

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Assistance



The 1999 Bureau of Justice Assistance

1999

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP MEETING

177623

Library of Congress

Working Together for Peace and Justice in the 21st Century

April 6-8, 1999
Washington, D.C.

BJA Bureau of Justice Assistance

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Janet Reno
Attorney General

Raymond C. Fisher
Associate Attorney General

Laurie Robinson
Assistant Attorney General

Noël Brennan
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

Nancy E. Gist
Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance

Office of Justice Programs
World Wide Web Home Page
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov>

Bureau of Justice Assistance
World Wide Web Home Page
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA>

For grant and funding information contact
U.S. Department of Justice Response Center
1-800-421-6770

This document was prepared by Conference Reports & Services, a division of Gallais Communications. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

BJA Bureau of Justice Assistance

The 1999 Bureau of Justice Assistance National Partnership Meeting

Working Together for Peace and Justice
in the 21st Century

Summary of Proceedings

Foreword

The 1999 National Partnership Meeting, *Working Together for Peace and Justice in the 21st Century*, was by far the most successful conference in the history of the Bureau of Justice Assistance. Our meeting featured more than 200 speakers, 56 workshops and plenary sessions, and more than 1,100 participants from across the United States, 5 U.S. territories, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Canada, and Australia. Not only did the conference allow us to celebrate our accomplishments thus far in crime control and prevention, it allowed us to share information about a variety of programs, innovations, issues, and trends in criminal justice.

This publication provides a summary of the conference workshops so that participants can access the information that was presented in all of the sessions. Contact information for the presenters is provided as well. Due to the many requests from the conference participants, we have also included transcripts of the keynote speeches by Attorney General Janet Reno, Mr. Henry Gardner, and Mr. Fox Butterfield.

I thank each and every participant for making this such a productive and successful conference. Through my contact with many of you during the meeting, I realized that, as a team, we can do so much in our efforts to reduce crime and violence. We can all help build a safer, stronger nation where peace and justice are both real and permanent.

Nancy E. Gist
Director

Contents

Conference Agenda 3

Summary of Workshops

Workshops: Community Partnerships for Justice

1.1	What Is Community Justice?	25
1.2	Sharing the Burdens and the Benefits: Community Ownership of Crime Problems and Solutions	28
1.3	Engaging the Leaders of Tomorrow in Problem Solving Today: The Role of Our Youth in Community Justice	31
1.4	Building Community Support for Law Enforcement	34
1.5	Power Sharing Between Law Enforcement, the Courts, and the Community	37
1.6	Community Justice in Rural America	40
1.7	Community Policing in the 21st Century	43
1.8	Restorative Justice From the Victim's Perspective	46
1.9	Offenders Repaying the Community: Meaningful Community Service Programs	49
1.10	Community Policing in Rural America	52
1.11	Who Is Being Served? Victims, Offenders, and the Community— The Consumers of Justice	55
1.12	Children of Incarcerated Parents: Working Together To Break the Cycle of Destruction	58
1.13	Benefits of Effective Community Street Outreach	61
1.14	Strengthening and Sustaining Community Partnerships: 10 Key Indicators for Success	63
1.15	Creating an Electronic Community: Integrated Justice Information Systems	66
1.16	Best Practices in Community Crime Prevention: An International Perspective	70
1.17	How To Start a Community Court	76
1.18	Addressing Tribal and Nontribal Issues in Law Enforcement	79
1.19	Community Responses to Alcohol-Related Crime	81
1.20	<i>It Ain't Love</i> [No summary provided due to workshop format.]	

Workshops: Creating System Balance

2.1	Hate Crimes: How Is the Criminal Justice System Responding?	85
2.2	Minorities in the Criminal Justice System: Addressing Overrepresentation	90
2.3	Responding to the Needs of Mentally Ill Offenders	95
2.4	Youths Adjudicated as Adults	98
2.5	The Third Leg of the Three-Legged Stool: Indigent Defense Supporting the Justice System	100
2.6	The Impact of Sex Offender Registration and Notification	103
2.7	Making Justice Work for the Elderly and Developmentally Disabled	106
2.8	Overcoming Cultural Barriers in the Criminal Justice System	110
2.9	Balance and Equality in Community-Based Offender Management	113
2.10	What About Girls?	117

Workshops: Building a Comprehensive Justice System

3.1	Partnership Between Substance Abuse Treatment and Criminal Justice: Maximizing Resources With Shared Populations	121
3.2	Combating the Methamphetamine Epidemic: Shifting Tactics in Rural Law Enforcement	125
3.3	Retooling Prevention for Changing Times	127
3.4	Creating a Blueprint for Community Safety: Planning and Action	131
3.5	Expanding the Concept of Sanctions To Increase Offender Accountability and Public Safety for the Long Term	134
3.6	Tools To Measure Program Effectiveness	138
3.7	High-Tech Crime and High-Tech Justice: Responses to Computer Crime and Terrorism	141
3.8	Domestic Terrorism Preparedness	143
3.9	Back From the Edge: Changing the Future of Street Kids and Gang Members	147
3.10	What’s New in Asset Forfeiture [No summary provided due to workshop format.]	
3.11	The Evolution of Drug Epidemics	151
3.12	Handle With Care: The Hazards of Investigating Clandestine Methamphetamine Laboratories	154
3.13	How Young Is Too Young? Children in the Criminal Justice System	158
3.14	Life Savers: Technology To Protect and Serve	161
3.15	Youth Leadership Forum: A Report	164
3.16	Supporting Crime Reduction and Drug Elimination at the Local Level: HUD’s Role	166
3.17	Multi-Jurisdictional Task Forces (MJTFs) and High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTAs)	169
3.18	Who Are the Victims? Who Are the Offenders?: Applying Current Crime Data to Federal, State, and Local Policy	172

3.19 Knowing the Unknown Offender: Building a History, Psychology, and
Image of a Suspect by the Facts of the Case 178

3.20 Making Connections: Managing Offender Reentry to the Community 181

Keynote Speech Transcripts

Keynote Address—Henry Gardner 187

Luncheon Keynote Address—Fox Butterfield 197

Closing Keynote Address—Janet Reno 207

Speaker Biographies 221

Speaker Contact List 265

CONFERENCE AGENDA

C O N F E R E N C E A G E N D A

Tuesday

April 6, 1999

7:00 a.m. *Grand Ballroom Foyer*

Registration

Exhibit Area Opens *Congressional Hall*

7:30 a.m. *Renaissance Ballroom*

Criminal Justice Topic Tables

Join other criminal justice professionals over a continental breakfast for a conference warmup and a discussion of pressing issues in criminal justice practice. Each table will be labeled with a current issue in criminal justice, and a senior staff member from the Bureau of Justice Assistance will facilitate the discussion. Pick your topic and join in the discussion.

BJA Senior Staff:

Richard H. Ward III, Deputy Director

Jeff Allison, Acting Director, State and Local Assistance Division

Timothy J. Murray, Director, Program Development Division

Albert Antony Pearsall III, Acting Director, National Programs Division

Linda James McKay, Director, Analysis and Planning Division

Luke G. Galant, Senior Program Advisor for Enforcement, Program Development Division

Robert A. Kirchner, Senior Program Advisor for Evaluation, Program Development Division

Robert Brown, Senior Program Advisor for Prevention, Program Development Division

Jay A. Marshall, Senior Program Advisor for Community Justice, Program Development Division

Charles M. (Bud) Hollis, Senior Program Advisor for Adjudication, Program Development Division

PROGRAM FEATURE

Skill Building Workshops

The sessions that appear in boxes are designed to build a set of practical, applicable skills in the respective topic area. Participants will take away from these sessions new skills and materials specific to the topic area that they can use on the job.

8:30 a.m. *Grand Ballroom*

Welcoming Remarks

Hon. Nancy E. Gist
Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance

9:00 a.m. *Grand Ballroom*

Keynote Address

Henry Gardner
Managing Partner, Gardner, Underwood, and Bacon

10:00 a.m. Break

10:15 a.m. *Grand Ballroom*

Plenary Session: Community Partnerships for Justice: Mobilizing the Community as a Problem Solver

How can the justice system empower the community to take decisive action in the identification and resolution of public safety concerns? Featured speaker, Deputy Attorney General Eric Holder, will challenge panelists to explore the critical equilibrium between autonomy and interdependence of partners. Speakers will share their challenges, successes, and recommendations for the development of effective community partnerships for justice.

Featured Speaker:

Hon. Eric M. Holder, Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice

Moderator:

Timothy J. Murray, Director, Program Development Division, Bureau of Justice Assistance

Panelists:

John Feinblatt, Director, Center for Court Innovation, New York, NY

TUESDAY April 6, 1999

Michael D. Schrunk, District Attorney, Multnomah County, Portland, OR

Edward A. Flynn, Chief, Arlington Police Department, Arlington, VA

11:45 a.m. Break

12:15 p.m. *Grand Ballroom*

Luncheon Keynote

Fox Butterfield

Correspondent, *New York Times*, New York, NY

Workshops: Community Partnerships for Justice

2:00 p.m. *Renaissance Ballroom East*

1.1 What Is Community Justice?

New approaches and philosophies such as community courts, community justice, and community policing have come to mean many things to many people. What does community justice really mean? How does a community become involved in community justice? This session will review what is meant by the term "community justice," describe its basic principles and mechanisms, and illustrate how these principles can be applied in different settings.

Moderator:

John S. Goldkamp, Professor of Criminal Justice, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

Panelists:

Leonard E. Noisette, Director, Neighborhood Defender Service, New York, NY

Douglas F. Smith, Director, Arizona HIDTA Center, Tucson, AZ

Beverly Watts-Davis, Executive Director, San Antonio Fighting Back of United Way, San Antonio, TX

Michael D. Schrunk, District Attorney, Multnomah County, Portland, OR

2:00 p.m.

Meeting Room 8/9

1.2 Sharing the Burdens and the Benefits: Community Ownership of Crime Problems and Solutions

Many communities are taking steps to become a part of the solution to their crime problems. This workshop examines community justice in action. Rather than acting as a consumer of justice provided by law enforcement, the courts, and corrections, these communities mobilized themselves to identify crime problems and find innovative solutions to these problems. Panelists will describe how their communities rose to this challenge and discuss the benefits they have experienced as a result.

Moderator:

Michael Gottfredson, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ

Panelists:

Peter Clavelle, Mayor, Burlington, VT

Michael E. Kelly, Assistant to the Mayor, Phoenix, AZ

Jimena Martinez, Director of Technical Assistance, Center for Court Innovation, New York, NY

Charles P. Austin, Sr., Chief, Columbia Police Department, Columbia, SC

2:00 p.m.

Meeting Room 2

1.3 Engaging the Leaders of Tomorrow in Problem Solving Today: The Role of Our Youth in Community Justice

How can communities empower today's youth to become community justice leaders? This workshop will highlight the work of youth leaders who have become active participants in solving crime problems in their communities. Panelists will report on how they have overcome limitations of age to tap into the great potential of youth resources in their communities.

Moderator:

David Singh, Special Assistant to the Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance

TUESDAY April 6, 1999

Panelists:

Kim McGillicuddy, Lead Organizer, Bronx Youth Force, New York, NY

Shaking Graham, Youth Organizer, Bronx Youth Force, New York, NY

Linda K. Bowen, Executive Director, National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention, Washington, DC

James C. Keener, Byrne Program Coordinator, Criminal Justice Planning Agency, Pago Pago, AS

Leonard Seumanutafa, Program Specialist, Criminal Justice Planning Agency, Pago Pago, AS

2:00 p.m.

Meeting Room 12/13/14

1.4 Building Community Support for Law Enforcement

This workshop explores methods to bridge the gap between a community's expectations for its police agencies and the realities of policing that may limit the fulfillment of those expectations. Law enforcement and community leaders will discuss how community members and police can overcome obstacles to partnering and develop a relationship that is mutually beneficial and meets the shared interest of reducing and preventing crime.

Moderator:

Joseph Brann, Director, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice

Panelists:

Gerald Cunningham, Senior Associate, Church Action for Safe and Just Communities, Homeland Ministries, Indianapolis, IN

Michael J. Farrell, Deputy Commissioner, Policy and Planning Division, New York City Police Department, New York, NY

Patricia Coats Jessamy, State's Attorney, Baltimore, MD

Mary Lopez, Director, Safe Futures Consortium, University of Nebraska, Omaha, NE

2:00 p.m.

Meeting Room 15

1.5 Power Sharing Between Law Enforcement, the Courts, and the Community

Hear about lessons learned from criminal justice professionals who have forged power-sharing relationships with key stakeholders in their jurisdictions. Is it possible to break down turf issues and increase efficiency by relinquishing organizational power? Panelists will highlight power-sharing initiatives; demonstrate how they have reduced barriers to cooperation; and share how their agencies/organizations have become more efficient, effective, and responsive to the constituencies they serve.

Moderator:

Maria Theresa Viramontes, Executive Director, East Bay Public Safety Corridor Partnership, Oakland, CA

Panelists:

Hon. Raymond Norko, Judge, Community Court, Hartford, CT

Hon. Wilma A. Lewis, U.S. Attorney, District of Columbia, Washington, DC

Scott Lyons, Chief, Duluth Police Department, Duluth, MN

2:00 p.m.

Meeting Room 3

1.6 Community Justice in Rural America

What are the challenges involved in implementing community justice principles in rural settings? This workshop will focus on the challenges and benefits surrounding the implementation of community justice principles in rural settings, including tribal lands.

Moderator:

Walter Dickey, University of Wisconsin Law School, Madison, WI

Panelists:

Roch O. Clapp, Director, Boise County Office of Community Justice, Idaho City, ID

Trudy Jackson, Trudy's Kitchen, Idaho City, ID

Hon. George W. Neilson, Presiding Judge, 22nd Judicial District, Madras, OR

TUESDAY April 6, 1999

Garland Brunoe, Vice Chair of the Tribal Council,
Confederated Tribe of Warm Springs, Warm
Springs, OR

2:00 p.m. *Renaissance Ballroom West A & B*

1.7 Community Policing in the 21st Century

What is the future of community policing? How have demands on policing changed the innovation of community policing in recent years? How will these demands and national priorities affect community policing in the next century? Leaders of the community policing movement will present their suggestions for preparing community policing organizations for the 21st century.

Moderator:

Hon. Jeremy Travis, Director, National Institute of Justice

Panelists:

Charles Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, DC

Henry Izumizaki, Executive Director, Eureka Bay Area, San Francisco, CA

Gil Kerlikowske, Deputy Director of Support Services, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice

2:00 p.m. *Meeting Room 4*

1.8 Restorative Justice From the Victim's Perspective

This session, presented from a crime victim's viewpoint, will focus on the sometimes conflicting nature of restorative justice policies and the rights and needs of victims. What do victims need to put traumatic events behind them and move on with their lives? How do these needs conflict with the opinions of the community at large and the agendas of policymakers? This session will address these critical issues and more.

Moderator:

Kathryn Turman, Acting Director, Office for Victims of Crime

Panelists:

Susan Herman, Executive Director, National Center for Victims of Crime, Arlington, VA

Ellen Halbert, Director, Victim Witness Program, District Attorney's Office, Travis County, Austin, TX

Clementine Barfield-Dye, President, Save Our Sons and Daughters, Detroit, MI

2:00 p.m. *Meeting Room 5*

1.9 Offenders Repaying the Community: Meaningful Community Service Programs

A key factor to restoring the public's confidence in the criminal justice system is the swift, visible, and meaningful engagement of offenders in repaying the community. This panel will examine the principles behind creative approaches to community service that are building public confidence in the justice system in communities across the country.

Moderator:

Dennis Maloney, Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Community Justice, Bend, OR

Panelists:

James Green, Deputy Director, Community Service Programs, Office of Alternative Sanctions, Weathersfield, CT

Anne McDiarmid, Program Services Manager, Dakota County Community Corrections, South St. Paul, MN

Barbara Broderick, State Director of Adult Probation, Supreme Court of Arizona, Phoenix, AZ

2:00 p.m. *Meeting Room 16*

1.10 Community Policing in Rural America

How is the philosophy of community policing applied in sparsely populated rural areas? This session will discuss the principles, issues, and problems encountered in community policing in rural America. Issues of self-determination, tribal and nontribal jurisdictions, and how law enforcement agencies must sometimes cross jurisdictional boundaries to provide policing to rural communities will be explored.

