

1. Age (current age, age at first arrest or conviction).
2. Prior criminal record (arrests, convictions, incarcerations).
3. Institutional Conduct (disciplinary record, program participation).

4. Prior performance on parole or probation (prior technical violations, recommitments).
5. History of Alcohol or Drug Use.
6. Time served (actual time, percentage of time served).
7. Parole/Release plans (employment, residency).
8. Mental health status.

The CMC is also referred to in the literature as the Wisconsin system, since it was the Wisconsin Department of Corrections that first developed it. It has since been adopted by many probation and parole supervision agencies nationwide. CMC is essentially the same as the PMC system, except modified for a prison system. It is based on a questionnaire completed by probationers and parolees to determine which level of supervision the offender should receive, as well as the types of services the inmate may require. Like the PMC, LSI-R and COMPAS, the offender is to be re-evaluated on a regular basis to account for any changes in the offender's risk factors that might alter the risk and needs levels.

ROC- Risk of Reconviction, and CNI-Criminogenic Needs Inventory. New Zealand's Risk of Reconviction scale was designed only to assess an inmate's risk and not his needs. It has been statistically accurate in making predictions regarding likelihood of reconviction, seriousness of reoffense, imprisonment, and sentence. The CNI model is a further development of the ROC system and includes an assessment on the role of culture (Maori Culture Related Needs, McCRNs) in criminal behavior. CNI predictions are based on behavior during the criminal's offending period (the day before and the day of, that the offense was committed) and a predisposing period (six months prior to the offending period). Both inventories include assessments of emotions, propensity towards violence, relationships, alcohol and drug related behaviors, impulsivity, and criminal associates. While administration of the CNI requires some expert supervision, it was designed to be used by non-specialist correctional administrators.

ROC and CNI assessments are making tremendous contributions to the risk assessment and inmate classification. Not only does the CNI include specific culture related behavior analysis, but also both the ROC and CNI provide more extensive and more specific and relevant information than most other models.

The **Community Risk/Needs Management Scale (CRNMS)** is a Canadian model developed from the **Case Needs Identification and Analysis CNIA**-instrument that had originally been designed to assess inmate needs at admission. The CRNMS expounded on information included in the CNIA and streamlined its design in order to evaluate criminal history risk, case needs, the likelihood of re-offending, and the level of community supervision necessary per offender. CRNMS has shown that the static variables included in the criminal history analysis are better predictors of recidivism during the early stages of release; dynamic variables however, are more influential over time.

There has been a growing interest in the identification and treatment of sex offenders. This is due, in large part, to the public's growing awareness and fear of sex offenders being released from prison and

continuing to commit sex crimes. Indeed, it is the public's fear of "predatory" sex offenders as well as some well publicized crimes by released inmates that has led to legislation designed to extend prison terms for such offenders, mandate their treatment prior to release, and require their location to be made public to law enforcement officials and the public upon their release. What follows is a description of risk assessment instruments that are being used most frequently in adult corrections today. **Rapid Risk Assessment for Sexual Offense Recidivism (RRASOR)**, like the LSI-R, was developed in Canada by Canadian researchers on Canadian inmates. It was designed to be a very simple but relatively accurate method for assessing the likelihood of convicted sex offenders to recidivate and return to prison. Originally, seven "static" items were tested to determine risk which are relatively easy to score by "non-professional" staff from an inmate's case file without the need for a structured staff interview. Based on a series of validation tests, the researchers found that four items (prior sex offenses, age at release, victim gender, and relationship to victim) could be used to successfully predict recidivism rates for convicted sex offenders. The RRASOR was later used to design the **Static 99** which is described next.

The **Static 99**, was developed jointly by researchers from both Canada and Great Britain. The risk assessment instrument consists of ten "static" items that have been shown to be associated with recidivism in four separate samples of Canadian and U.K. offenders.⁶ As the name implies, the system relies exclusively on "static" factors that reflect historical attributes associated with the convicted sex offender. Like the RRASOR no interview is required as these items can be obtained from the inmate's case file.⁷ It is now being used by a number of parole boards including the Texas Board of Pardons and Parole the Pennsylvania Sex Offender Assessment Board (SOAB) to screen inmates convicted of sex crimes who are also eligible for parole. The SOAB, which is part of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, is also mandated to review all convicted sex offenders about to be sentenced by the courts.

The **Minnesota Sex Offender Screening Tool (MnSOST-R)** is a more expansive instrument than the ones listed above as it utilizes 16 scoring items. Most of these items are similar in nature to the Static 99 and RRASOR although the MnSOST-R requires more detailed data on the so-called 12 static variables that have to do with the offender's criminal record and his relationship to his victims. It also adds four dynamic components that measure factors associated with age and behavior while incarcerated. Here again, no interview is required as all of the factors were available in the Minnesota DOC inmate files.

⁶ Hanson, Karl R. and David Thornton. (1999) *Static 99: Improving Actuarial Risk Assessments for Sex Offenders*. Ottawa, Canada: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada, Public Works and Government Services Canada.

⁷ Hanson and Thornton. (1999).

The **Sexual Violence Risk-20 SVR-20** is a currently developing assessment organized by Canadian psychologist Douglas Boer as a basis for analysis and prediction of sexual violence. Similar to assessments of general violence, Boer's SVR-20 incorporates information pertaining to an offender's psychosocial adjustment and future plans⁸. In addition however, the SVR-20 includes factors specifically related to the offender's attitudes toward sexual offenses and his history of violence in such. The SVR-20 however, does not include a classification tool used to designate risk, but rather can be used as a topical guideline for risk assessments linked with studying violent sexual offenders.