TUESDAY April 6, 1999

Moderator:

Dr. Lee Colwell, Director, National Center for Rural Law Enforcement, Criminal Justice Institute, University of Arkansas, Little Rock, AR

Panelists:

M. Kay Harris, Associate Professor of Criminal Justice, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

Simon Brown, Lieutenant, Alaska State Troopers, Anchorage, AK

3:30 p.m. Break

3:45 p.m. Renaissance Ballroom East

1.11 Who Is Being Served? Victims, Offenders, and the Community—The Consumers of Justice

How does the justice system determine the needs and expectations of the community, victims, and offenders? This session will look at ways to sort out priorities and explore effective mechanisms for meeting the needs of each group.

Moderator:

John Feinblatt, Director, Center for Court Innovation, New York, NY

Panelists:

Henry Gardner, Managing Partner, Gardner, Underwood and Bacon, Oakland, CA

Mary D. Dorman, Attorney Midtown Community Court, New York, NY

Scott C. Newman, Prosecuting Attorney, Marion County, Indianapolis, IN

M. Patricia Hoven, Vice President, Social Responsibility, Honeywell, Inc., Minneapolis, MN

M. Beth Davis, Executive Director-State Defender, Mississippi Public Defender's Commission, Jackson, MS

3:45pm

Meeting Room 5

1.12 Children of Incarcerated Parents: Working Together To Break the Cycle of Destruction

How can the justice system impact the cycle of incarceration? Statistically, children of incarcerated parents stand a significantly higher chance of becoming offenders themselves. This workshop examines how the cycle can be broken by highlighting programs and concepts devoted to this issue.

Moderator:

Nancy M. Ware, Director of Technical Assistance and Training, Executive Office for Weed and Seed

Panelists:

Garry A. Mendez, Jr., President, National Trust for the Development of African-American Men, Riverdale, MD

Ann L. Jacobs, Executive Director, Women's Prison Association, New York, NY

James Mustin, Consultant, National Institute of Corrections, Palmyra, VA

Fox Butterfield, Correspondent, *New York Times*, New York, NY

3:45 p.m.

Meeting Room 4

1.13 Benefits of Effective Community Street Outreach

Community courts are more than just courtrooms. Together with local partners, they are active problem solvers in the neighborhoods they serve. This session will focus on the partnership of social workers and police officers to encourage people on the streets to take advantage of the court's social services before an arrest occurs.

Presenters:

Julius Lang, Coordinator, Midtown Community Court, New York, NY

Maria Almonte, Outreach Program, Center for Court Innovation, New York, NY

Michael Scagnelli, Assistant Chief, New York Police Department, New York, NY

TUESDAY April 6, 1999

3:45 p.m.

Meeting Room 3

1.14 Strengthening and Sustaining Community Partnerships: 10 Key Indicators for Success

How many of us have been part of an important crime prevention initiative that started with enthusiasm only to fizzle out and lose energy? What we know to be true is that it's a lot easier to start something than it is to sustain it. This interactive training session is not about another new violence prevention program; it's about how to mobilize policymakers, practitioners, and community leaders to make crime prevention efforts attainable and sustainable. Ten key indicators for sustaining commitment to—and involvement in—community crime prevention initiatives will be presented.

Presenters:

Rick Phillips, Executive Director, Community Matters, Santa Rosa, CA

Drew Diamond, Consultant, Police Executive Research Forum, Tulsa, OK

3:45 p.m.

Renaissance Ballroom West A & B

1.15 Creating an Electronic Community: Integrated Justice Information Systems

All around the country, local jurisdictions are breaking down the electronic walls that separate essential information from the professionals who require timely access. The goals in developing these systems are to avoid duplication; strengthen relationships among courts, prosecutors, public defenders, and law enforcement agencies; and engage in flexible, expandable networking of information systems. This session will highlight successful integrated information systems and the steps taken to build them. Issues addressed will include ownership, priorities, and the sharing of sources and resources.

Moderator:

Michael P. Judge, Chief Public Defender, Los Angeles, CA

Panelists:

Sean M. Byrne, Prosecutor Coordinator, New York Prosecutors Training Institute, Albany, NY

Suzanne James, Administrator, Prince George's County Court Administrator, Upper Marlboro, MD

George P. March, Chair, Pennsylvania Justice Network Steering Committee (JNET), West Chester, PA

David J. Roberts, Deputy Executive Director, SEARCH Group, Inc., Sacramento, CA

3:45 p.m.

Meeting Room 12/13/14

1.16 Best Practices in Community Crime Prevention: An International Perspective

Although burglaries, robberies, car thefts, and violence against women are prevalent problems throughout the Western World, innovative ways to reduce and prevent these crimes are not as common. The objective of this session is to share best practices and partnership strategies in Western Europe, Australia, and the United States. The panel will present models of cost-effective and sustainable strategies to reduce delinquency, violence, and community members' insecurity.

Moderator:

Irvin Waller, Director General, International Centre for Prevention of Crime, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Panelists:

Nigel Whiskin, Chief Executive, Crime Concern, Swindon, England

Victor Jammers, Ministry of Justice, Department of Crime, The Hague, Netherlands

Yvonne Korn, Director, National Crime Prevention, Commonwealth Attorney General's Department, Canberra, Australia

David E. Garrett, Senior Planner, Fort Worth Police Department, Fort Worth, TX

TUESDAY April 6, 1999

3:45 p.m.

Meeting Room 16

1.17 How To Start a Community Court

Community courts are a promising approach to solving neighborhood problems like vandalism, prostitution, landlord-tenant disputes, and juvenile delinquency. What does it take to start a community court? The panelists in this session will share their firsthand experiences in creating the Midtown Community Court (New York City), the Portland Community Court, and the Harlem Community Justice Center.

Presenters:

Eric Lee, Deputy Director, Center for Court Innovation, New York, NY

Rodney A. Sprauve, Project Director, Harlem Community Justice Center, New York, NY

Judith N. Phelan, Staff Assistant, Multnomah

3:45 p.m.

Meeting Room 8/9

1.18 Addressing Tribal and Nontribal Issues in Law Enforcement

Over the years, questions and concerns regarding policing across law enforcement jurisdictions have routinely been raised by Federal, tribal, and local units of government. With the increasing need to open lines of communication to better coordinate criminal justice systems and other services, it is imperative that the focus be narrowed on fostering efficient and effective working relationships with tribal and nontribal jurisdictions. This workshop builds upon lessons learned from tribal and nontribal communities in the Green Bay (WI) area that have enhanced lines of communication, shared resources, and worked together to ensure the public's safety.

Moderator:

Edward Krueger, Chair, Criminal Justice Department, Fox Valley Technical College, Appleton, WI

Panelists:

James Danforth, Chief, Oneida Tribal Police Department, Oneida Nation, WI

Tom Hinz, Sheriff, Brown County, Green Bay, WI

Bradley Gehring, Sheriff, Outagamie County, Appleton, WI

3:45 p.m.

Meeting Room 2

1.19 Community Responses to Alcohol-Related Crime

A 1998 Bureau of Justice Statistics report confirms that half of all violent victimizations involve the use of alcohol by the perpetrator. This session will discuss how communities have successfully reduced alcohol-related crime in their neighborhoods by defining the problem, building partnerships with local officials and community organizations, and implementing interventions.

Moderator:

James E. Copple, Director, Coalition, State, and Field Services, National Crime Prevention Council, Washington, DC

Panelists:

Raymond Daw, Executive Director, Northwest New Mexico Fighting Back, Gallup, NM

Alta Lash, Executive Director, United Connecticut Action for Neighborhoods, Hartford, CT

Gene Barnes, District Administrator, Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control, San Diego, CA

3:45 p.m.

Auditorium

1.20 It Ain't Love

Dating violence among teens has only recently emerged from a veil of silence. Studies suggest that teenage victims, like adult victims, often fail to get help because they fear the consequences of reporting the violence, they blame themselves, and/or they are unaware that help is available. This 1-hour documentary (to be shown here in full), which was produced by Olmos Productions with support from the Foundation for Advancements in Science and Education and the Bureau of Justice Assistance, approaches this difficult subject in a forthright but sensitive way. *It Ain't Love* uses young actors to communicate with young viewers.

TUESDAY April 6, 1999

Panelists:

Daniel Haro, Producer, Olmos Productions, Inc.,
Century City, CA

Fernando Cubillas, Production Manager, Olmos
Productions, Inc., Century City, CA

Nick Athas, Producer, Olmos Productions, Inc.,
Millwood, NY

5:15 p.m. Break

6:00 p.m.

Grand Ballroom

**Special Session: Developing and
Making the Most of Professional Networks**

Through computer matching, this interactive session will allow participants to make the kinds of professional contacts they think will be most helpful to advancing their work. Participants will be matched with professionals from inside and outside their usual professional circles. The goal of this session is for participants to walk away with the skills to expand their professional network.

7:30 p.m. Adjournment

CONFERENCE AGENDA

Wednesday

April 7, 1999

7:30 a.m. Renaissance Ballroom

Continental Breakfast and Welcoming Remarks

Hon. Raymond C. Fisher
Associate Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice

8:30 a.m. Grand Ballroom

Plenary Session: Protecting the Public, Protecting Rights: Creating System Balance

In every community, state, and region of this great nation, a constant tension exists between criminal justice efforts to enhance the safety of communities and the need to protect the rights of citizens as they are set out in the U.S. Constitution. This session will challenge participants to explore their values, priorities, and practices with regard to the application of justice and focus on the highly charged moral, legal, and political considerations of the tension between protecting the people and protecting their rights.

Featured Speaker:

Hon. Bill Lann Lee, Acting Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

Panelists:

Carla Arranaga, Deputy in Charge, Hate Crimes
Suppression Unit, Los Angeles County District
Attorney's Office, Los Angeles, CA

Marcia Choo, Assistant Director, Museum Programs,
Simon Wiesenthal Center, Los Angeles, CA

Sunny Lee, Program Coordinator, Tools for Tolerance
for Law Enforcement, Simon Wiesenthal Center, Los
Angeles, CA

Tom (T.J.) Leydon, Task Force Against Hate, Simon
Wiesenthal Center, Los Angeles, CA

10:00 a.m. Break

Workshops: Creating System Balance

10:15 a.m. Renaissance Ballroom West A & B

2.1 Hate Crimes: How Is the Criminal Justice System Responding?

America's communities are struggling over whether and how various groups of people should be specially protected against criminal acts of bias. Amid this debate, the criminal justice system must continue to respond to hate crimes as they occur. This session will look at how different jurisdictions are addressing hate crimes through legislation and practice.

Moderator:

Hon. Rose Ochi, Director, Community Relations
Service, U.S. Department of Justice

Panelists:

Daphne Kwok, Executive Director, Organization of
Chinese Americans, Washington, DC

Trenton Hargrove, Chief Deputy Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division, Civil Rights Enforcement
Section, Office of the Attorney General, Harrisburg, PA

Reuben Greenberg, Chief, Charleston Police
Department, Charleston, SC

Stephen L. Wessler, Assistant Attorney General, Maine
Department of the Attorney General, Augusta, ME

Victoria Nute, Civil Rights Team, Lee Academy,
Lee, ME

10:15 a.m. Meeting Room 12/13/14

2.2 Minorities in the Criminal Justice System: Addressing Overrepresentation

Minorities are increasingly overrepresented in the criminal justice system in the United States. This session will examine the manner in which the criminal justice system responds to crime in America and explore how we can create a balanced justice system. Panelists will address policies and legislation that are designed to affect this disproportion.

Moderator:

Marc Mauer, Assistant Director, Sentencing Project,
Washington, DC

WEDNESDAY April 7, 1999

Panelists:

Bob Boruchowitz, Director, Public Defender Association, Seattle, WA

Michael Lawlor, Representative, Connecticut House of Representatives, Hartford, CT

Dr. Luis Garcia, Chief Criminologist, Boston Police Department, Boston, MA

Hon. Patrick Lee, Chief Judge, Oglala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge, SD

10:15 a.m. *Meeting Room 2*

2.3 Responding to the Needs of Mentally Ill Offenders

Mental illness includes disorders, such as schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder, and depression, that have reached a level of severity resulting in psychosis. How do we best prepare criminal justice professionals to identify and manage offenders with serious mental illness? What proportion of this offender population is potentially violent? And how can the criminal justice system improve its response to the needs of seriously mentally ill offenders? This panel will present the current thinking on these issues and report on criminal justice programs that show promise in addressing the needs of persons with mental disorders who come in contact with the criminal justice system.

Moderator:

Judith White McBride, Senior Advisor to the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs

Panelists:

Hon. Ginger Lerner-Wren, Judge, Broward County Mental Health Court, Fort Lauderdale, FL

Dr. Henry J. Steadman, President, Policy Research Associates, Inc., Delmar, NY

Sam Cochran, Lieutenant, Memphis Police Department, Memphis, TN

David Wertheimer, Administrator, Services and Systems Integration Administration, Department of Community and Human Services, King County, Seattle, WA

10:15 a.m. *Meeting Room 3*

2.4 Youths Adjudicated as Adults

Many communities have begun to close a loophole that allows juveniles who commit adult crimes to go free when they reach the age of consent. There has been dramatic increases in juveniles serving long sentences in adult correctional facilities. This session will explore the shifting expectation of communities, the changing responsibilities of justice systems, and other important issues related to the trend of adjudicating serious juvenile offenders as adults.

Moderator:

Rita Aliese Frye, Public Defender, Cook County, Chicago, IL

Panelists:

James R. Bell, Youth Law Center, San Francisco, CA

Hon. Frank Orlando, Judge, Nova Southeastern University Law Center, Fort Lauderdale, FL

Richard L. Stalder, Secretary, Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Baton Rouge, LA

10:15 a.m. *Meeting Room 4*

2.5 The Third Leg of the Three-Legged Stool: Indigent Defense Supporting the Justice System

On March 18, 1963, the U.S. Supreme Court decided in the case *Gideon v. Wainwright* that it is the constitutional responsibility of the courts to provide fair and equal representation for offenders who cannot afford to provide their own. This session will examine how viable indigent defense contributes to the effectiveness of the entire criminal justice system.

Moderator:

JoAnn Wallace, Director, Public Defender Service, Washington, DC

Panelists:

Dennis Murphy, Deputy Capital Defender, Capital Defender Office, New York, NY

Hon. Kevin S. Burke, Judge, Hennepin County Court, Minneapolis, MN

Richard Wilson, Professor, American University Washington College of Law, Washington, DC

CONFERENCE AGENDA

Ronald Earle, District Attorney, Travis County,
Austin, TX

10:15 a.m. *Meeting Room 5*

2.6 The Impact of Sex Offender Registration and Notification

Is sex offender notification being utilized? What mechanisms have local governments put in place to make the information available to communities? Has the constitutionality of registration and notification statutes been challenged? This panel will explore the impact of this legislation on communities across the United States.

Moderator:

Elizabeth A. Pearson, Senior Staff Associate, National Criminal Justice Association, Washington, DC

Panelists:

John Kaye, Prosecuting Attorney, Monmouth County, Freehold, NJ

Joseph M. Beard, Detective, Sheriff's Office, Snohomish County, Everett, WA

R. Lewis Vass, Captain, Division Commander, Criminal Justice Information Services, Virginia State Police, Richmond, VA

10:15 a.m. *Meeting Room 8/9*

2.7 Making Justice Work for the Elderly and Developmentally Disabled

This session will highlight programs that have opened the justice support network to the elderly and developmentally disabled. Representatives from three programs will discuss the challenges and highlights of making the system work for these unique groups of victims and offenders.

Moderator:

Charles A. Moose, Chief, Portland Police Department, Portland, OR

Panelists:

Dottie Burkette, TRIAD, Stanford, FL

Jerijeane Houchins, Texas Planning Council, Round Rock, TX

10:15 a.m. *Meeting Room 15*

2.8 Overcoming Cultural Barriers in the Criminal Justice System

How does the criminal justice system effectively serve the diverse cultures in communities across the United States? This session will address how criminal justice agencies define and understand cultural groups and how they assist widely diverse populations. Presenters will discuss different programs in place that assist cultural groups in "navigating" the criminal justice system.

Moderator:

Claire Johnson, Special Advisor to the Director, DC Initiative, National Institute of Justice

Panelists:

Hon. James D. Cayce, Presiding Judge, King County District Court, Seattle, WA

Weris Jama, Program Specialist, Outreach to New Americans, National Crime Prevention Council, Washington, DC

Edward Flynn, Chief, Arlington Police Department, Arlington, VA

Charles Johnson, Bridging the Gap, Atlanta, GA

10:15 a.m. *Renaissance Ballroom East*

2.9 Balance and Equality in Community-Based Offender Management

From front-end pretrial administration to back-end parole supervision, the determination of offender risk and stability is key to balancing the high cost of incarceration against the increased risk of managing offenders in the community. Leaders in the field of community-based offender management will present effective approaches to balancing the demand for punishment and the many costs of incarceration against the risk of managing offenders in the community.

Moderator:

George Keiser, Community Corrections Chief, National Institute of Corrections, Washington, DC

Panelists:

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Deputy Commissioner of Probation, Office of the Commissioner of Probation, Boston, MA

WEDNESDAY April 7, 1999

Hon. Frances Gallegos, Judge, Santa Fe Municipal Court, Santa Fe, NM

Cranston Mitchell, Chair, Missouri Parole Commission, Jefferson City, MO

D. Alan Henry, Executive Director, Pretrial Services Resource Center, Washington, DC

10:15 a.m. *Meeting Room 15*

2.10 What About Girls?

State juvenile justice systems across the country are challenged by the question: "What About Girls?" This question cannot be ignored because female involvement in the juvenile justice system continues on a steady upward course. This session addresses the various issues and challenges involving youthful female offenders in the juvenile justice system.

Moderator:

Nancy Ware, Director of Technical Assistance and Training, Executive Office for Weed and Seed

Panelists:

Mari Ann Daniels, Director, Baltimore Department of Juvenile Justice, Baltimore, MD

Dr. Marcia R. Chaiken, Director of Research, LINC, Alexandria, VA

Margo L. Frasier, Sheriff, Travis County, Austin, TX

Dr. Sheila D. Peters, Project Manager, Green, Peters & Associates, Nashville, TN

12:00 noon *Grand Ballroom*

Luncheon/Plenary Session: Negotiating a Piece of the Pie: Building a Comprehensive Justice System

Criminal justice practitioners and policymakers everywhere advocate to increase funding in the areas of their highest priority. But such increased funding often has to be taken from other areas. This interactive session will challenge participants to consider what they value most and what they would be willing to sacrifice to protect or increase funding for their programs or disciplines. Take the opportunity to lobby our mythical policy board. Influence their decision in this simulation employing

current issues by answering the two multiple-choice questions presented to you when you picked up your conference materials. Participants will observe as their collective responses are presented and the role players anguish over, debate, and resolve the issues.

Moderator:

Hon. Laurie O. Robinson, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs

Workshops: Building a Comprehensive Justice System

2:00 p.m. *Meeting Room 2*

3.1 Partnership Between Substance Abuse Treatment and Criminal Justice: Maximizing Resources With Shared Populations

Each year more than 60 percent of publicly funded substance abuse treatment referrals come from the criminal justice system. Increasingly, these two fields are seeing opportunities that allow them to share resources and responsibilities. This session will highlight successful partnerships between the criminal justice and treatment systems.

Moderator:

Fred W. Garcia, Director, Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse, Olympia, WA

Panelists:

Preston Daniels, Mayor, Des Moines, IA

Foster Cook, Director, Breaking the Cycle, Birmingham, AL

Valera Jackson, Executive Vice President, The Village, Miami, FL

2:00 p.m. *Meeting Room 12/13/14*

3.2 Combating the Methamphetamine Epidemic: Shifting Tactics in Rural Law Enforcement

As the use of methamphetamine continues to spread through the Midwest, leaders in law enforcement are looking for solutions to this major threat. The methamphetamine epidemic carries with it a new set of

CONFERENCE AGENDA

rules: new trafficking patterns; a different kind of dealer; hazardous byproducts of production; and the devastating, lasting effects on the individuals addicted to its use. This session will focus on how selected rural jurisdictions are reorganizing their law enforcement assets to meet these new challenges.

Moderator:

Hon. Stephen L. Hill, Jr., U.S. Attorney, Western District of Missouri, Kansas City, MO

Panelists:

George Epp, Sheriff, Boulder County, Boulder, CO

E. Mick Mollica, Special Consultant, Learn Associates, Folsom, CA

Guy J. Hargreaves, Staff Coordinator, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC

Lou Pharo, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC

2:00 p.m.

Meeting Room 16

3.3 Retooling Prevention for Changing Times

How can existing prevention programs change and adapt to better prevent violence and drug abuse in our communities? In this session, presenters will draw upon their years of experience in the prevention arena to share lessons learned, principles of program effectiveness, and recommendations for future change in the face of increasingly complex crime and crime prevention issues.

Moderator:

Hon. Shay Bilchik, Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Panelists:

James J. McGivney, Deputy Director for Government Relations, D.A.R.E.® America, Dumfries, VA

Linda Dahlberg, Senior Behavioral Scientist, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA

Barbara E. Thomas, Projects Manager, The Family Institute, Washington, DC

2:00 p.m.

Meeting Room 3

3.4 Creating a Blueprint for Community Safety: Planning and Action

Communities across the country have proved that developing comprehensive, action-focused planning initiatives that engage government, grassroots, and other community sectors can generate powerful results in reducing and preventing crime and enhancing the community's quality of life. This session will draw upon the experiences of collaborative planning efforts in several cities, with particular focus on three of the BJA-sponsored Comprehensive Communities Program (CCP) sites: Baltimore, MD; Hartford, CT; and Salt Lake City, UT. Presenters will share lessons learned through sustaining key programs and partnerships, including principles fundamental to their success. Each will provide examples of the tangible benefits their cities achieved.

Moderator:

Theresa Kelly, Director of Special Projects, National Crime Prevention Council, Washington, DC

Panelists:

Jeanne Robison, Assistant City Prosecutor, City Prosecutor's Office, Salt Lake City, UT

RaeAnn Palmer, Coordinator, Special Projects and Community Programs, Hartford, CT

Patricia Smith, Assistant Director, CCP/Hotspots, Mayor's Coordinating Council on Criminal Justice, Baltimore, MD

2:00 p.m.

Meeting Room 4

3.5 Expanding the Concept of Sanctions To Increase Offender Accountability and Public Safety for the Long Term

In recent years, many states have turned to increasing prison space as the answer to community concerns about crime. This session will describe comprehensive systems of cost-effective alternatives to prison that have demonstrated a lasting impact on offender behavior.

Moderator:

William H. Carbone, Director, Office of Alternative Sanctions, Rocky Hill, CT

WEDNESDAY April 7, 1999

Panelists:

Gary Hinzman, Director, Sixth Judicial District, Cedar Rapids, IA

John F. Gorczyk, Director, Vermont Department of Corrections, Waterbury, VT

Mary V. Leftridge Byrd, Superintendent, State Correctional Institution, Chester, PA

2:00pm

Meeting Room 5

3.6 Tools To Measure Program Effectiveness

Practitioners and administrators require information to make decisions about the effectiveness of criminal justice programs and policies. Facilitators will discuss and demonstrate recent progress in making tools available to develop credible evaluation activities and practices. Tools demonstrated will include: an interactive process on the World Wide Web; designing an evaluation that works for you; a new Evaluation Desk Reference Manual Series; and specific guidelines such as the National Crime Prevention Council's *How Are We Doing?: A Guide to Local Program Evaluation*.

Presenters:

Robert A. Kirchner, Senior Program Advisor, Program Development Division, Bureau of Justice Assistance

Jean F. O'Neil, Director, Research Policy Analysis, National Crime Prevention Council, Washington, DC

Craig Cussimano, Manager of Web Site Development, Justice Research and Statistics Association, Washington, DC

2:00 p.m.

Meeting Room 8/9

3.7 High-Tech Crime and High-Tech Justice: Responses to Computer Crime and Terrorism

How is crime being reorganized around new information and communication technologies? Computers and the World Wide Web have made electronic commerce and instant communication a possibility, but have these technologies also made us vulnerable? This session will examine what high-tech criminals are capable of and what you can do to stop them.

Presenters:

Kevin Jackson, Program Manager, Research and Technology Division, National Institute of Justice

Keith Chval, Supervisor, Internet Criminal Activity Unit, Office of the Attorney General of Illinois, Chicago, IL

2:00 p.m.

Renaissance Ballroom West A & B

3.8 Domestic Terrorism Preparedness

Domestic terrorism and its impact on our nation's communities is a real but, in many instances, unknown threat. The Federal Government is developing significant programs to assist state and local agencies to respond more effectively and safely by building capacity in the law enforcement, fire, hazardous materials response, and emergency medical disciplines. This panel will examine the emerging threat of domestic terrorism and the critical need for states and localities to enhance their capabilities to respond to potential terrorist incidents involving weapons of mass destruction. Panelists will provide firsthand experience in working with Byrne agencies to support programs and in helping define the key role that states should play.

Moderator:

Andy Mitchell, Deputy Director, Office for State and Local Domestic Preparedness Support, Office of Justice Programs

CONFERENCE AGENDA

Panelists:

Stan M. McKinney, Director, Emergency Preparedness Division, Office of the Adjutant General, Columbia, SC

Donna H. Burns, Director of Special Projects, Office of the Governor, Georgia Emergency Management Agency, Atlanta, GA

Martha Gilland, Director, Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, Atlanta, GA

2:00 p.m. *Meeting Room 15*

3.9 Back From the Edge: Changing the Future of Street Kids and Gang Members

How do you mobilize community, family, and other support systems to make a difference for both youth and the community? Leaders of frontline prevention and intervention programs will discuss ways to reach youth who are on the verge of, or caught up in, a high-risk lifestyle.

Moderator:

Jerel Eaglin, Director, Youth Services, National Crime Prevention Council, Washington, DC

Panelists:

Wayne Sakamoto, Violence Prevention Coordinator, San Diego County, San Diego, CA

Waunetta Lonewolf, Oglala Nation, Glendale, AZ

Luis Cardona, Director, Barrios Unidos, Washington, DC

Rico Rush, Alliance of Concerned Black Men, Washington, DC

2:00 p.m. *Renaissance Ballroom East*

3.10 What's New in Asset Forfeiture

What new Supreme Court cases affect forfeiture? Should I establish an asset forfeiture unit? How will it benefit my agency? What are the ethical issues involved in the custody, management, and disposition of seized

and forfeited property? How can I participate in the sharing program? Is it better to go federal or state forfeiture? Can I use shared funds to pay for salaries? What other resources are available to those who participate in the program? All these questions and more will be answered in an interactive discussion designed for law enforcement and prosecution executives.

Presenter:

Alice W. Dery, Assistant Chief, Asset Forfeiture Division, U.S. Department of Justice

3:30 p.m. Break

3:45 p.m. *Grand Ballroom*

Special Session: Media as a Vehicle for Prevention

For years, the Ad Council, the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC), the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), and, more recently, MTV have worked to use the media to disseminate crime and drug abuse prevention messages. See some of the latest public service announcements designed by NCPC, ONDCP, and MTV; hear and discuss the impact that the media are having on prevention efforts; and learn how you can use this vehicle in your community.

Moderator:

Janie L. Jeffers, Deputy Executive Director, White House-DC Interagency Task Force, Washington, DC

Panelists:

Stephen Friedman, Vice President, Public Affairs, MTV, New York, NY

John A. Calhoun, Executive Director, National Crime Prevention Council, Washington, DC

Alan Levitt, Senior Advisor and Chief, Education Branch, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Washington, DC

5:30 p.m. Adjournment

CONFERENCE AGENDA

Thursday
April 8, 1999

7:30 a.m. *Grand Ballroom*

Continental Breakfast

Workshops: Building a Comprehensive Justice System

8:30 a.m. *Meeting Room 4*

3.11 The Evolution of Drug Epidemics

Over the past two decades, the major drug trafficking problems in the United States have shifted from heroin to powder cocaine to crack cocaine to methamphetamine and heroin. This session will consider the use of information systems and intelligence to predict future changes in drug trafficking and stop epidemics before they start.

Moderator:

Richard H. Ward III, Deputy Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance

Presenter:

Dr. David F. Musto, Department of History, Yale University, New Haven, CT

Panelists:

Jack Riley, Director, Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program, National Institute of Justice

Randy A. Weaver, Chief, National Drug Assessment Group, National Drug Intelligence Center, Johnstown, PA

8:30 a.m. *Meeting Room 12/13/14*

3.12 Handle With Care: The Hazards of Investigating Clandestine Methamphetamine Laboratories

As methamphetamine laboratories have sprung up across the country in recent years, drug enforcement specialists have had to learn along the way about how

to handle the dangers of exposure to the volatile and toxic precursor chemicals and waste byproducts of methamphetamine production. Drug Enforcement Administration agents will demonstrate a simulated methamphetamine laboratory in action. Presenters will highlight lessons learned and multiagency approaches to protecting law enforcement officers while increasing speed and efficiency of clandestine methamphetamine laboratory investigations.

Moderator:

Thomas J. Pagel, Director, Division of Criminal Investigation, Cheyenne, WY

Panelists:

Mike Cashman, Special Agent, Drug Enforcement Administration, Quantico, VA

Michael S. McCampbell, Project Director, Circle Solutions, Tamarack, FL

Troy Derby, Officer, Drug Enforcement Administration, Quantico, VA

8:30 a.m. *Meeting Room 2*

3.13 How Young Is Too Young? Children in the Criminal Justice System

More than 100 children under the age of 10 commit delinquent acts in Hennepin County, Minnesota, each year. Promising results from a model program designed to address the challenges of working with this group of very young offenders and their families will be covered in this workshop. Also discussed will be the numbers and demographics of this population and the factors that put them at continued risk for delinquency.

Moderator:

Spurgeon Kennedy, Program Manager, National Institute of Justice

Presenter:

Janet K. Wiig, Associate Director, Institute on Criminal Justice, University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis, MN

THURSDAY April 8, 1999

Panelist:

Samuel Payne, Youth Coordinator, Phyllis Wheatley Community Center, Minneapolis, MN

8:30 a.m.

Renaissance Ballroom East

3.14 Life Savers: Technology To Protect and Serve

This panel presents two BJA programs: the Bulletproof Vest Partnership and the 1122 Equipment Procurement Program. The panel will begin with a discussion of an everyday investigation into suspicious activity that turned life threatening in an instant. The investigation was conducted by two Falls Church, Virginia, police officers. This incident will provide the introduction to the Bulletproof Vest Partnership, a program administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance that helps states and units of local and tribal governments equip their law enforcement officers with armor vests. In this session, the program's end-to-end, Internet-based system will be presented. This will then be followed by a presentation of the 1122 Equipment Procurement Program, which provides single jurisdictions with the purchasing power of a large group when procuring law enforcement equipment. Following will be a discussion of how North Carolina proposes to combine the Vest and 1122 programs to provide maximum benefit to its jurisdictions and the law enforcement officers that serve them.

Presenters:

Robert T. Murray, Chief, Falls Church Police Department, Falls Church, VA

Neil R. Woodcock, Director, Law Enforcement Support Services, Department of Crime Control and Public Safety, Raleigh, NC

Michael Burdeen, Grant Program Specialist, State and Local Assistance Division, Bureau of Justice Assistance

Paul Belkin, Grant Program Specialist, State and Local Assistance Division, Bureau of Justice Assistance

Lluana McCann, Operations Chief, State and Local Assistance Division, Bureau of Justice Assistance

8:30 a.m.