Hare Psychopathy Checklist, Revised (PCL-R) was developed in Canada by Robert Hare. It is now owned and distributed by the firm that controls the LSI-R. The instrument consists of 20 items that must be completed by staff trained in the PCL-R and is either a licensed psychologist or has a masters level degree in psychology but is under the supervision of a licensed psychologist. Both a structured interview and a careful review of the inmate's file are required. It uses both static and dynamic factors. There is little if any research showing that it has been independently tested by persons with no financial interests in the PCL-R, though it is a widely accepted and used measure of psychopathy.

The **Violence Risk Assessment Guide VRAG** also was developed in Canada based on research conducted at a single maximum-security prison (Penetanguishne). It has been advertised as an objective risk assessment procedure to evaluate violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders, but subsequent research has suggested that the scale can also be used for predicting sexual offense recidivism. The assessment process requires a pre-existing PCL-R score as well as additional interview questions and a review of the inmate's case file. Classification accuracy of the VRAG is said to be about 75%⁹.

Since the PCL-R is owned by a private entity, one must assume that the VRAG is also privately controlled and distributed. According to Hanson, correctional agencies concerned with cost and efficiency would be uninterested in using the VRAG as a measure of sex offense recidivism risk, given that professionally trained interviewers and careful file review are requirements for the system to work properly. There is little if any research showing that it has been independently tested by persons with no financial interests in the VRAG.

In general, state prison systems do not have actuarial systems for assessing whether an inmate is in a security threat group (STG) or some other type of organized street and or prison gang. Typically, states develop policies that require certain staff to be designated as specialists in the identification of STG inmates, their movements, and illicit activities. These staff have developed general criteria for identifying STGs, which generally require multiple, and independent sources.

⁸ Dunne, Felicity. (2000) A Framework for Reducing Reoffending: Differentiated Case Management In Victorian Corrections.

⁹ Quinsey, V., Harris, G., Rice, M., Cormier, C. (1998) Violent Offenders. Appraising and Managing Risk. American Psychological Association, Washington DC

However, a couple of jurisdictions (Federal Bureau of Prisons and the Colorado Department of Corrections) have gone so far as to develop point systems in which an inmate receives points for having certain attributes associated with gang membership. For example, if an inmate has a history of active gang membership, certain types of tattoos, or is reported by another credible source as being associated with an STG, the inmate will be receive points for each attribute so noted. If the points reach a certain threshold, the inmate will be confirmed as a member of a STG.

1. Most adult correctional systems now have in place well established external custody/security systems that have been validated. These inmate classification systems have been successful in increasing the numbers of inmates assigned to minimum custody without jeopardizing staff, inmate or public safety.

2. Most states have developed program needs assessment systems. Unlike the inmate custody classification systems, they have not been as rigorously tested with respect to identifying programmatic needs. In some states, the use of clinical assessment methods is relied upon most heavily to assess an inmate's need for mental health and other treatment services.

3. A number of states and the Federal Bureau of Prisons used internal classification risk-assessment systems. These risk models are designed to determine how best to house and program inmates within a facility. Although these systems have shown, when properly implemented, to be effective in the identification of inmates likely to be predators or victims of assault and other serious forms of misconduct, they are not being widely used today.

4. A small number of states have more sophisticated risk assessment systems that have been designed to measure future criminality or public risk. Unlike inmate custody classification systems, these risk assessment systems are intended to classify offenders according to their potential for continuing to engage in criminal activity upon their release from incarceration and/or while under parole and probation supervision.

5. These more sophisticated risk assessment systems rely upon self-report questionnaires that can often take one hour to administer by a person trained in psychometric methods. Consequently, they require staff skill levels that are often beyond the education and assessment skills of current DOC staff. Where such training is lacking, can result in low reliability scores and subsequent inaccurate predictions.

6. Many of these more sophisticated criminal risk systems have been developed by researchers on non-US inmate populations (Canada and Great Britain in particular). The absence of cross-validation studies is likely to limit their utility as prediction tools.

7. There are a number of risk assessment systems for sex offenders that rely on static predictors of recidivism. Also developed in Canada and Great Britain, these instruments can be completed by "non-professional" staff using data that are readily available from existing court records. Although these instruments have shown to be predictive, it is also noteworthy that the relatively low recidivism rates of sex offenders as well as the absence of further cross-validation studies in the United States limits their

application for making release decisions by correctional authorities.

8. There are very few risk assessment systems identifying security threat group membership. States rely upon “common-sense” approaches where inmates are so identified based upon multiple but independent sources of identification such as credible informants, previous affiliations, tattoos, and observations of inmate gang activity.

Institutional Readiness Models. The following programs offer descriptions of the types of institutionally-based programs that should be part of Phase I of a reentry program.

Kansas City Community Release Center. This is a 300-bed community-based program that prepares male and female offenders for reintegration into the community. The Kansas City Community Release Center provides the Department with a transitional facility to manage and assist offenders requiring a supervised transition from confinement to community supervision. The Parole Board stipulates offenders for assignment to the center based on their need for substance abuse treatment or more structured supervision/assistance including work release programming as part of the release process. The center also serves as a secure location to assess offenders under Parole Board supervision in Jackson County who are at risk for revocation. Pending a determination to retain the offender under supervision, implement an alternate community supervision plan or return for formal revocation hearings, the offender’s risk to abscond or re-offend is mitigated by temporary confinement at the center.