Meeting Room 3

3.15 Youth Leadership Forum: A Report

This session is designed to broaden our perspective on youth-adult collaborations in youth violence prevention and examine the findings of the 12th National Youth Crime Prevention Conference's Youth Forum 1999. Participants will explore creative ways of working together with youth as partners to achieve common goals. Adults and youth will have the opportunity to discuss partnerships they have developed and what makes these partnerships work.

Moderator:

Michael Smith, 1999 Youth Forum Coordinator, 12th National Youth Crime Prevention Conference, Arlington, VA

Panelists:

Thomas Sweed, National Youth Forum, Denver, CO

Michael Serra, Youth Forum Representative, Meriden, CT

Tony Truong, Outreach to New Americans, Des Moines, IA

Tammy Tramble, National Youth Forum, Denver, CO

8:30am

Meeting Room 5

3.16 Supporting Crime Reduction and Drug Elimination at the Local Level: HUD's Role

This workshop will provide an overview of the work of HUD Community Safety and Conservation Division and its flagship anticrime program, the Public and Indian Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP). Panelists representing various public and Indian housing agencies will discuss important aspects of their PHDEP grants, including partnerships, prevention strategies, and law enforcement.

Moderator:

Sonia L. Burgos, Director, Community Safety and Conservation Division, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, DC

Panelists:

Nancy Odierno, Coordinator, Drug Elimination Program, Menominee Tribal Housing Authority, Keshena, WI

CONFERENCE AGENDA

Carl R. Greene, Executive Director, Philadelphia Housing Authority, Philadelphia, PA

Hezekiah Bunch, Jr., Chief, Housing Authority of Baltimore City Police Department, Baltimore, MD

Maude Saunders, Assistant Director for Resident Services, Richmond Housing Development, Richmond, VA

8:30 a.m. *Renaissance Ballroom West A & B*

3.17 Multi-Jurisdictional Task Forces (MJTFs) and High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTAs)

With the declaration of the war on drugs in 1987, state and local law enforcement agencies began searching for drug enforcement innovations that would make a dramatic and demonstrable difference in the nation’s drug problem. Representatives from MJTFs and HIDTAs and from the Office of National Drug Control Policy will consider how each enforcement approach was born, how it has evolved, and how these efforts can work together to address today’s drug enforcement challenges.

Moderator:

Hon. Saul A. Green, U.S. Attorney, Eastern District of Michigan, Detroit, MI

Panelists:

Robert J. Bodisch, Sr., Director, Texas Narcotics Control Program, Criminal Justice Division, Austin, TX

Thomas H. Carr, Director, Baltimore/Washington HIDTA, Greenbelt, MD

Eric J. Bergstrom, Assistant District Attorney, Multnomah County District Attorney’s Office, Portland, OR

8:30 a.m. *Meeting Room 8/9*

3.18 Who Are the Victims? Who Are the Offenders?: Applying Current Crime Data to Federal, State, and Local Policy

How do practitioners use crime trend data and crime mapping to plan interventions and make policy decisions? Presenters will review the most recent trends in crime and

victimization in the United States and discuss how they have used national and local trend data to plan and carry out crime control strategies.

Moderator:

Hon. Jan M. Chaiken, Director, Bureau of Justice Statistics

Panelists:

Richard Moore, Director, Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning Division, Des Moines, IA

Bethany Blakey, Director, Crime Mapping Research Center, National Institute of Justice

8:30 a.m. *Meeting Room 15*

3.19 Knowing the Unknown Offender: Building a History, Psychology, and Image of a Suspect by the Facts of the Case

Using information from cases long cold, along with cases from other jurisdictions and interviews with offenders convicted of similar crimes, it is possible to develop a surprisingly accurate profile of an unknown perpetrator. A representative of the Utah Criminal Tracking and Analysis Program will present the program’s systematic, multidisciplinary approach to profiling offenders in serious cases.

Presenters:

Mike King, Lieutenant, Utah Attorney General's Office, Salt Lake City, UT

Gregory M. Cooper, Chief, Provo Police Department, Provo, UT

8:30 a.m. *Meeting Room 16*

3.20 Making Connections: Managing Offender Reentry to the Community

This session will explore the issues and challenges facing communities, tribal and criminal justice systems, and service providers in preparing ex-offenders for their return to communities. How do we develop and support innovative practices and partnerships that ensure public

THURSDAY April 8, 1999

safety and offender accountability and better prepare ex-offenders, their families, and communities for successful reentry? How can we rethink the traditional institutional roles of criminal justice systems to actively engage with communities in a partnership that can bridge transitional services from within the prison to offender treatment, job training, housing placement, counseling, and other services in the community needed to reduce recidivism and restore ex-offenders to their role as citizens in the community?

Moderator:

Dr. Robert E. Roberts, Director, Project Return, New Orleans, LA

Panelists:

Dr. Mario A. Papanozzi, Assistant Professor, The College of New Jersey; President, American Probation and Parole Association, Sergeantsville, NJ

Hon. Gary L. Acevedo, Associate Judge, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Pablo, MT

B. Diane Williams, President/CEO, SAFER Foundation, Chicago, IL

Dennis Gabriel, Director, Addiction Services, Project Return, New Orleans, LA

Dr. Carmen Peña, Director, Bureau of Evaluation and Assessment, Administration of Corrections, Hato Rey, PR

10:00 a.m. Break

10:30 a.m. *Grand Ballroom*

Closing Keynote Address

Hon. Janet Reno
Attorney General of the United States

11:30 a.m. Adjournment

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOPS

Workshop 1.1—What Is Community Justice?

Moderator:

John S. Goldkamp, Professor of Criminal Justice
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Panelists:

Beverly Watts-Davis, Executive Director
San Antonio Fighting Back
San Antonio, Texas

Leonard E. Noisette, Director
Neighborhood Defender Service
New York, New York

Douglas F. Smith, Director
Arizona HIDTA Center
Tucson, Arizona

Michael Schrunk, District Attorney
Multnomah County
Portland, Oregon

Summary of Proceedings

Community justice efforts can take a variety of different programmatic forms when being implemented. However, the factor that makes them unique is the development and implementation process that gets community and institutional stakeholders working together to: (1) define the problems; (2) agree on desired results; (3) develop appropriate programs/strategies that are collaborative and community based to respond to the problems; and (4) evaluate and report results.

Panelists discussed the philosophy of community justice and presented specific examples of programs and strategies. All emphasized that involvement in community justice efforts is more complicated than it seems because it requires a definition of community, an identification of key institutional and community stakeholders, and an engagement process that ensures buy-in and long-term participation in the effort.

The engagement process usually begins with meetings between and among the stakeholders; however, it can begin with one-on-one conversations that set the stage for a meeting. The key requirement is that they begin a dialogue, leading to establishment of some trust and confidence that all involved are concerned about the same issues and working together to address commonly agreed upon outcomes for that particular community.

Because the development and success of community justice efforts are dependent on building relationships among individuals and organizations that may not have worked together before, community justice should be viewed as a long-term undertaking—it is not a quick fix. As explained by Douglas Smith from Tucson, “Long-term results come from people understanding

that they have an investment in their neighbors. They learn who each other is. . . . They realize they're all citizens in a common community.”

One can define community justice as being a way to involve individuals living and working in a particular area more directly in decisionmaking about criminal justice issues in their neighborhood. Since programs and strategies dealing with community justice issues are designed with local stakeholder participation, they will vary from one location to another, even when they go by the same name. For example, a community court in one neighborhood may have a different array of services than one in another place.

However it is named, “Community justice has completely revamped the way people look at the justice system,” said Beverly Watts-Davis of San Antonio. “They now see it as part of their communities rather than some ivory tower. They have seen their neighborhoods and their children become different as a result of their work.” Panelists presented specific examples that highlight different ways of achieving community-defined outcomes.

Common to each is the idea that success in any community-driven effort must involve a multitude of stakeholders, from both the public and private sectors, and that people and organizations have to work together in collaborations rather than in isolated, single-focused organizations.

Examples included:

- **Geo-based Policing**—the Tucson police department assigns officers to work with residents and community associations in specific geographic areas to identify perceptions of crime and issues related to justice.
- **Neighborhood Enhancement Teams**—created by the Tucson City Manager, these teams to pull together multiple service delivery organizations to work with neighborhood/community citizens to identify and address criminal justice issues.
- **Community Justice Boards**—local residents in Tucson work together to address locally defined problems related to justice issues.
- **Back to Basics Program**—this redesign of the Tucson city budgeting process to involve neighborhood/ community groups in defining spending priorities.
- **Community Prosecution Programs**—these efforts focus on the needs of both defendants and victims in Tucson to develop appropriate community-defined sentences as well as linkages to needed support and followup services.
- **Community Defender Program**—developed out of the New York public defender’s office, it relocates personnel into the neighborhoods and focuses on the multiple problems of the individuals and families involved in the justice system. It encourages proactive, prevention work with at-risk community members.

- Neighborhood District Attorney Program in Portland—the program sponsors community court projects and works with neighborhood/community advisory committees to define the issues that are important to the citizens and develop appropriate responses.
- San Antonio Fighting Back—developed initially to clean up parks and reclaim neighborhoods from drug dealers, the program has expanded to address multiple community problems.

In many of the programs and strategies noted above, the initial work focused on one issue—e.g., drugs, homelessness, prostitution, or juvenile crime. But communities ultimately found that it was not enough to work on a single issue. People were coming into the justice system with multiple problems, and therefore the response had to comprehensively address the needs of clients and their families through multiple intervention strategies.

An important implication of the need for multifaceted responses, however, is that the availability of adequate resources to address the problems becomes a critical issue; hence, there is a need to continually identify new stakeholders, both within and outside the community, to bring financial and human resources to the collaborative effort.

Other important findings included:

- Neighborhoods and communities are multicultural and multiethnic, so the task of building consensus will be difficult, but not impossible.
- The role of community residents as advocates within the justice system will increase, resulting in programs like the Court Watch Program, in which residents monitor decisions made by judges and note those that are community friendly.
- Neighborhoods/communities generally targeted for community-based programs tend to be complex, high-crime, economically depressed, multiproblem areas.
- Citizens within these areas tend to have a low degree of trust and confidence in the traditional justice system.
- The issues defined by these communities as important may be surprising because the more violent offenses may not be the highest priority; rather, the issues defined may be drugs, vandalism, graffiti, speeding, chronic nuisance/noise, and housing. Many citizens believe that if these problems are addressed, there will be a decrease in other more serious crime.

Workshop 1.2—Sharing the Burdens and the Benefits: Community Ownership of Crime Problems and Solutions

Moderator:

Michael Gottfredson
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Panelists:

Jimena Martinez, Director of
Technical Assistance
Center for Court Innovation
New York, New York

Peter Clavelle, Mayor
Burlington, Vermont

Michael E. Kelly, Assistant to the Mayor
Phoenix, Arizona

Charles P. Austin, Sr., Chief
Columbia Police Department
Columbia, South Carolina

Summary of Proceedings

Who is responsible for justice in our society? In the traditional justice model, the expectation is that law enforcement professionals will deter crime when possible and will quickly identify, arrest, and prosecute offenders when it does occur. Thus, historically, citizens and officials themselves have put ownership of justice problems in the hands of law enforcement professionals.

However, police and citizens alike are rethinking the traditional view. More places are implementing strategies such as community policing where, according to Charles Austin, Chief of the Columbia, South Carolina, police department, the prevailing philosophy is that “the police are only one part of the puzzle in addressing criminal justice issues. And, they’re probably not the main part of the puzzle. The most original ideas of how to best deal with criminal justice issues come from the community, not from the police.”

Community policing and other community justice strategies are built around the concept of community involvement. According to Austin, the guiding principles are based on the belief that “the real work is about engaging the community in identifying and solving its own issues/problems/concerns. It’s an active partnership between the community, the police department, and many others in the city. . . . What’s really needed is community-owned government, because government has to be supportive of and involved in the process in order to realize success.”

Jimena Martinez of the Center for Court Innovation in New York City argued that police and other institutional leaders must recognize that “any response has to begin with dialogue with

[the] community, e.g., meeting one on one with community members; having dialogues with public housing groups, clergy, local homeowners; talking to local elected officials, police, housing authority members, and local health/human service providers—anyone who has a stake in that neighborhood.” It is through these interactions that community members and professionals begin to understand each other, build relationships of trust, and realize that by working together they can accomplish more than they can by working separately.

Michael Kelly, Assistant to the Mayor in Phoenix, Arizona, used the term “communitarianism” to refer to people coming together to solve problems and becoming vested in the community. There is more to it than just being involved in dialogue about problems; it is, according to Kelly, about a balance of rights and responsibilities between citizens and government and organizations. This balance translates into relationships that encourage adherence to community standards and to a clear understanding of the consequences of not adhering to those standards. It is about citizens sharing ownership of justice issues in their communities.

One of the interesting implications of this shared ownership is that some issues identified as important will fall outside the traditional purview of law enforcement. Examples include citizens’ concerns about dropout rates, youth health problems, youth development, and youth recreation. According to the panelists, these issues cannot be ignored. In many ways they should be welcomed, because they provide the opportunity to expand ownership of the problems beyond the traditional criminal justice system. It is an opportunity to identify assets/resources within the community itself and to engage new stakeholders in seeking solutions to problems.

What is really being talked about is democracy in action, said Burlington, Vermont, Mayor Peter Clavelle. “Democracy doesn’t just involve voting,” he said. “It must involve a dialogue with citizens. It has to mean that government and citizens must work together to solve problems. There must be a broad spectrum of opportunities for citizens to voice their concerns. True democracy means turning the work of the community over to the community.”

Ultimately, said Michael Gottfredson of the University of Arizona in Tucson, “We’re headed toward taking the focus off the criminal justice system. The issues that need to be addressed do not rest with the criminal justice system alone. They’re issues that have implications for all who live in the community. If we’re going to have an effect, we’ve got to involve community people in helping identify and address the issues. No longer can we define it as a criminal justice system problem, . . . it’s a community problem.”

Panelists briefly described several programs that are working well in local communities:

- The Community Justice Center in Burlington, Vermont, a far-reaching resource for citizens, addresses neighborhood preservation and quality-of-life issues. It houses community boards/associations, volunteer boards, family counseling services, mediation and conflict resolution services, and various classes and workshops. It also deals with minor offenses through its tailored sentencing program that ensures offenders make amends to their victims and repair the harm done to the community.

- The Youth Street Worker Program, also in Burlington, involves police, schools, the United Way, community-based organizations, and businesses and provides outreach workers in the downtown area to address the problems of at-risk youth through counseling, referral, and conflict resolution services.
- The Community Based Action Teams (CBAT) in Burlington operate proactively to involve collaborations in solving community problems, including community cleanup initiatives.
- The Knock and Talk Program in Phoenix targets high-crime areas and sends police to knock on residents' doors and discuss neighborhood problems with them.
- The Shoring Up the Village Program, also in Phoenix, allows individuals to file complaints in small claims court when they observe criminal activity occurring in their community.
- The Community Justice Centers in New York deal with community-defined problems and provide sentencing for low-level, quality-of-life offenses.

“Crime is a byproduct of neglected, unaddressed social issues,” said Austin. “The idea of hiring more police officers and building more prisons is not the solution. The new strategies that include cooperative efforts between police and community are working. Therein lies our long-term answers.”

Workshop 1.3—Engaging the Leaders of Tomorrow in Problem Solving Today: The Role of Our Youth in Community Justice

Moderator:

David Singh, Special Assistant to the Director
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Shaking Graham, Youth Organizer
Bronx Youth Force
New York, New York

Leonard Seumanutafa, Program Specialist
Criminal Justice Planning Agency
Pago Pago, American Samoa

Kim McGillicuddy, Lead Organizer
Bronx Youth Force
New York, New York

Linda K. Bowen, Executive Director
National Funding Collaborative on
Violence Prevention
Washington, D.C.

James C. Keener, Byrne Program
Coordinator
Criminal Justice Planning Agency
Pago Pago, American Samoa

Summary of Proceedings

Many of the problems prompting a focus on community justice involve negative youth behaviors that affect the quality of life in neighborhoods. Correspondingly, panelists urged participants to avoid stereotyping youth and involve them directly in collaborations to develop prevention programs and solve community problems.