The Work Release Program helps offenders obtain full-time employment, improve their interview skills and work histories. Of the money offenders earn, 50% is placed in a savings account, 25% is available to the offender and 25% is returned to the Inmate Revolving Fund reducing the state’s expense for their housing. The programs are structured to parallel the offender’s responsibilities after release to supervision in their local communities.

The Substance Abuse Treatment Program consists of addiction assessment and treatment including group and individual sessions provided by certified substance abuse specialists. Offenders are stipulated by the Parole Board for treatment based on their history of addiction and their need to practice relapse prevention strategies. Assessment and treatment sessions are scheduled to coincide with the offenders’ non-work hours. This program is primarily funded by the Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth in Sentencing (VOI/TIS) grant program.

St. Louis Community Release Center. This is a 500-bed community based program that prepares male and female offenders for reintegration into the community. The St. Louis Community Release Center provides the Department of Corrections with a transitional facility to manage and assist offenders requiring a supervised transition from confinement to community supervision. The Parole Board stipulates offenders for assignment to the center based on their need for substance abuse treatment or more structured supervision/assistance including work release programming as part of the release process. The Center also serves as a secure location to assess offenders under Parole Board

supervision in St. Louis City who are at risk for revocation. Pending a determination to retain the offender under supervision, implement an alternate community supervision plan or return for formal revocation hearings, the offender's risk to abscond or reoffend is mitigated by temporary confinement at the center.

Offenders are required to accept more personal responsibility for their choices and dealing with the realities of community living such as using public transportation to work locations, obtaining medical care and accessing available educational/vocational opportunities. The Work Release Program helps offenders obtain full-time employment, improve their interview skills and work histories. Of the money offenders earn, 50% is placed in a savings account, 25% is available to the offender and 25% is returned to the Inmate Revolving Fund reducing the state's expense for their housing. The programs are structured to parallel the offender's responsibilities after release to supervision in their local communities. The Substance Abuse Treatment Program consists of addiction assessment and treatment including group and individual sessions provided by certified substance abuse specialists. Offenders are stipulated by Parole Board for treatment based on their history of addiction and their need to practice relapse prevention strategies. Assessment and treatment sessions are scheduled to coincide with the offenders' non-work hours.

Appendix L: Reentry Models

The Fort Wayne, Indiana Reentry Program. One judge-centered Reentry Court model is operating in Ft. Wayne, Indiana which borrows heavily from the drug court experience. That is, an ongoing, central role for a judge, a "contract" drawn up between court and offender, discretion on the judge's part to impose graduated sanctions for various levels of failure to meet the conditions imposed, and the promise of the end of supervision as an occasion for ceremonial recognition. In Ft. Wayne, the Reentry Court Judge has been vested with authority by the Indiana Parole Commission to act on the Commission's behalf in supervising released adult offenders. A transition team, comprised of treatment providers, corrections staff, law enforcement, employment trainers, and family counselors, are assigned to the offender to assist with the development, monitoring, and enforcement of the reentry plan that is implemented upon release from the institution. This plan is based on assessments (i.e., risk, educational, vocational, mental health, and substance abuse) and developed with the offender and his/her support system. This plan becomes the guide by which the offender's reentry into the community is managed. Many of the offenders have been connected with a network of mentors who help guide their transition back into the community.

With the reentry plan completed, and upon the offender's release from commitment, the offender appears before the Reentry Court Judge for formalization or ordering of the reentry plan, depending on the offender, the support system, and the agencies of government representing the community. Typically, an offender will have to remain drug free, make restitution to his victim and reparation to the community, participate in programs that had begun in commitment (work, education, emotions management, parenting classes, etc.), refrain from committing crime, and comply with any other terms and conditions of the reentry plan. The offender is also required to appear before the Reentry Court Judge on a regular basis to determine if the plan remains appropriate and effective and if the offender is in compliance.

The Ohio Reentry Court Program. The Richland County Common Pleas Court in partnership with the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction developed a comprehensive reentry program that addresses all offenders sent from prison and return to Richland County, Ohio. The Richland County Reentry Court Program began in January 2000, following its selection by the U.S. Department of Justice's call for a concept paper on establishing a reentry court to enhance accountability of offenders being released from prison with judicial oversight, stronger supervision and an emphasis on addressing issues which make reentering society difficult. The reentry court was fully operational and became a part of the judicial process January 1, 2001. Through early assessment and planning the reentry court addresses the basic issues that lead most offenders to crime and which most often resurface when they return. By establishing reentry release plans at sentencing, offenders are presented with those areas which they must address before release back into the community. The probation and parole supervision system must also address the reentry needs of the offender prior to release, and during supervision to make pro-social reintegration more successful. Already the benefits

of this collaborative process has begun to surface, not only with the increased success of offenders returning to the community, but with the closer collaborations between the criminal justice, law enforcement, social service and treatment communities to assist them.