“The vast majority of youth do not engage in criminal activity,” said David Singh, Special Assistant to the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance. “And, those youth are not part of the problem, but they certainly can be part of the solution.”

Linda Bowen, Executive Director of the National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention, noted that her organization requires that youth be involved in the collaborations it funds. Young people bring fresh perspectives that can prompt new solutions. She cautioned, however, that both youth and adults must be trained and prepared to work together, because neither is accustomed to doing meaningful work in partnership with each other.

“Before youth can be involved effectively in community justice efforts, several questions must be answered,” she said. “What ages are included in the definition of youth? Will parental permission for participation be needed? If a broad age range is included, is it necessary to tailor training and orientation for different age groups? How can adults be prepared to work meaningfully with youth? How can diversity among youth participants be ensured? Should ‘at-risk’ and/or ‘problem’ youth be included in the effort? How should youth participants be selected? Most importantly, what roles can youth be expected to assume within the collaboration?”

Youth roles in community problem solving generally take one of the following forms, according to Bowen:

- (1) Youth input—adults merely seek information, data, and perspectives from youth to use in the adult-driven decisionmaking process. “If input is all that is expected,” Bowen said, “it is important to demonstrate that youth opinions and perspectives are addressed when decisions are made. Otherwise, the process becomes patronizing for youth, and they may simply feel as though they have been used.”
- (2) Youth as advisers—a bit more formal structure for hearing from youth, in that clear channels of communication are developed and advisory roles are defined.
- (3) Parallel youth process—a separate structure or parallel process, generally focused on helping youth learn to make decisions responsibly, is designed and implemented. Usually, this means that youth merely make recommendations and adults still have the final decisions.
- (4) Youth as full partners—youth are brought into the process with equal rights, responsibilities, and privileges.

Two speakers from the Bronx Youth Force, Shaking Graham and Kim McGillicuddy, said their organization resulted from a community process that took youth perspectives seriously. The Youth Force has gone beyond traditional justice issues, and it is not unusual for members to work on projects such as poverty alleviation, improvement of both mental and physical health, and neighborhood cleanup.

The multiple components of the project include: a youth court; legal education, including the issuing of photo IDs for young residents; a street outreach program; court support; community organizing; advocacy; and a street university to teach youth how to conduct community and economic development activities. She emphasized that, in all the programs, youth are involved not only in designing them but also in running them.

Two panelists from Pago Pago, American Samoa—Leonard Seumanutafa and James C. Keener of the Criminal Justice Planning Agency—argued that culture is critical in defining the role of youth. While people in the United States tend to regard youth involvement in community justice issues as extraordinary, in Samoa a more communal culture naturally assigns important roles to youth in community problem solving. For example, youth provide security and other services for

each of 70 villages. In Samoan culture, they said, community service is the norm even for children as young as 7 years.

Regardless of the culture, however, the panelists emphasized that youth are often overlooked resources in the community. They often know the issues well, have good ideas about solutions, and are willing to become involved.

Workshop 1.4 — Building Community Support for Law Enforcement

Moderator:

Joseph Brann, Director
Office of Community Oriented
Policing Services (COPS)
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Mary Lopez, Director
Safe Futures Consortium
University of Nebraska
Omaha, Nebraska

Michael J. Farrell, Deputy Commissioner
Policy and Planning Division
New York City Police Department
New York, New York

Patricia Coats Jessamy, State's Attorney
Baltimore, Maryland

Gerald Cunningham, Senior Associate
Church Action for Safe and Just
Communities
Homeland Ministries
Indianapolis, Indiana

Summary of Proceedings

Panelists identified the key elements in building community support for law enforcement within a community justice model and argued that law enforcement must make room for citizens to be the “coproducers of public safety.”

“Too often,” said Joseph Brann of the COPS Program, “people feel policing is done *to* a community rather than *with* a community.” That mindset must be changed by establishing active partnerships in which all parties have equal and independent status with shared obligations. In developing these partnerships, a critical goal is to align community expectations and the realities of policing, while also insisting that police meet expectations that are realistic.

“The community expects first and foremost from its police, results,” said Michael Farrell, Deputy Commissioner for policy and planning in the New York City Police Department. “Community support can be built on achieving those results. That support must be built in a complex political environment in which the ‘community’ is not a monolith but a matrix of neighborhood associations, business groups, universities, churches, hospitals, and individuals, each of which may have different needs and expectations,” Farrell said. Meeting community expectations is crucial to the success of community policing programs. To accomplish that, the message from police leadership must be strong and unambiguous in its support.

Patricia Coats Jessamy, State's Attorney in Baltimore, Maryland, said the key lesson from her experience was to listen more than she talked when dealing with the community.

"It is common," she said, "to hear community members say they want everyone locked up and kept in jail forever." Criminal justice leaders need to educate communities about what is possible, and simultaneously solve the real problems that communities identify as most important. Very often those are the nuisance crimes that damage a neighborhood's quality of life. "What community justice initiatives do is, they make communities feel as though they are getting some results, even though it's not jail time," she said.

Baltimore hired community coordinators to work in each police district, trying to make the system more proactive and offensive, rather than reactive and defensive. They have helped residents prioritize their concerns and develop solutions. From this program, three benefits districts were established. In one, community members chose to pay more taxes in return for improvements in specific services, including law enforcement, security, and others such as trash collection.

The community coordinators try to have offenders who are assigned to do community service perform in the community where the crime was committed because of research showing that people are less likely to commit crimes in the areas where they work. The coordinators issued community impact statements, and they wrote a statute providing for an expedited civil procedure to charge owners of drug houses; it also gave community associations authority to file civil actions against the owners on their own behalf. "That's where listening to the community makes a difference," Jessamy said.

"Baltimore generally takes a three-pronged approach to crime: prevention, treatment, and early intervention," Jessamy said. Establishing trust between the community and law enforcement has been one of the key ingredients of success. Partnerships were formed in which every agency agreed to devote financial and personnel resources to the initiative. It forced the agencies and communities to begin talking with each other, to understand what was being done, to establish trust, and to ensure that individuals who damaged the community were held accountable.

Mary Lopez said the keys to successful working partnerships are:

- Clearly defining the roles of each person and eliminating turf issues.
- Assigning rights and responsibilities to each.
- Establishing clear goals at the beginning.
- Framing the issues in a way that can command support.
- Supporting leadership.
- Evaluating the process and outcomes.
- Planning strategies to deal with the media and the public at large.

Dr. Gerald Cunningham, of Church Action for Safe and Just Communities in Indianapolis, argued that church participation in community partnerships can be critical for success. “Also important,” he said, “is a clear definition of success and a timeline with an endpoint; community members are more likely to stick with a program when they can see the end.”

Workshop 1.5—Power Sharing Between Law Enforcement, the Courts, and the Community

Moderator:

Maria Theresa Viramontes, Executive Director
East Bay Public Safety Corridor Partnership
Oakland, California

Panelists:

Hon. Wilma A. Lewis, U.S. Attorney
District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

Scott Lyons, Chief
Duluth Police Department
Duluth, Minnesota

Hon. Raymond Norko, Judge
Community Court
Hartford, Connecticut

Summary of Proceedings

Increasingly, success in launching domestic violence programs, community court systems, and crime and violence prevention efforts requires sharing resources among courts, law enforcement agencies and their officers, and the community at large. That sharing takes the form of money; human, technical, and material resources; and rights and responsibilities that give them power. Panelists offered their experiences and strategies for effectively sharing power and governance across disciplines, interests, and jurisdictions. Underlying the success of such strategies are the existence of a shared mission, goals, and objectives fostered by open and direct communication, mutual respect, and the development and maintenance of good relationships.

Wilma Lewis illustrated the importance of collaborative efforts in the establishment of a domestic violence court system in the District of Columbia, which attempts to be rational and responsive. “Although the District’s domestic violence system was initiated by the local court and coordinated by the Domestic Violence Coordinating Council (Coordinating Council), the system profited greatly from the passage of the Violence Against Women Act in 1994 (VAWA),” she said. Three hooks secured the success of the District’s domestic violence system: public and judicial perception of serious domestic violence issues, federal funding provided by VAWA to state and local agencies, and the ability to attract and maintain managerial interest and commitment.

Coordinating Council membership drew from the Superior Court, the U.S. Attorney’s Office, the city’s corporation counsel, the police department, the Public Defender’s Service, and the D.C. Coalition Against Domestic Violence (a consortium made up of domestic violence service providers) as well as from law school clinics, shelters, and hospitals. Key to the council’s success

was a clear statement of objectives—namely, increasing the safety of victims and holding abusers accountable for their conduct.

Victims often do not seek assistance from the justice system because of its complex, confusing, and inconsistent nature. Traditionally, criminal cases were assigned randomly to judges and prosecutors on the basis of crime severity; civil cases that involved protection orders, divorce issues, child custody, and support matters often were assigned to four different judges. A single victim, therefore, who sought criminal prosecution and related civil relief faced at least five different judges, all at different times. Lack of information sharing among the judges on cases relating to the same victim also produced inconsistent orders.

The council's plan to remedy these systemic and structural problems provided for: (1) a centralized domestic violence intake center that provided victim counseling and other services and a single filing of all related cases; (2) a domestic court system in which all civil and criminal cases relating to the same victim proceeded on parallel tracks, heard together at the same place and time by judges focused on and trained in domestic violence; and (3) a single domestic violence unit in the U.S. Attorney's Office with prosecutors trained in domestic violence. Finally, information on related cases is available to the presiding judge to guard against the issuance of inconsistent orders.

At the intake center, victims can receive counseling, assistance, and services; request preparation and filing of child protection and custody documents, civil protection orders, divorce papers, and paternity-related papers as needed; pursue criminal prosecution through an advocate for the U.S. Attorney's Office; and report the incidents to the police. This paperwork is forwarded to the court's domestic violence coordination unit for case processing and assignment of a single court date for all related criminal and civil matters.

“Some of the lessons learned from this collaboration include the importance of active participation, coordination, and cooperation of all involved entities, the need for a common vision, and a process for resolving conflicts in authority among various agencies,” Lewis said. For example, the corporation counsel may initiate a civil case for violations of civil protection orders just as the U.S. Attorney's Office may seek criminal prosecution of such violations where they constitute criminal contempt. To resolve this conflict in authority, an early determination is made on the handling and tracking of a particular matter. The council also balanced sharing information among agencies and promoting joint interagency collaborations, on one hand, with respecting the agency's individual focus and mission on the other.

In Hartford, Connecticut, which was facing the loss of industry and rising crime, including gang violence, the establishment of a community court resulted from community pressure and federal grants, according to the Hon. Raymond Norko of the Community Court. The city's community planning process involved a wide range of interests that had to be accommodated. Its plan included:

- Standardizing existing legislation and ordinances to address inconsistencies.
- Uniformly changing all quality-of-life ordinances to include community service as well as fines or jail.
- Reflecting state and federal agendas within the community court.
- Finding a common language and interests among different entities of different competencies.
- Respecting confidentiality laws.

Regarding privacy and data release issues, memoranda of understanding between agencies should be developed. Although an entity may have a blanket approval from a particular agency on the release of data, Maria Theresa Viramontes strongly advised procurement of a specific clearance on the release of particular data. Notwithstanding existing and signed memoranda of understanding, relevant agencies should first be notified and invited to a meeting on the release of data, particularly when such data are of a controversial, embarrassing, or structurally difficult nature.

Collaborative efforts among agencies and across disciplines are necessary to successfully create, implement, and maintain these programs. Yet such collaboration is complicated, panelists said, by the preexisting responsibilities of participating work groups and the absence of line management.

Workshop 1.6—Community Justice in Rural America

Moderator:

Walter Dickey
University of Wisconsin Law School
Madison, Wisconsin

Panelists:

Roch O. Clapp, Director
Boise County Office of
Community Justice
Idaho City, Idaho

Trudy Jackson
Trudy's Kitchen
Idaho City, Idaho

Hon. George W. Neilson, Presiding Judge
22nd Judicial District
Madras, Oregon

Garland Brunoe, Vice Chair of the Tribal
Council
Confederated Tribe of Warm Springs
Warm Springs, Oregon

Summary of Proceedings

With the influx of people, rising crime rates, and increasing concern about civility in small-town and rural America, communities have been experimenting with different models of community justice, seeking ways to restore the quality of life many people associate with such areas.

Community justice pilot programs have been established in several communities, including Boise County, Idaho, and Jefferson County, Oregon, which the panelists discussed as potential models. Both areas are poor, rural, and somewhat isolated.

“A clear lesson from these programs is that ‘one size does not fit all,’ ” said moderator Walter Dickey of the University of Wisconsin Law School. Different communities have different needs and resources to draw on. However, in each case, the impetus for establishing some sort of community justice system arose out of a dissatisfaction with the functioning of the criminal justice system, particularly in juvenile court. Communities sought alternatives that were more responsive, constructive, and individualized, and that provided earlier intervention in the lives of troubled children and their families.

“Getting townspeople involved is essential to making community justice work,” Dickey said. At community meetings, concerns went beyond the standard nuts and bolts of policing. The decline of civility in modern life was a primary worry. Many people have moved back to small towns in order to be part of a close-knit community, and instead have found declining respect and civility. “Once community concerns are noted and addressed, problem solving can begin and civility can be restored,” he said.

The focus should be on prevention. The Boise County, Idaho, Office of Community Justice has evolved to include a mixture of prevention and juvenile justice services, Roch Clapp noted. One example is the Healthy Families Initiative. It is a home visitation program Clapp started that was first aimed at preparing teen mothers, then broadened to cover first-time parents of all ages. Healthy Families would like to expand, adding programs for children aged 3 to 5.

“Correcting dysfunctional family situations early can minimize the odds of children eventually entering the justice system,” said Trudy Jackson, a Steering Committee for Community Justice member, single mother, and owner of Trudy’s Kitchen, a restaurant in Idaho City, Idaho. “Listening is the critical skill required,” she said, “because so many young people are lacking role models and mentors and need someone simply to talk to. Once kids see that adults really care about them, respect follows.”

“In rural areas, community support is especially important,” Clapp said, “because volunteers do most of the work in programs such as Healthy Families. Recruitment depends on a positive word-of-mouth process.”

Mediation between first-time offenders and victims is another element in community justice models. After George Neilson, Presiding Judge in Madras, Oregon, saw too many repeat offenders and the children of those offenders in his courtroom, he expanded his court’s services to include prevention. Rather than being just a processor of cases, Neilson wanted to see positive outcomes in his court.

Instead of quickly looking at the defendant, the criminal act, and the consequences, Neilson started examining more factors, such as the impact of the criminal act, who was affected, what led to the act, and what could be done to prevent it. By adopting this perspective, responsibility for criminal justice expanded beyond the court into the community. Neilson also uses mediation and education programs to reduce caseloads in divorce court. In civil and small claims courts, Neilson noted, mediation is used to settle 80 percent of cases. “People are walking away from the court system smiling instead of hating everybody,” he said.

“Reconciliation between offender and victim is also important,” said Garland Brunoe, Vice Chair of the Tribal Council in Warm Springs, Oregon. “In the tribal justice system,” he said, “reconciliation is a key element in achieving closure and perhaps deterring future incidents.” Despite the closeness of familial ties within the tribe and the culture of respect for elders, Native American crime rates are dramatically higher than for other ethnic groups in the United States.

Dickey spoke of the need for citizens and community institutions to assume a “guardianship” role. Getting schools involved is important because they already have an infrastructure from which to offer services to children. But the need for services often becomes obvious once they are offered. In Madras, for example, Neilson helped start a Boys and Girls Club to give young people something to do after school. Within a few weeks, 350 children were enrolled. Plans are under way to create a parks and recreation district to expand afterschool opportunities.

“Acknowledgment that a problem does exist” is the key step toward creating something new, Brunoe said. The community must first acknowledge that something is wrong with the system and that changes are needed. And leadership is needed at every level for community justice to work. Jackson spoke of Clapp’s “powerful presence in Boise County.” She said when people saw that he was responding to the community’s needs, how hard he worked, and the results he was getting, they were more likely to pitch in.

Dickey envisions four possible evolutionary paths for community justice in rural America. It may fade away if townspeople do not believe it works. It may become an adjunct to the existing justice system. It may focus more on prevention of social problems. It may become a community problem-solving mechanism. None of these outcomes are inevitable, Dickey said, but a combination of the last three outcomes is the most likely.

Workshop 1.7—Community Policing in the 21st Century

Moderator:

Hon. Jeremy Travis, Director
National Institute of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Charles H. Ramsey, Chief
Metropolitan Police Department
Washington, D.C.

Henry Izumizaki, Executive Director
Eureka Bay Area
San Francisco, California

Gil Kerlikowske, Deputy Director
of Support Services
Office of Community Oriented Policing
Services
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Summary of Proceedings

Police departments must reorganize at a fundamental level, policing must be better integrated with other community services, and citizens must become more deeply involved at the leadership level in order to fully implement the philosophical shift toward community policing well under way throughout the nation. Ultimately, this will mean a different form of governance altogether, in which decisions are made as a “community of the whole,” a panel of law enforcement experts argued.

Traditionally, police departments have had command-and-control structures, with personnel relatively isolated in bureaus. They were essentially reactive, and their performance was measured by numbers: of stops, arrests, et cetera. Over time, departments developed stronger partnerships with community service agencies and community leaders, and have shifted toward a more proactive problem-solving approach. In addition, community activists have become more sophisticated, addressing with police not only particular crime problems but also the environmental factors, such as abandoned buildings, that contribute to them.

“But the implementation of community policing has been limited by inadequate resources, some resistance from older officers, and especially by an organizational structure that has frustrated officers,” Charles Ramsey said. Instead of becoming a new way of doing business for entire departments, community policing has remained limited to patrol divisions, and even there, “the beat officer didn’t seem to get it” because of conflicting reward systems, poor information flow, mixed messages, and obstacles to cooperation with other police divisions and community agencies.

“In Washington, D.C., and other cities, police departments are changing to a geographically based, community-organization model,” he said. Washington, D.C., has established three Regional Operation Command Centers, each with an assistant chief in charge, which bring together personnel from all parts of the department to focus on smaller geographical areas and their neighborhoods. The city’s mayor is now redeploying personnel from other city agencies’ central offices to work with police in the regional centers.

“It is not only police reorganization that is necessary to move community policing to the next level, but also more extensive community organizing and a change in behaviors and attitudes,” Henry Izumizaki argued. Izumizaki, former head of the San Francisco Citizens Crime Prevention Commission under Mayor George Moscone in the 1970s, said the lessons from those days of community organizing can be applied now to make community policing more effective. He recalled how, at a time of tremendous upheaval in the police department, that city established civilian offices in each of the city’s nine precincts and trained them to organize blocks in their precincts. In 3 years, they organized 500 blocks, crime reporting increased substantially, and citizens became far more involved in directing police resources. With initial successes, their interests expanded beyond crime prevention to include other services, such as garbage collection and disaster preparedness.

“Community policing” and “comprehensive services,” the goals of nearly every community, are unlikely to be effective unless there is substantial citizen involvement at the leadership level, and unless that involvement leads to a more caring, neighborhood-oriented set of attitudes and behaviors, he said. “This is about how to rebuild neighborhoods.”

Gil Kerlikowske noted that, like many institutions, police departments tend to seize on single ideas, or programs, or solutions as one-size-fits-all solutions—for example, “zero tolerance” or new technology such as the CompStat system. Such singular approaches often are adopted in the wake of dramatic tragedies. But community policing is a more systematic approach, and in order to thrive, “it’s going to have to become much more institutionalized,” he said. Problem solving and collaboration should become the way of doing business, not an additional burden on police. Ultimately, it can lead to communities in which decisions are made as a “committee of the whole.”

Such an approach will require both more, and more reliable, measures of performance. “The reality is we’re still being measured by the numbers to a large extent,” Ramsey said, and as a result, “we’re sending mixed messages” to officers in the field, asking them to do proactive problem solving but then measuring them primarily by traditional criteria such as number of arrests. “Success,” he said, “is when an elderly couple can sit on their front porch in southeast Washington without worrying about getting shot,” and departments need ways both to measure and to reward police performance that achieves that type of result.

New technologies such as CompStat offer more sophisticated methods for measuring the same criteria, rather than criteria more suited to community policing, such as public satisfaction with police. The National Institute of Justice is developing a core set of metrics and has begun testing them in five cities, Jeremy Travis noted. Ultimately, this approach should allow communities to

implement “evidence-based policing” and determine whether problem-solving activities are having an effect on the problems. But an even more fundamental problem with performance measures is that a great deal of police data are not recorded accurately, Kerlikowske noted, making it difficult to develop reliable evidence.

Several key structures in police departments are inadequate to support a comprehensive community policing approach, the panel argued. “Many lack adequate and sufficiently dispersed computer power and funding is often piecemeal and temporary, for example,” Kerlikowske said. Ramsey agreed: “The foundation we were trying to build this new strategy on was not well supported,” so many operations get larger and more complex and then collapse under their own weight. “I think the system is largely dysfunctional [in terms of matching resources and needs]. No one’s really got the real vision to move forward.”

While the panel emphasized organizational barriers to implementing community policing, they acknowledged that resistance among the rank and file also has slowed its adoption. “Many recruits come to policing with the same television-induced misconceptions that much of the public has,” Ramsey said. “Out of fear of both danger and criticism, they often stereotype citizens, making it difficult to develop the personal relationships required for effective community policing. The majority of officers are interested in public service but need more education and guidance.”

The short tenure of many police chiefs—2.5 years in large cities, 4.9 years overall—enhances the power of resisters, who assume they can outlast their chiefs, and makes other officers skeptical of change. Izumizaki argued that such instability makes even those who are sympathetic extremely skeptical about the commitment to change, while Ramsey argued that organizational barriers are more important than short tenures or resistance among the rank and file.

Workshop 1.8—Restorative Justice From the Victim’s Perspective

Moderator:

Kathryn Turman, Acting Director
Office for Victims of Crime
Office of Justice Programs
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Susan Herman, Executive Director
National Center for Victims of Crime
Arlington, Virginia

Clementine Barfield-Dye, President
Save Our Sons and Daughters
Detroit, Michigan

Ellen Halbert, Director
Victim Witness Program
District Attorney’s Office
Travis County
Austin, Texas

Summary of Proceedings

After a quarter century of work to make sure victims’ voices are heard in the criminal justice system, “the doors to restorative justice do not yet open as wide as even those to the courthouse,” said Susan Herman, Executive Director of the National Center for Victims of Crime. Restorative justice often is too narrowly conceived as a palliative for victims rather than as a method for repairing harm and restoring lives. Panelists outlined its concept, its implementation, and the prospects for making it a standard part of mainstream justice, and two victims described the programs they have founded to help others.

“Restorative justice holds promise as a set of values that strengthen bonds, that serve as the foundation of community, and that can ultimately serve as an alternative justice system,” Herman said. Key principles include empathy, mutual understanding, restitution, and accountability. She stressed the triad of victim, offender, and community, and said the highest priority should be placed on “maintaining or restoring individual human dignity.”

There are few programs, and those that exist are often very good, but most fall short of their goals in part because there are so many reasons one of the parties might not participate. Most victims do not participate in any formal process to resolve the issues around victimization for a variety of reasons: the victim does not report the crime, the offender is not found or is not arrested, the district attorney chooses not to prosecute, or the case never makes it to trial. Also, in the traditional restorative justice model, the offender admits culpability and wants to participate in the process; because that is rare, the number of eligible cases remains small.

But the restorative justice model needs to be expanded, Herman said. “Repairing the harm often is far more complicated than apologies and restitution and relationship-building,” said Herman. Very often victims need sophisticated counseling, relocation assistance, or emergency day care. Programs may need to deal with a wide variety of crime-related expenses, including substance abuse treatment for those who use alcohol or drugs after the trauma of the crime, escort services for those too afraid to leave home, or something as basic as new locks and doors.

The restorative justice model often addresses only the short-term damage, not the harm that a single, violent moment can generate for a lifetime. Instead of focusing on the acknowledgment of harm and apologies—however important—the central question should be: What do you need to rebuild your life? “It is certainly appropriate for offenders and the communities to help victims become whole again,” Herman said. Many of these needs cannot be met by individual offenders and communities because they bring limited resources to the table. However, without appropriate resources, restorative justice will be unsatisfying.

The model also should be expanded so that restorative justice programs can occur with or without the victims and offenders being present in face-to-face meetings, as long as they are represented in proceedings. Restoring justice to victims should be independent of this personal interaction, be based on an analysis of the victim’s needs, begin as early in the process as possible, and be supported by adequate funding and government resources.

Kathryn Turman of the Office for Victims of Crime in Washington, D.C., outlined the Federal Government’s initiatives to enhance the system of restorative justice. These include:

- Managing and executing restoration orders at the local, state, and federal levels.
- Developing methods for identifying assets and increasing collections for victim compensation.
- Establishing guidelines for victim/offender mediation training that is victim sensitive.
- Developing victim impact classes.
- Bringing community impact panels into community courts.
- Establishing focus groups on the victim’s role.
- Providing consultants for those who need technical assistance to start or expand programs.

Thirteen years ago, Ellen Halbert was attacked in her home, beaten, raped, and left for dead. With that act, Halbert said, she was thrust into “the criminal justice universe,” a system, which, at best, is “confusing and unpredictable.” She was barred from the courtroom at the offender’s trial and decided that victims’ voices were not being heard. “We didn’t have a back seat; we really had no seat at all,” she said.

Five years later she was appointed as the first victim representative to a board that oversaw adult corrections in Texas. That began her educational journey into the other end of the criminal justice system. Her experience has been frustrating and has produced few answers to her questions: “If prisons are the answer, why aren’t we the safest country in the world? If prison works, why is recidivism so high? And, most importantly, where are the voices of the victims?”

“We had been thinking as a society that we needed to get meaner and meaner to offenders to scare them into acting right,” she said. “But we know that fear is not a very good motivator. We’ve found that relationships shape behavior more than fear.” Although initially unfamiliar with the label “restorative justice,” Halbert wanted a program to bring victims, offenders, and community members together to repair the harm, so that the measure of success was the degree of repair, not the degree of punishment.

She brought “circle sentencing” to her Texas community, and jump-started the program with the tough case of a crack addict charged with burglary. The offender was eager to participate. The circle consisted of 26 people, representing the offender, the victims, and the community. Victims spoke from the heart about their experiences, she recalled, and, in turn, the offender explained his life as an addict, and attempted to use that as an excuse for his criminal behavior—a tactic that “did not fly” with the group. The offender’s mother and sister spoke about their disappointment in him and the life he had chosen. In the end, the group insisted that he seek treatment while serving his sentence. He now writes to the victims and other members of the circle, promising to live a better life when he gets out. No matter the outcome, Halbert said, the circle was a powerful experience for the participants. “It is restorative justice at its best,” she said.

It does not always work as well, she noted. The process often lacks judicial support, is time-consuming, does not serve enough victims, and rarely receives sufficient funding.

Halbert’s program also offers victim/offender mediation behind prison walls. Most who go through it report that the meeting was generally helpful, and 91 percent of victims have said meeting the offender helped them heal. There are 300 victims on the waiting list for the program, but it has been difficult to convince skeptics who seek proof of its efficacy.

Like Halbert, giving victims a voice in the justice process was also the goal of Clementine Barfield-Dye, President of Save Our Sons and Daughters (SOSAD). She formed the group after one of her teenage sons was shot to death and the other was wounded and still carries a bullet in his neck. Feeling the need to restore herself and her family to “wholeness,” she worked to bring the issue of crime victims’ rights to the forefront. She discovered even family members do not want to talk about what has happened, and that there was a need to align with other victims in order to heal.

Workshop 1.9—Offenders Repaying the Community: Meaningful Community Service Programs

Moderator:

Dennis Maloney, Chief Probation Officer
Juvenile Community Justice
Bend, Oregon

Panelists:

James Green, Deputy Director
Community Service Programs
Office of Alternative Sanctions
Weathersfield, Connecticut

Barbara Broderick, State Director of Adult
Probation
Supreme Court of Arizona
Phoenix, Arizona

Anne McDiarmid, Program Services
Manager
Dakota County Community Corrections
South St. Paul, Minnesota

Summary of Proceedings

Community service programs are at the heart of many efforts to establish alternative sentencing programs that can repair harm done to the community, noted moderator Dennis Maloney. Panelists outlined successful programs in Connecticut, Minnesota, and Arizona that meet needs identified by communities, teach skills to inmates in a structured environment, are linked with other services such as general equivalency diploma preparation or medical intervention, and focus more on repairing harm and restoring value rather than on punishment.

Connecticut

Connecticut has one of the most successful and recognized alternative sentencing programs, which was launched in response to severe prison crowding, and community service is a key part of it. About one-third of the least violent offenders participate, according to James Green, Deputy Director of Community Service Programs. Instead of assigning offenders the most mundane or dirtiest work as a form of punishment, the state sought out projects offenders would like and from which they could learn marketable skills. The projects needed to be visible to the public and state legislators who funded it.

“You accomplish a great deal if you let the public know that [the program] can be productive, and let the offenders know that they can be productive,” Green said. Once a year, the state assembles work crews in one large project, partly in order to generate publicity and public support. The program now includes projects at every state park; at the Nutmeg Games, a statewide sporting event; and at the Connecticut Special Olympics.

At the Nutmeg Games, inmates handle the money, run the concession stands, make the food, and help manage the event. The books have balanced every time, Green noted. At the Special Olympics, the involvement is similar, but inmates benefited additionally by seeing those who successfully faced even greater challenges. Other offenders are trained as firefighters, to clean up after forest fires are extinguished, and to build watchtowers. In some cases, offenders have proposed projects the state had not considered. Last summer, Green recalled, a camp for inner-city children shut down when a member of the board absconded with its money. One of the offenders in Green's program asked if the program could assemble community service crews to reopen and run the camp. The state ensures a year-round cycle of work by including both indoor and outdoor projects.

Dakota County, Minnesota

In Dakota County, Minnesota, the community service program has been so successful that there are more offenders in community services than are incarcerated, said Anne McDiarmid, Program Services Manager of the Dakota County Corrections Department. The program is part of a restorative justice model program, which includes victim restitution funds, revenue-generating projects, precourt victim-impact programs, and the "Generations Together" initiative.

McDiarmid's staff enter the process before an offender's court hearing by conducting a victim impact investigation. They contact the victim and try to identify appropriate restitution, which they then recommend to the court. Low-risk, nonviolent offenders are placed in community businesses and paid by those businesses. Their earnings, together with moneys from the return of stolen merchandise and other sources, go toward restitution, either directly to the victim if ordered by the court or to a restitution fund, which is distributed to victims by the corrections department. Communities benefit because important projects are completed, and in turn, McDiarmid noted, the offender is "undemonized" in the eyes of the community. Offenders are put to work in a wide variety of projects, but "we try to make the work meaningful," McDiarmid said; for example, offenders helped clean up after recent floods.

In the "Generations Together" program, youth offenders and elderly people are teamed. A teen may be responsible for getting an elder slowed by arthritis to and from the store, and will assist in grocery shopping. The young people also are given job preparation training—and taught interviewing and application skills—as basic skills training.

Arizona

Arizona's community service program evolved in the context of a larger reevaluation of justice in the state. With increasing concern about dealing more effectively with crime, the state's Chief Justice created the Arizona Judicial Council with members from many interests, and it developed the Justice 2002 Strategic Agenda with three goals: (1) protect children, families, and communities; (2) provide access to swift and fair justice; and (3) be more accountable to communities. The program called for more restitution with strict monitoring and community service. The state's role was to provide a vision and resources to do the job, set up statewide

performance measures, work with the media, and then “get out of the way,” recalled Barbara Broderick, State Director of Adult Probation.