The Iowa Reentry Program. The Iowa reentry court project is a pilot initiative and is a collaboration between the Iowa Department of Corrections, the Iowa Parole Board, and the city of Cedar Rapids and targets offenders who have mental health disorders or who have been dually diagnosed with mental health and substance abuse problems. This program in Cedar Rapids is operational. Another program is being implemented in Des Moines and focuses on the 22 percent of offenders who refuse treatment and parole, as well as paroled offenders who are not typically assigned to a parole officer.

The Iowa reentry court makes use of an administrative law judge (ALJ) under the jurisdiction of the Parole Board , and relies on a Community Accountability Board that works with the ALJ. Composed of local service providers, probation and parole officers, victims, and other interested citizens, the Accountability Board identifies community service and support opportunities and develops accountability mechanisms for the successful reentry of released inmates.

A Reentry Coordinator in the Department of Corrections Offender Services Office works with institutional counseling staff who are preparing offenders for participation in the reentry process. Staff are now working to identify special needs of at-risk inmates through assessment and diagnosis in the prison setting, and will begin pre-release treatment and planning to connect them with community resources. Upon release from confinement, parolees will meet with the Community Accountability Board and ALJ at least monthly.

The West Virginia Reentry Program. The Division of Juvenile Services has implemented a juvenile reentry court initiative targeting adjudicated youth (male and female) who have been committed to the West Virginia Industrial Home for Youth and the Davis Center and who will be returning to Grant, Mineral or Tucker counties. The Industrial Home for Youth is the state's most secure committed facility and the Davis Center is a medium secure facility. These counties are located in the panhandle region in a fairly remote part of the state. This initiative is modeled after the OJJDP-supported Intensive Community-Based Aftercare Program (IAP) currently being replicated by juvenile justice systems throughout the country. In addition to intensive case management provided to youth while in confinement and upon return to the community, collaborative partnerships have been formed with the Circuit Court and Juvenile Probation, local law enforcement, faith communities and local school systems.

Youth are oriented into the program at the time of commitment to the Industrial Home for Youth. Youth returning to Grant, Mineral and Tucker Counties are assessed for eligibility. Upon return to the community, youth attend monthly court hearings before the Juvenile Court Judge. An aftercare case manager is immediately assigned to the case. Along with the juvenile probation officer, the aftercare case manager will provide intensive supervision and surveillance with frequent contacts in the school, at home and at work, if applicable. Advisory boards in each of the counties have been established to

allow community members to provide valuable input to the restorative justice process.

Appendix M:

Involvement of Faith-Based and Community-Based Organizations

Communities are sharing stories of success in utilizing one of the most potent weapons in fighting crime and social problems - faith and community based organizations. Continuing to rely on the basic assumption that offenders will return to the community, this initiative is seeking to better engage the support network of Faith-Based Organizations (FBOs) and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) and to build their capacity to address the challenges of offenders returning the community. Specifically, this initiative is seeking communities that are willing to engage neighborhood-oriented FBOs/CBOs as members and participants for offender reentry to strategies.

Faith-based organizations are seen as particularly viable for inclusion in this initiative, due to the impact they can have in our most crime-ridden urban areas and because of the unique role they play. For example, a significant number of local grantees receiving HUD funds are faith- or community-based service providers. McGarrell, Brinker, and Etindi (1999) point out that "while criminologists and sociologists think in terms of "religiosity", the faith-based groups themselves think in terms of "mission." Even the Puritans who first settled in America did so with the idea of creating a "city set upon a hill - a religious colony which would serve as an example to the rest of the world. Both the Old and New Testaments, accepted by those who embraced the Judeo-Christian ethic for our nation, admonish believers to live exemplary lives, committed to good works and helping others. The idea of a church or religious organization reaching out to have a positive influence in the community is as old as most of the organizations themselves." The authors further noted that "bringing to America the charitable practices of Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, Muslim and other faiths, religious congregations have always been known for giving not only of their money, but also of their time and talents to those of their own groups and the larger community around them." Additionally, in many cases local faith based organizations are located in the immediate neighborhoods where the problem exists, accepted and trusted by the residents as legitimate institutions, and perhaps most importantly, pride themselves in being open to anyone in need of their services.

It is important to realize, however, that these organizations, especially those in inner-city areas or rural areas are often small, modestly funded, organizationally unsophisticated, under staffed and as a result, in many cases, will need to be invited to the table to participate in the offender reentry initiative. These types of organizations, usually, lack the financial and technical resources to design, implement, assess, adjust and sustain programs and services. However, with appropriate support that offer continuous technical capacity, these organizations can be enhanced to provide a broad array of services without losing their primary purpose or principal identity. If the resources and the partnerships are effectively approached and provided, it should afford opportunities for the FBO/CBO congregations/organizations to become effective service providers either involved as trained volunteers or paid staff and, therefore, integral partners of the reentry initiative.

Appendix N: Federal Funding Restrictions

Generally, all funds provided under this program may be used for the purposes of this solicitation. The funding agencies intend to be as flexible as law allows in the use of their respective funds. However, there are specific statutory limitations to the use of funds received. These include the following:

U.S. Department of Labor. Grant funds under Section 171 of WIA shall be used to address employment and training needs. Projects shall include the provision of direct services to individuals to enhance employment opportunities and an evaluation component and may include other related employment and training activities described in this solicitation. Specifically, grant funds may not be used for construction.

U.S. Department of Justice. Grant funds U.S. Department of Justice support is derived from a number of different funding streams administered by several different components.