The range of community service projects is broad, and must be useful to both large and small cities and rural towns, Broderick said. With substantial funding, projects include:

- Project Fuel Wood (in rural areas). Residents of a rural county told the state they needed wood for home heating. Offenders now cut down cords of pine and juniper trees, which are then delivered to those who most need firewood. The large challenge, Broderick said, was convincing the judicial department to pay for axes, chainsaws, and wood chippers.
- Good Neighbor programs (in farming communities). Houses were repaired and painted, fencing was restored, and schools were renovated, at a savings of about \$108,000 to the communities.
- Search and Rescue Squad (for youth offenders). Offenders work in the Grand Canyon and Yosemite as part of the park service, patrolling the areas, and helping hikers who are in distress, lost, or in need of water.
- Project Art (in metropolitan areas). The project identifies painters, graphic designers, and other artists and provides an opportunity to sell their work through silent auctions sponsored by nonprofits.
- Nonprofit Registry (in metropolitan areas). The registry lists more than 2,000 nonprofit organizations that need community service workers. Offenders choose the jobs they want to complete their work program.

Workshop 1.10—Community Policing in Rural America

Moderator:

Dr. Lee Colwell, Director
National Center for Rural Law Enforcement
Criminal Justice Institute
University of Arkansas
Little Rock, Arkansas

Panelists:

M. Kay Harris
Associate Professor of Criminal Justice
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Simon Brown, Lieutenant
Alaska State Troopers
Anchorage, Alaska

Summary of Proceedings

Crime rates have risen sharply in rural areas, the crime has become rougher and more violent, and rural law enforcement agencies are struggling to keep up, despite insufficient personnel and resources. There are several special challenges as well, including great distances between communities and isolation. In this situation, community policing is a longstanding necessity, not an option, but one that can be practiced more effectively with more resources, more involvement by the public, and better measures of performance.

The crime rate in rural areas has risen 53 percent in the last 10 years, and in the first 6 months of 1998 alone, murder increased by 8 percent in towns with populations of fewer than 10,000 people. Further, the nature of crime in rural areas began to change in the late 1970s and early 1980s with the collapse of the farm economy, said Dr. Lee Colwell of the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement. The mass bankruptcy of family farms fueled a rise in suicide, drug and alcohol abuse, domestic violence, robbery, and murder.

In addition, rural officers have a statistically higher chance of being killed on patrol than urban officers. Colwell noted that rural officers frequently work alone and for agencies that lack resources for equipment and training. Firearms are easily obtainable by criminals who also have greater mobility. Also, rural officers tend to be more trusting and less guarded in many situations.

Most law enforcement agencies in the United States are facing this crisis. Of the 13,408 agencies in the United States—most of them municipal police and sheriffs departments—90 percent serve populations of 25,000 or fewer, and 77 percent of municipal police departments serve populations of fewer than 10,000. Only 2 percent serve populations larger than 200,000.

The increasing visibility of crime in areas where people least expected it has prompted a sense of urgency about and interest in community policing. Many rural officers say community policing is

just a new term for something they have been doing for years, Colwell said. Perhaps the most difficult place to do community policing in the United States is also the place where they have been doing it the longest—Alaska.

There, said Simon Brown of the Alaska State Troopers, “the state is too big, and we don’t have enough troopers to get out and do in-depth investigations and solve crimes by ourselves,” he said. “By getting the citizens involved, we can do a better job. We call it police work, but we come down here and I’m told it’s called community policing.”

Alaska is as big as Texas, California, and Montana combined, making it almost impossible to police in the traditional way. Of the 330 communities in Alaska, about 227 have little or no law enforcement presence. One trooper may cover an area as large as Pennsylvania. It often takes between 2 and 12 hours for a trooper to respond to an emergency call due to both distances and weather conditions, and backup help can be as much as 24 hours away. Many places are only accessible by air, and responding to a call can cost the state anywhere from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

“It’s a whole different kind of law enforcement,” said Brown. “The only way you can solve a crime, the only way you can have an impact on a community and serve the citizens is through community policing. You have to have the people in the community involved. . . . When you come into a situation alone and you’re confronted with the weather conditions, the distance, and the bad crimes that do occur. . . you learn to talk to people and convince them to do things without violence, because you know there’s no backup. There’s just you and no one else.”

The Village Police Officer Program is one way of supplementing the troopers, Brown said. Village Officers live in the communities they serve and do not carry firearms, but respond to family fights, medical emergencies, fires, and, occasionally, shootings and homicides. They also serve as the trooper’s “eyes” before he or she arrives. The troopers also work with various state agencies to handle some offenses, such as domestic violence and alcoholism.

M. Kay Harris, from Temple University, challenged the workshop participants to identify key features of community policing. Features most commonly mentioned were partnership between police and citizens to solve problems in a community, trust and effective communication between all involved, consistency in application, and adaptability to changing community needs.

Communication is key, Brown said. In Alaska, troopers go out of their way to share information with communities and maintain regular contact. The best way to measure this is to observe the way the community responds to law enforcement officers on patrol. “Are kids talking to them?” asked Brown. “Are people reporting minor crimes? Is an officer having to threaten to arrest somebody to find out what’s going on or are people coming up to talk you? If that’s happening, crime is probably dropping and your ability to solve crimes will improve.”

Harris said community policing requires “a different kind of evaluation,” such as quality-of-life measures, than such traditional measures as arrest rates to determine effectiveness. Several law enforcement personnel in attendance said that arrest rates are overrated. One officer from Louisiana, for example, said that better indicators of how effectively a drug task force is working is the number of heroin overdoses or the value of homes in areas that formerly were the site of major drug dealing.

Workshop 1.11—Who Is Being Served? Victims, Offenders, and the Community—The Consumers of Justice

Moderator:

John Feinblatt, Director
Center for Court Innovation
New York, New York

Panelists:

Henry Gardner, Managing Partner
Gardner, Underwood and Bacon
Oakland, California

M. Patricia Hoven, Vice President
Social Responsibility
Honeywell, Inc.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Scott C. Newman, Prosecuting Attorney
Marion County
Indianapolis, Indiana

M. Beth Davis
Executive Director-State Defender
Mississippi Public Defender's Commission
Jackson, Mississippi

Mary D. Dorman, Attorney
Midtown Community Court
New York, New York

Summary of Proceedings

The increasing drug epidemic, particularly of crack cocaine, and frontal attacks by dope peddlers on the justice system and the communities they intimidate challenge the effectiveness of the criminal justice system. This panel considered the role of the community in the justice system, the relative notion of justice for different parties, the benefits of community involvement as well as its dangers, and, finally, the challenges in sentencing.

Prosecutors like Scott Newman of Indianapolis and others believe that exponential improvements are possible through empowerment of local communities. Community involvement helps ensure that the punishment reached is just: appropriate in severity, rendered swiftly and publicly, and capable of holding the offender accountable for the harm he or she has done to the community and of restoring some sense of ownership in the criminal justice system for direct and indirect victims.

Mary Dorman recounted her experience in serving as one of the community members on an impact panel established by the midtown Manhattan court during sentencing of three "Johns" who had pled guilty to soliciting a prostitute. The defendants lived elsewhere and had been seeking a "good time" in "Funville."

During a face-to-face meeting between the panel and the defendants, one panel member explained the impact of prostitution on community life, recounting how his daughter witnessed immoral acts performed in a car and how he had to step over used condoms on his way to work. His moving statement painted a picture of midtown Manhattan as being made up of neighborhoods and struggling communities, rather than an entertainment center for outsiders. At the same time, panelists developed possible solutions to such activity, including better lighting, signage, and more police presence.

Justice, however, means different things to different parties, and community involvement ensures that a broader range of interests are considered in the formulation of a just, or more just, response. Victims view the length of time it takes to get a case to trial as a critical factor in justice; defendants value treatment and the provision of other types of community-based services; the community seeks safety while existing businesses desire an environment that attracts clients. Regarding the latter, Pat Hoven of Honeywell recalled the impact of a 1996 *New York Times* front page headline branding Minneapolis “Murderapolis,” the murder capital of the United States: the company found it more difficult to recruit and retain employees. Lack of funding makes it difficult to meet all the expectations of the various interest groups.

Community involvement also helps ensure that government officials, judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys are accountable to their individual constituents. Community representatives are viewed as more able representatives of the community’s perspective even when elected or appointed individuals are at the table. Not uncommonly, elected individuals, while carrying the mandate of thousands, are often perceived as having agendas separate from the community’s own. Public defenders, when allowed to participate at the table, also further the community’s views by identifying failings within the town or police department in incidents as simple as treatment for those found guilty of speeding. On this basis, Beth Davis of the Mississippi Public Defender’s Commission frequently advises police departments that the manner in which its officers treat individuals affects the department’s community standing and its ability to later persuade a jury of their point of view.

Notwithstanding these benefits of community involvement, there are certain risks to bringing together all of these parties. Tensions within the community justice system may be highlighted and even increased among the crime victims and prosecutors, on the one hand, and community members and prosecutors, on the other. For example, a victim of property theft who has recovered his or her property from the insurance company will typically not want to appear in court to testify, whereas a community that has experienced recurring incidents of such crimes views such crimes as a priority. By contrast, a victim of a more serious burglary may seek full prosecution of the defendant in no uncertain terms, while the community may prefer a more restorative approach.

Ultimately, community justice systems face the challenge of maintaining a balanced approach. Davis challenged the wisdom of robbing prosecutors of their discretionary powers. Prosecutors are better able to gauge the likelihood that a case will survive the scrutiny of a jury based on their experience practicing and understanding the law, she said. By contrast, a prosecutor who forwards a case largely on the basis of community insistence will waste valuable resources if the

jury later finds no basis for such a case. Giving the community a place at the table, therefore, should not mean that prosecutors succumb to pressure or forfeit their professional judgment. Still, Newman maintains that prosecutors must use the discretion granted to them by voters to achieve an outcome that benefits the community.

Community needs also must be balanced with the rights of the accused, and community justice systems must guard against neighborhood influences that include racial intolerance, Henry Gardner of Oakland, California, and other panelists said. Some community partners may set narrow, trivial, or self-interested agendas. Finally, the imposition of tribal justice and local standards at the expense of national constitutional principles must be avoided.

The proper role of a community in trials is to participate in the sentencing phase so judges understand the impact of defendants' behaviors on the community, panelists argued. Their involvement helps the judge formulate a more just sentence. John Feinblatt, Director of the Center for Court Innovation, said that the possibility of local variation among communities arising from local problems is less a concern than local variation stemming from suspect classifications. Still participants raised some doubt as to whether those in the community affected by an incident can be unbiased, particularly during sentencing.

Sentencing is one area in which issues of impartiality, effectiveness, and fairness converge. While judges and jurors may not always uphold the ideal of impartiality, the test of effective community involvement is whether this ideal is advanced. It is also challenging for judges to impose fair and effective sentences that reflect the impact of the defendant's behavior on the community; if the judges do not visit the neighborhood, community involvement is one way to convey to the judge a sense of that neighborhood.

Workshop 1.12—Children of Incarcerated Parents: Working Together To Break the Cycle of Destruction

Moderator:

Nancy M. Ware
Director of Technical Assistance and Training
Executive Office for Weed and Seed
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Ann L. Jacobs, Executive Director
Women’s Prison Association
New York, New York

James Mustin, Consultant
National Institute of Corrections
Palmyra, Virginia

Fox Butterfield, Correspondent
New York Times
New York, New York

Garry A. Mendez, Jr., President
National Trust for the Development
of African-American Men
Riverdale, Maryland

Summary of Proceedings

The growing population of incarcerated parents with children is alarming but difficult to quantify because of a lack of information from inmates and a lack of research, according to moderator Nancy Ware of the Executive Office for Weed and Seed. “Conservative estimates place the number of minor children with at least one incarcerated parent at 1.5 million,” she said; an estimated 1.23 million incarcerated men have 1.38 million children and 70 percent of women in custody have at least one child when they are arrested. Children of incarcerated parents stand a significantly higher chance of becoming offenders themselves—by one estimate at least five times higher than their peers. How can the justice system break this cycle of incarceration?

One in ten children will be incarcerated before adulthood, but also “children who experience a parent’s arrest, and the subsequent separation that follows, suffer a wide range of psychological problems that also result in poor academic achievement, dropping out of school, running away, gang involvement, early pregnancy—the whole spectrum of bad outcomes that we would like to protect our children from,” said Ann Jacobs of the Women’s Prison Association, citing a 1993 report from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Prison-based parenting programs are a relatively new phenomenon in corrections, and the assertion that strong family engagement reduces recidivism by parents, as well as future criminal activity by their children, has been key to proponents’ arguments for them. The theories of social networks and primary relationships support this family engagement premise, panelists argued. In their 1997 report, *Map and Track: State Initiatives to Promote Responsible Fatherhood*, the

National Center for Children and Poverty at Columbia University reported that eight states describe their prison-based programs as “improving responsible fatherhood among inmates.”

The social network theory suggests that families of inmates provide a buffer from negative or stressful activity, enabling the individual to cope and adjust more easily. Primary relationships support social networks and provide inmates with opportunities for nurturing, as well as a sense of security and well-being. This does not guarantee that inmates will not relapse into criminal activity once they have served their time.

What is being done to educate prison officials regarding family issues of the incarcerated and the need for better parenting? There are 576 parenting and childrearing programs at federal and state correctional facilities, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Most programs are for incarcerated mothers, not fathers. However, in a recent study for the National Institute of Justice cited by Dr. Garry Mendez, President of the National Trust for the Development of African-American Men, 90 percent of a sample of 835 incarcerated men said they would like to improve their relationship with their families, and 87 percent said they would participate in a program if one were available.

Regarding the children of inmates, Jacobs and other panelists outlined five areas in which “we can do better”:

- (1) Foster and support interagency collaborations, cross-train child welfare and criminal justice employees, and develop manuals for them. Jacobs noted that, “we do nothing in relation to reunification and reintegration of the family separated by incarceration. Most parolee and probation people don’t even know about the parental status, let alone where the kids are and what the reunification plans are.”
- (2) Aid parents in managing their parental roles and responsibilities. Mendez noted, “The issue of parents who are incarcerated is seen as a ‘woman’s issue.’ It is not seen as a male issue, a police issue, a correction issue. Those in the criminal justice system don’t want to talk about this stuff.”
- (3) Improve conditions of visitation. According to James Mustin, President and Founder of the Family and Corrections Network, “There are some really great prison officials that run visiting programs well. But in most prisons, a visitor never knows what to expect. Visitations are not viewed as a customer service.” Jacobs added, “Regular visitation is critically important for kids to deal with their trauma. Kids mostly see their parents; they don’t see the razor wire in the same way that adults do.”
- (4) Reduce trauma suffered by children. At arrest, parents should be allowed to make childcare arrangements for their children, and as their case progresses, to provide their children’s caregivers with reasonable information about its status, Jacobs argued. From the moment of arrest, she said, “this is where bad outcomes start, because a plan is not made for the care of the child/children. Often they end up with a caregiver who thinks that they are taking care of

the child/children overnight, when, in reality, the parent is in jail for weeks and then is 'sent upstate.' Then the plan starts to fall apart and there is no backup plan."

- (5) Invest resources in community-based correction, drug treatment, and family reunification programs. Jacobs argued that "we've invested in the war on drugs, we've invested our energies in mandatory sentencing and increasing penalties for drug offenders, and we know that women who are overwhelmingly drug offenders are nonviolent and do not present a risk to public safety. Yet we invest our resources in very long mandatory sentences, which, for all practical purposes, means certain termination of parental rights."

Workshop 1.13—Benefits of Effective Community Street Outreach

Presenters:

Julius Lang, Coordinator
Midtown Community Court
New York, New York

Maria Almonte
Outreach Program
Center for Court Innovation
New York, New York

Michael Scagnelli, Assistant Chief of
Police
New York Police Department
New York, New York

Summary of Proceedings

Can quality-of-life crimes like loitering, prostitution, vagrancy, and public drunkenness be addressed in creative ways that might prevent them from happening? Is there a more efficient and effective alternative to the traditional criminal justice system for dealing with these offenders? There was a resounding “yes” to both of these questions from a panel of representatives from three New York City organizations: the Police Department, the Center for Court Innovation, and the Midtown Community Court.