Funds made available for adult offender populations may be used to support law enforcement participation and coordination of offender reentry programs. Funds may not be used for substance abuse or mental health treatment or job training.

Funds made available by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) may be used to support activities related to at-risk and delinquent youth in the juvenile justice system, the specific authority for which depends on the funding stream. For example, OJJDP funds may be used for activities such as (1) research, evaluation, and demonstration to promote greater accountability in the juvenile justice system; (2) the development, implementation, and evaluation of education, prevention, diversion, treatment, and system improvement programs; (3) the development, testing, and demonstration of programs to prevent and reduce juvenile drug use; and 4) other authorized juvenile justice programs. Limitations exist on the use of funds to support construction activities.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Funds may be used to provide substance abuse or mental health services for offenders on parole or probation. Funds may not be used to provide substance abuse or mental health services in prisons, jails, or juvenile detention centers; or to fund involuntary civil commitment for mental health treatment or compelled administration of medication; or for construction.

Appendix O: Standard Information and Requirements/Forms

Administrative Requirements

Application for Federal Assistance Standard Form (SF) 424

The *Application for Federal Assistance* (SF-424) must be submitted with all applications. A copy of this form is included in this Appendix to provide the applicant with an example of the information that will be required to complete the application online. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number is 16.202 and the title is *Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative*. List the federal cognizant audit agency and fiscal year of the applicant organization in block 11.

Assurances

Applicants must agree, online, to a standard set of *Assurances* to successfully complete the application. The *Assurances* are a list of conditions with which the applicant must comply with in order to receive federal funds under this program (for the applicant's reference, the list of *Assurances* are included in this appendix). It is the responsibility of the recipient of the federal funds to fully understand and comply with these requirements. Failure to comply may result in the withholding of funds, termination of the award, or other sanctions.

Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements

Applicants must agree, online, to a set of Certifications (a copy of the form is provided in the Appendix for the applicants reference). In agreeing to the *Certifications Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements* form, the applicant agrees to comply with the following:

Lobbying: The applicant and its subgrantees, contractors, and subcontractors will not use federal funds for lobbying and will disclose any lobbying activities.

Debarment: The applicant and its principals have not been debarred or suspended from federal benefits and/or no such proceedings have been initiated against them; have not been convicted of, indicted for, or criminally or civilly charged by a government entity for fraud, violation of antitrust statutes, embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property; and have not had a public transaction terminated for cause or default.

Drug-Free Workplace: The applicant will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace.

Signing and submitting the *Certifications* form commits the applicant to compliance with certification requirements under 28 CFR Part 69, New Restrictions on Lobbying, and 28 CFR 67, Government-Wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-Wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants). The *Certifications* form will be treated as a material representation of the fact on which the Justice Department will rely in making awards.

Civil Rights Compliance

Applicants must submit the name and contact information for the person responsible for ensuring compliance with all civil rights related matters (this Appendix includes a form to use).

All federal-grant recipients must comply with nondiscrimination requirements contained in federal laws. Should a court or administrative agency make a finding of discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, disability, or age against a recipient of funds after a due process hearing, the recipient must agree to forward a copy of the finding to the Office for Civil Rights, Office of Justice Programs (OJP). Applicants should consult the *Assurances* form included in the Appendix to understand the applicable legal and administrative requirements.

Human Subject Research and Confidentiality Compliance

For information about research conducted with federal funds, applicants should refer to 28 CFR Part 22 and Part 46 regarding confidentiality of personally identifiable information and human subject research, respectively. Applicants should review their activities in light of the terms and definitions contained in these parts.

National Environmental Policy Act Compliance

All federal-grant recipients are required to assist the sponsoring federal agency in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and related federal requirements for environmental-impact analyses. Applicants must inform OJP if an environmental-impact analysis is required by the state or local jurisdiction for any proposed activities or if a federal agency is conducting an environment impact analysis. If the applicant anticipates new construction, renovation, or remodeling of a property that (1) is used as part of the Reentry Program for which the applicant is requesting funds, (2) is listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, (3) is located within a 100-year flood plain, or (4) would undergo a change in its basic prior use or a significant change in size, then the applicant should contact the Corrections Program Office, OJP.

Single Point of Contact Review

Executive Order 12372 requires applicants from state and local units of government or other

organizations providing services within a state to submit a copy of the application to the state Single Point of Contact (SPOC), if one exists and if this program has been selected for review by the state. Applicants must contact the state SPOC to determine if the program has been selected for state review. The date that the application was sent to the SPOC or the reason such submission is not required should be entered in block 16 on the *Application for Federal Assistance*, SF-424.

**APPLICATION FOR
FEDERAL ASSISTANCE**

OMB Approval No. 0348-0043

1. TYPE OF SUBMISSION: Application <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Construction Preapplication <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Construction		2. DATE SUBMITTED	Applicant Identifier
		3. DATE RECEIVED BY STATE	State Application Identifier
		4. DATE RECEIVED BY FEDERAL AGENCY	Federal Identifier
5. APPLICANT INFORMATION			
Legal Name:		Organizational Unit:	
Address (give city, county, State, and zip code):		Name and telephone number of person to be contacted on matters involving this application (give area code)	
6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN): <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>		7. TYPE OF APPLICANT: (enter appropriate letter in box) <input type="checkbox"/>	
8. TYPE OF APPLICATION: <input type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Revision If Revision, enter appropriate letter(s) in box(es) <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> A. Increase Award B. Decrease Award C. Increase Duration D. Decrease Duration Other(specify): _____		A. State H. Independent School Dist. B. County I. State Controlled Institution of Higher Learning C. Municipal J. Private University D. Township K. Indian Tribe E. Interstate L. Individual F. Intermunicipal M. Profit Organization G. Special District N. Other (Specify) _____	
		9. NAME OF FEDERAL AGENCY:	
10. CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE NUMBER: <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>		11. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT:	
12. AREAS AFFECTED BY PROJECT (Cities, Counties, States, etc.): _____			
13. PROPOSED PROJECT		14. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS OF:	
Start Date	Ending Date	a. Applicant	b. Project
15. ESTIMATED FUNDING:		16. IS APPLICATION SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS?	
a. Federal	\$.00	a. YES. THIS PREAPPLICATION/APPLICATION WAS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS FOR REVIEW ON: DATE _____	
b. Applicant	\$.00	b. No. <input type="checkbox"/> PROGRAM IS NOT COVERED BY E. O. 12372 <input type="checkbox"/> OR PROGRAM HAS NOT BEEN SELECTED BY STATE FOR REVIEW	
c. State	\$.00		
d. Local	\$.00		
e. Other	\$.00		
f. Program Income	\$.00		
g. TOTAL	\$.00	17. IS THE APPLICANT DELINQUENT ON ANY FEDERAL DEBT? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If "Yes," attach an explanation. <input type="checkbox"/> No	
18. TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, ALL DATA IN THIS APPLICATION/PREAPPLICATION ARE TRUE AND CORRECT, THE DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DULY AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE APPLICANT AND THE APPLICANT WILL COMPLY WITH THE ATTACHED ASSURANCES IF THE ASSISTANCE IS AWARDED.			
a. Type Name of Authorized Representative		b. Title	c. Telephone Number
d. Signature of Authorized Representative		e. Date Signed	

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SF-424

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 45 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0043), Washington, DC 20503.

**PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.
SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.**

This is a standard form used by applicants as a required facesheet for preapplications and applications submitted for Federal assistance. It will be used by Federal agencies to obtain applicant certification that States which have established a review and comment procedure in response to Executive Order 12372 and have selected the program to be included in their process, have been given an opportunity to review the applicant's submission.

- | Item: | Entry: | Item: | Entry: |
|-------|---|-------|--|
| 1. | Self-explanatory. | 12. | List only the largest political entities affected (e.g., State, counties, cities). |
| 2. | Date application submitted to Federal agency (or State if applicable) and applicant's control number (if applicable). | 13. | Self-explanatory. |
| 3. | State use only (if applicable). | 14. | List the applicant's Congressional District and any District(s) affected by the program or project. |
| 4. | If this application is to continue or revise an existing award, enter present Federal identifier number. If for a new project, leave blank. | 15. | Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions should be included on appropriate lines as applicable. If the action will result in a dollar change to an existing award, indicate <i>only</i> the amount of the change. For decreases, enclose the amounts in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, show breakdown on an attached sheet. For multiple program funding, use totals and show breakdown using same categories as item 15. |
| 5. | Legal name of applicant, name of primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity, complete address of the applicant, and name and telephone number of the person to contact on matters related to this application. | 16. | Applicants should contact the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for Federal Executive Order 12372 to determine whether the application is subject to the State intergovernmental review process. |
| 6. | Enter Employer Identification Number (EIN) as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service. | 17. | This question applies to the applicant organization, not the person who signs as the authorized representative. Categories of debt include delinquent audit disallowances, loans and taxes. |
| 7. | Enter the appropriate letter in the space provided. | 18. | To be signed by the authorized representative of the applicant. A copy of the governing body's authorization for you to sign this application as official representative must be on file in the applicant's office. (Certain Federal agencies may require that this authorization be submitted as part of the application.) |
| 8. | Check appropriate box and enter appropriate letter(s) in the space(s) provided:

-- "New" means a new assistance award.

-- "Continuation" means an extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project with a projected completion date.

-- "Revision" means any change in the Federal Government's financial obligation or contingent liability from an existing obligation. | | |
| 9. | Name of Federal agency from which assistance is being requested with this application. | | |
| 10. | Use the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number and title of the program under which assistance is requested. | | |
| 11. | Enter a brief descriptive title of the project. If more than one program is involved, you should append an explanation on a separate sheet. If appropriate (e.g., construction or real property projects), attach a map showing project location. For preapplications, use a separate sheet to provide a summary description of this project. | | |

ASSURANCES

The Applicant hereby assures and certifies compliance with all Federal statutes, regulations, policies, guidelines and requirements, including OMB Circulars No. A-21, A-110, A-122, A-128, A-87; E.O. 12372 and Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements—28 CFR, Part 66, Common Rule, that govern the application, acceptance and use of Federal funds for this federally-assisted project. Also the Applicant assures and certifies that:

1. It possesses legal authority to apply for the grant; that a resolution, motion or similar action has been duly adopted or passed as an official act of the applicant's governing body, authorizing the filing of the application, including all understandings and assurances contained therein, and directing and authorizing the person identified as the official representative of the applicant to act in connection with the application and to provide such additional information as may be required.
2. It will comply with requirements of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 P.L. 91-646) which provides for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs.
3. It will comply with provisions of Federal law which limit certain political activities of employees of a State or local unit of government whose principal employment is in connection with an activity financed in whole or in part by Federal grants. (5 USC 1501, et seq.)
4. It will comply with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act if applicable.
5. It will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that is or give the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others, particularly those with whom they have family, business, or other ties.
6. It will give the sponsoring agency or the Comptroller General, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the grant.
7. It will comply with all requirements imposed by the Federal Sponsoring agency concerning special requirements of law, program requirements, and other administrative requirements.
8. It will insure that the facilities under its ownership, lease or supervision which shall be utilized in the accomplishment of the project are not listed in the Environmental protection Agency's (EPA-list of Violating Facilities and that it will notify the Federal grantor agency of the receipt of any communication from the Director of the EPA Office of Federal Activities indicating that a facility to be used in the project is under consideration for listing by the EPA.
9. It will comply with the flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, Public Law 93-234, 87 Stat. 975, approved December 31, 1976. Section 102(a) requires, on and after March 2, 1975, the purchase of flood insurance in communities where such insurance is available as a condition for the receipt of any Federal financial assistance for construction or acquisition purposes for use in any area that had been identified by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as an area having special flood hazards. The phrase "Federal financial assistance" includes any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurance payment, rebate, subsidy, disaster assistance loan or grant, or any other form of direct or indirect Federal assistance.
10. It will assist the Federal grantor agency in its compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16 USC 470), Executive Order 11593, and the Archeological and Historical Preservation Act of 1966 (16 USC 569a-1 et seq.) by (a) consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer on the conduct of investigations, as necessary, to identify properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places that are subject to adverse effects (see 36 CFR Part 800.8) by the activity, and notifying the Federal grantor agency of the existence of any such properties, and by (b) complying with all requirements established by the Federal grantor agency to avoid or mitigate adverse effects upon such properties.
11. It will comply, and assure the compliance of all its subgrantees and contractors, with the applicable provisions of Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, or the Victims of Crime Act, as appropriate; the provisions of the current edition of the Office of Justice Programs Financial and Administrative Guide for Grants, M7100.1; and all other applicable Federal laws, orders, circulars, or regulations.
12. It will comply with the provisions of 28 CFR applicable to grants and cooperative agreements including Part 18, Administrative Review Procedure; Part 20, Criminal Justice Information Systems; Part 22, Confidentiality of Identifiable Research and Statistical Information; Part 23, Criminal Intelligence Systems Operating Policies; Part 30, Intergovernmental Review of Department of Justice Programs and Activities; Part 42, Nondiscrimination/Equal Employment Opportunity Policies and Procedures; Part 61, Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act; Part 63, Floodplain Management and Wetland Protection Procedures; and Federal laws or regulations applicable to Federal Assistance Programs.
13. It will comply, and all its contractors will comply, with the nondiscrimination requirements of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, 42 USC 3789(d), or Victims of Crime Act (as appropriate); Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; Subtitle A, Title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) (1990); Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; the Age Discrimination Act of 1975; Department of Justice Non-Discrimination Regulations, 28 CFR Part 42, Subparts C, D, E, and G; and Department of Justice regulations on disability discrimination, 28 CFR Part 35 and Part 39.
14. In the event a Federal or State court or Federal or State administrative agency makes a finding of discrimination after a due process hearing on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or disability against a recipient of funds, the recipient will forward a copy of the finding to the Office for Civil Rights, Office of Justice Programs.
15. It will provide an Equal Employment Opportunity Program if required to maintain one, where the application is for \$500,000 or more.
16. It will comply with the provisions of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (P.L. 97-348) dated October 19, 1982 (16 USC 3501 et seq.) which prohibits the expenditure of most new Federal funds within the units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

Signature

Date



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER

CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 28 CFR Part 69, "New Restrictions on Lobbying" and 28 CFR Part 67, "Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)." The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Justice determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. LOBBYING

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 69, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over \$100,000, as defined at 28 CFR Part 69, the applicant certifies that:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

(b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions;

(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS (DIRECT RECIPIENT)

As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67, Section 67.510—

A. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, sentenced to a denial of Federal benefits by a State or Federal court, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a

public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67 Sections 67.615 and 67.620—

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about—

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

(2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and

(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will—

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352
(See reverse for public burden disclosure.)

Approved by OMB
0348-0046

1. Type of Federal Action: <input type="checkbox"/> a. contract <input type="checkbox"/> b. grant <input type="checkbox"/> c. cooperative agreement <input type="checkbox"/> d. loan <input type="checkbox"/> e. loan guarantee <input type="checkbox"/> f. loan insurance	2. Status of Federal Action: <input type="checkbox"/> a. bid/offer/application <input type="checkbox"/> b. initial award <input type="checkbox"/> c. post-award	3. Report Type: <input type="checkbox"/> a. initial filing <input type="checkbox"/> b. material change For Material Change Only: year _____ quarter _____ date of last report _____
4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity: <input type="checkbox"/> Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Subawardee Tier _____, <i>if known</i> : Congressional District, if known:	5. If Reporting Entity in No. 4 is a Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime: Congressional District, if known:	
6. Federal Department/Agency:	7. Federal Program Name/Description: CFDA Number, <i>if applicable</i> : _____	
8. Federal Action Number, if known:	9. Award Amount, if known: \$ _____	
10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant <i>(if individual, last name, first name, MI):</i>	b. Individuals Performing Services <i>(including address if different from No. 10a)</i> <i>(last name, first name, MI):</i>	
11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when this transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.	Signature: _____ Print Name: _____ Title: _____ Telephone No.: _____ Date: _____	
Federal Use Only:		Authorized for Local Reproduction Standard Form LLL (Rev. 7-97)

CIVIL RIGHTS INFORMATION

List below the name, title, address, and telephone number of the civil rights contact person who has lead responsibility for ensuring that all applicable civil rights requirements are met and who will act as liaison in civil rights matters with the Office for Civil Rights of the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

Name

Title

Address

City, State, and Zip Code

Telephone Number

Budget Detail Worksheet

Purpose: The Budget Detail Worksheet may be used as a guide to assist you in the preparation of the budget and budget narrative. You may submit the budget and budget narrative using this form or in the format of your choice (plain sheets, your own form, or a variation of this form). However, all required information (including the budget narrative) must be provided. Any category of expense not applicable to your budget may be deleted.

A. Personnel - List each position by title and name of employee, if available. Show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time to be devoted to the project. Compensation paid for employees engaged in grant activities must be consistent with that paid for similar work within the applicant organization.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
		TOTAL _____

B. Fringe Benefits - Fringe benefits should be based on actual known costs or an established formula. Fringe benefits are for the personnel listed in budget category (A) and only for the percentage of time devoted to the project. Fringe benefits on overtime hours are limited to FICA, Workman's Compensation, and Unemployment Compensation.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
		TOTAL _____
		Total Personnel & Fringe Benefits _____

C. Travel - Itemize travel expenses of project personnel by purpose (e.g., staff to training, field interviews, advisory group meeting, etc.). Show the basis of computation (e.g., six people to 3-day training at \$X airfare, \$X lodging, \$X subsistence). In training projects, travel and meals for trainees should be listed separately. Show the number of trainees and the unit costs involved. Identify the location of travel, if known. Indicate source of Travel Policies applied, Applicant or Federal Travel Regulations.

Purpose of Travel	Location	Item	Computation	Cost
				TOTAL _____

D. Equipment - List non-expendable items that are to be purchased. Non-expendable equipment is tangible property having a useful life of more than two years and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. (Note: Organization's own capitalization policy may be used for items costing less than \$5,000). Expendable items should be included either in the "supplies" category or in the "Other" category. Applicants should analyze the cost benefits of purchasing versus leasing equipment, especially high cost items and those subject to rapid technical advances. Rented or leased equipment costs should be listed in the "Contractual" category. Explain how the equipment is necessary for the success of the project. Attach a narrative describing the procurement method to be used.

Item	Computation	Cost
		TOTAL _____

E. Supplies - List items by type (office supplies, postage, training materials, copying paper, and expendable equipment items costing less than \$5,000, such as books, hand held tape recorders) and show the basis for computation. (Note: Organization's own capitalization policy may be used for items costing less than \$5,000). Generally, supplies include any materials that are expendable or consumed during the course of the project.

Supply Items	Computation	Cost
		TOTAL _____

F. Construction - As a rule, construction costs are not allowable. In some cases, minor repairs or renovations may be allowable. Check with the program office before budgeting funds in this category.

Purpose	Description of Work	Cost
		TOTAL _____

G. Consultants/Contracts - Indicate whether applicant's formal, written Procurement Policy or the Federal Acquisition Regulations are followed.

Consultant Fees: For each consultant enter the name, if known, service to be provided, hourly or daily fee (8-hour day), and estimated time on the project. Consultant fees in excess of \$450 per day require additional justification and prior approval from OJP.

Name of Consultant	Service Provided	Computation	Cost
--------------------	------------------	-------------	------

Subtotal _____

Consultant Expenses: List all expenses to be paid from the grant to the individual consultants in addition to their fees (i.e., travel, meals, lodging, etc.)

Item	Location	Computation	Cost
------	----------	-------------	------

Subtotal _____

Contracts: Provide a description of the product or service to be procured by contract and an estimate of the cost. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source contracts in excess of \$100,000.

Item	Cost
------	------

Subtotal _____

TOTAL _____

H. Other Costs - List items (e.g., rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial or security services, and investigative or confidential funds) by major type and the basis of the computation. For example, provide the square footage and the cost per square foot for rent, or provide a monthly rental cost and how many months to rent.

Description	Computation	Cost
--------------------	--------------------	-------------

TOTAL _____

I. Indirect Costs - Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a Federally approved indirect cost rate. A copy of the rate approval, (a fully executed, negotiated agreement), must be attached. If the applicant does not have an approved rate, one can be requested by contacting the applicant's cognizant Federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct costs categories.

Description	Computation	Cost
--------------------	--------------------	-------------

TOTAL _____

Budget Summary- When you have completed the budget worksheet, transfer the totals for each category to the spaces below. Compute the total direct costs and the total project costs. Indicate the amount of Federal requested and the amount of non-Federal funds that will support the project.

Budget Category	Amount
A. Personnel	_____
B. Fringe Benefits	_____
C. Travel	_____
D. Equipment	_____
E. Supplies	_____
F. Construction	_____
G. Consultants/Contracts	_____
H. Other	_____
Total Direct Costs	_____
I. Indirect Costs	_____
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	_____
Federal Request	_____
Non-Federal Amount	_____