The criminal justice system is overcrowded, and processing low-level, quality-of-life crimes through the regular system simply is not the most effective solution. Quality-of-life crimes generally result in a revolving door—that is, the offender is arrested, gets arraigned, is released, gets arrested again, is arraigned again, gets released again. . . on and on. There is no place in the cycle where the individual’s real problems are identified and treated.

The Midtown Community Court resulted in part from the efforts of an officer involved in community police efforts who realized he knew the individuals who were being arrested over and over. He was seeing the revolving door effect on his own beat. He also knew that there were services available to deal with the problems these offenders had: for example, drug and alcohol addiction, mental illness, poverty, and dysfunctional families and relationships.

He talked with others, including top leaders in the department, about how police, in partnership with community stakeholders, could develop solutions for these quality-of-life crimes outside the traditional justice system. Their solution was the community court.

The community court was an “experiment in decentralizing the courts to bring them back to the community in order to make people accountable at the community level,” said Julius Lang, Court Coordinator. A strong partnership has developed among the police, courts, service providers, and community members to create an appropriate sentencing structure involving community service,

and to address offenders' basic needs and problems and make sure services are available for them.

Unlike other community courts, an additional component in Manhattan is Street Outreach Services (SOS), created to proactively prevent and address low-level, quality-of-life crimes. The program drew on the strengths of each partner: (1) police know the areas where low-level crimes are most likely to occur—the “hot spots”; (2) police know the individuals most likely to be arrested for these crimes; and (3) health and human service providers offer programs to deal with the multiple problems the individual is having that may result in behaviors leading to arrest. Building on these strengths, teams of two or three officers and health/human service professionals go to the “hot spots” and proactively work with those at risk of arrest. The team focuses on problems such as panhandling, prostitution, public drinking, and homelessness. They seek not only to remove the at-risk person from the street, but to assess his or her needs and help the individual get appropriate services or treatment. If willing, individuals receive treatment quickly without the traditional redtape that can be an obstacle to entering the service system. This outreach effort has proved successful, and primarily as a result of word of mouth, at-risk individuals are beginning to seek out the services prior to the outreach team's arrival.

Panelists placed special importance on relationships of trust and understanding among the police, courts, health/human service professionals, and community stakeholders. While it takes time to develop these relationships, they are critical to the success of any such effort. “The days of pushing a problem away are over,” said Maria Almonte of the Center for Court Innovation in New York. “We don't want to displace a problem, we want to rectify it. The message of SOS is clear. What is needed is a committed police department, committed social service delivery organizations, and other players in the criminal justice system who are on board and willing to work together in partnership to solve problems.”

Because SOS is such a departure from traditional policing, it is important to have support from the top leadership of the department, noted Michael Scagnelli, Assistant Chief of Police of the New York Police Department. It is unrealistic to think that programs like SOS will appeal to every officer. Only those attracted to the community policing concept are likely to respond.

Workshop 1.14—Strengthening and Sustaining Community Partnerships: 10 Key Indicators for Success

Presenters:

Drew Diamond, Consultant
Police Executive Research Forum
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Rick Phillips, Executive Director
Community Matters
Santa Rosa, California

Summary of Proceedings

Community justice initiatives typically begin in one of three ways, noted Rick Phillips, Executive Director of Community Matters in Santa Rosa, California: (1) money becomes available from a funding source, which, though usually time-limited, is a catalyst; (2) a charismatic individual who is passionate about a particular issue generates interest and support; or (3) a community crisis occurs and leaders and citizens alike feel a need to respond.

Any of these are good reasons to begin work on community justice issues; however, none of them are sustainable over the long term. Money/grants are generally time-limited; one individual alone cannot sustain a community effort, and, unfortunately, one crisis may be the focal point for attention only until the next crisis occurs.

Additionally, because most community justice efforts involve the development of collaborative approaches to problem solving, the work will be complex, tedious, challenging, and very time-consuming. Therefore, stakeholders need to be thinking from the very beginning about how to sustain the efforts over the long term—beyond the time when the initial funding runs out, when the enthusiastic organizer loses enthusiasm, or when the present crisis is replaced by a new crisis.

Phillips and Drew Diamond, of the Police Executive Research Forum in Tulsa, Oklahoma, discussed the length of time it takes and the difficulty of the work to be done in developing a strong, results-focused community collaboration. Diamond noted that, for many people, “collaboration is an unnatural act because folks are not used to doing it.” Many people are good at cooperating, but it is difficult to move beyond cooperation to collaboration because the latter usually asks for pooling or sharing resources and giving up ego and turf so that the community good becomes the focal point rather than the good of the individual or the organization.

Phillips, in supporting this view, noted five common features in efforts to establish effective collaborations:

- (1) Need for more time to develop and maintain collaborations than expected, because of the diversity of the group and because of the multiple agendas of the organizations.

- (2) Occasional disorganization, because effective collaborations do not evolve in a linear manner. Participants tend to get along, have problems, spend time seeking solutions, regroup, and then try again.
- (3) Tension between individuals and organizations.
- (4) Individual sacrifices among participants to attain something for the good of the group later.
- (5) Ultimate success determined by the relationships of trust and understanding that develop among the participating stakeholders.

To encourage strategic thinking about the sustainability of community justice collaborations, Phillips presented 10 important suggestions:

- (1) Be sure there is a clearly articulated, jointly developed vision among the participants.
- (2) Develop shared leadership that is not dependent on any one individual or organization.
- (3) Spend the necessary time to develop the relationships of trust and confidence that are needed to get the individuals and group through periods of stress and tension.
- (4) Pay attention to the health and wellness of the participants in the process. Give recognition to those doing good work, and celebrate small successes.
- (5) Commit and use resources, both human and financial, wisely. Identify community assets that can be considered resources for the effort and use them in the process.
- (6) Develop effective operating systems so that detailed records (minutes) document the proceedings and use of assets (bookkeeping/financial accounting).
- (7) Develop community support and buy-in as well as participation in the effort.
- (8) Cultivate relationships with individuals and organizations that can contribute resources to sustain the effort. Get them involved and be sure they see success.
- (9) Be accountable for results, and be sure all the stakeholders and the community in general know what is being accomplished.
- (10) Be adaptable and willing to change as the effort progresses. Community conditions will change and, as they do, be flexible enough to redirect emphasis and resources.

There is a tendency to assume that small rural communities find it easier to work collaboratively because “everyone knows everyone” and there is a better understanding of who is doing what jobs in the community. However, Phillips said, regardless of community size and location, the same questions, concerns, and issues outlined in the “indicators” above must be addressed to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of the effort.

Workshop 1.15—Creating an Electronic Community: Integrated Justice Information Systems

Moderator:

Michael P. Judge, Chief Public Defender
Los Angeles, California

Panelists:

Sean M. Byrne, Prosecutor Coordinator
New York Prosecutors Training Institute
Albany, New York

Suzanne James, Administrator
Prince George's County Court
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

George P. March, Chair
Pennsylvania Justice Network Steering
Committee (JNET)
West Chester, Pennsylvania

David J. Roberts, Deputy Executive Director
SEARCH Group, Inc.
Sacramento, California

Summary of Proceedings

Panelists examined the current disjointed information-gathering system, the benefits of electronic integration, and several model programs whose most salient feature is not their technological wizardry but the inclusion of multiple interests in designing and implementing them. The Justice Department has urged states to develop a cooperative, nationwide electronic community that is well integrated, secure, and protects privacy. The panelists also considered barriers to achieving such a system.

Currently, basic information on a case is typed, printed, and copied, then forwarded to a new office for typing, printing, and copying of the same information on related forms. This process is repeated several times within and across agencies throughout the life of the case. An integrated justice information system (IJIS) allows information to be entered only once and then transmitted within and among agencies and jurisdictions. Features of such a system include name queries to other jurisdictions, information that can be pushed or pulled from one record or site into another, information on individuals to be published, and subscription to a notification service. Information captured at the originating point must be accurate, timely, and accessible at key decision points throughout the justice process.

Justice agencies spend billions of dollars in smokestack systems partly because software vendor contracts prohibit software copying (although the relevant provisions are not negotiated during the contract review process) and because components within a particular system often are not coordinated. Within the trial court system, Suzanne James observed, elected clerks, elected and nonelected judges, and elected prosecutors, as well as county and state-funded agencies, frequently operate independently with their own data collection systems.

The community is absent in this matrix, though its interest in efficiency, fiscal prudence, and safety can provide a focus in the information integration process. In Prince George's County, Maryland, for example, the circuit court established the ACE (Achieving Court Excellence) program. The ACE council was charged with developing a strategic plan and implementing Total Quality Management. Inclusion of five community members on the council prompted quicker action; these members identified the system's failure to account for differences in budget cycles among agencies and to integrate information systems electronically.

The National Association of Prosecutors and Coordinators (NAPC) has produced a report for the Justice Department showing that integration of existing software technologies to develop an integrated case system (ICS) increases efficiency in processing criminal cases, and raises accountability in the arrest-conviction-incarceration continuum. In this report, summarized by Sean Byrne of the New York Prosecutors Training Institute (NYPTI), an ICS includes courts, defenders, and custodial supervision agencies. It draws from existing elements in the technology used by police, prosecutorial, defense, judicial, and correction agencies of several states, which are then reprogrammed into a single software format with appropriate security, uniform data elements, and communications protocols. Cost savings come from sharing intellectual properties and subsequent flows of internal data.

The data collected in the automated criminal arrest/complaint form at the origination point flow automatically throughout the life of the case—through acquittal or service of sentence. Existence of parallel but separate case-tracking components allows prosecutors and public defenders to communicate with one another, coordinate events and people, and eliminate paperwork.

Initial software design should first produce a backbone of forms used in most cases and jurisdictions—for computerizing the criminal complaint/arrest process, automating the collection of indictment/prosecutor information, and tracking cases in the defense/prosecutorial/judicial systems—the report said. An ICS should be generic, standard in appearance, and allow easy customization of forms to incorporate changes made over time in different states. It should contain defense/prosecution brief banks; e-mail; direct and secure court system links to prosecutors and defense, community, corrections, parole, and probation agencies; time data collection features; common data mapping software applications; and standard data dictionaries.

The NYPTI brief bank system demonstrates the feasibility of NAPC recommendations. NYPTI links the district attorney's office of every member court through a secure private network within a centralized brief bank. It contains briefs, memoranda of law, and expert witness materials for use by prosecutors in preparing court submissions. These materials are directly accessible by category, subcategory, and key words and may be downloaded directly into the material being prepared. Four security levels guard access to the NYPTI system. The total cost has been less than \$70,000 for two generations of software changes, and less than \$50,000 for all hardware, including reconditioned 486 computers with high-speed modems that are provided free to prosecutors. Other successful integrated criminal justice systems are in Pennsylvania (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Justice Network site at (www.state.pa.us/Technology_Initiatives/jnet/home.htm), Florida, Kansas, and Maryland, as well as in Texas (Houston), Colorado, California (Marin County), and Delaware.

To George March, Chair of the Pennsylvania Justice Network Steering Committee (JNET), the real barriers to the development of an integrated information system, therefore, are neither cost nor lack of technology or know-how, but people's resistance to change. The three components of success are executive will, flexible funding, and responsive government. Recruiting executive sponsorship requires making a case for an integrated system based on the following results of using a nonintegrated system: (1) the number of guilty who are neither convicted nor discovered; (2) the number of innocent people wrongly convicted; (3) the release of the "wrong" inmates from prison; and (4) the ability of criminals on parole to escape prison through interstate movement.

Funding-related issues also stem from lack of executive will in the form of different and overlapping fiscal years on the federal, state, and municipal levels; rigid government procurement processes that are incompatible with the pace of technology and funding allocation changes; funding that does not allow for continual updating of technology; and the lack of nonline item, nonlapsing discretionary funds for the acquisition of new technology and opportunities. As David J. Roberts, Deputy Executive Director of SEARCH in California, noted, effective strategic planning includes involvement of those affected by the system, recruitment of executive sponsors with a stake in the project, as well as the hiring of competent focused staff who are similarly vested, development of a concise vision, and establishment of functional requirements, realistic expectations, and interim milestones. Local and state governments along with the Federal Government play a significant role. They must:

- Provide incentives for use and standardization of technology.
- Focus integration efforts on common data dictionaries rather than on system design per se.
- Encourage state and local fiscal agencies to work collaboratively in pooling technology resources.
- Encourage interstate and interdisciplinary technology exchanges.
- Leverage state and local investment in software systems so that they interact with each other.
- Coordinate needs with moneys.
- Involve all stakeholders.
- Encourage modular system development with additional elements brought online as dictated by milestones built into the plan.
- Establish minimum standards for information collection and storage as well as rules concerning privacy and security.

- Define state and local roles so that local agencies meet daily operational requirements and so the state builds the infrastructure to connect agencies within a jurisdiction, across jurisdictions, and to the Federal Government.

**Workshop 1.16—Best Practices in Community Crime Prevention:
An International Perspective**

Moderator:

Irvin Waller, Director General
International Centre for the Prevention of Crime
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Panelists:

Yvonne Korn, Director
National Crime Prevention
Commonwealth Attorney General's
Department
Canberra, Australia

David E. Garrett, Senior Planner
Fort Worth Police Department
Fort Worth, Texas

Nigel Whiskin, Chief Executive
Crime Concern
Swindon, England

Victor Jammers
Ministry of Justice
Department of Crime
The Hague, Netherlands

Summary of Proceedings

Panelists reviewed successful crime reduction efforts in Fort Worth, Texas; the Netherlands; Australia; and Britain—"path-blazers to reduce delinquency, violence, and insecurity" that the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC) is promoting as best practices for other communities to emulate.

The ICPC was founded 4 years ago by governments and private organizations, primarily in Europe (but including in the United States the National Crime Prevention Council and U.S. Conference of Mayors), to: (1) bring together best practices dealing with issues such as investment in youth, redesign of the physical environment to prevent crime, and youth diversion projects; (2) define what actually works and at what cost, as in the recent *Sherman Report* about American programs, which demonstrated significant crime reduction from low-cost investments in prevention; and (3) distribute this material widely, including via the Internet. The organization's site (www.crime-prevention-intl.org) is in English and French, with a small Spanish section, and receives about 3,000 hits a day, mostly from the United States.

Among the U.S. cities studied by ICPC, Fort Worth was the most successful in achieving reductions in crime and serves as a good model.

Fort Worth, Texas (United States)

When a new police chief arrived from Los Angeles in 1985, Fort Worth had a population of 400,000 people, but “we were trying to police as if we were a city of 20,000,” with a centralized structure and “no community interaction,” Senior Planner David Garrett said. The new chief introduced various reforms, but by 1991, Fort Worth had the second highest crime rate in the nation, and was losing population and business.

That year the police department started “Code Blue,” an innovative program to enlist citizens directly in a program to reduce crime. Three highlights of the program include:

- (1) “Citizens on Patrol”: Like many other cities, Fort Worth sought citizen volunteers to patrol their neighborhoods and help reduce burglaries and other crimes, but it added some features unusual for the time. The police first enrolled volunteers in a 10-hour training program, then gave them citizens band radios so they could communicate with police and each other during their shifts. Radio traffic was so congested, no one could get through, so police gave them the department’s portable radios and put them directly on a police frequency, much to the consternation of officers who feared the volunteers would tie up radio traffic. Volunteers first were limited to dealing with dispatchers, but officers soon requested direct contact so they could respond more quickly to the volunteers’ calls. Fort Worth now has 4,000 volunteers, nearly 1,000 radios, and 1,800 people patrolling each day. Since the program’s beginning in 1991, burglaries have declined 43 percent.
- (2) “Coming Up”: The city’s high homicide rate in 1994 included 35 gang-related murders. After two gang-related crimes prompted a public outcry, gang leaders approached the police, and the chief publicly proposed hiring six current—not former—gang members to work out truces and reduce violence. The program was funded internally. After some initial negative publicity, the department asked the Boys and Girls Club to fund 14 more gang counselors and contracted with them to run the program called “Coming Up”—a gang term in Texas. Today, the police employ 24 gang counselors, and gang-related crime has declined by 21 percent. Last year, there were two gang-related homicides. The police chief’s willingness to publicly propose and defend the program subsequently made it easier for the Boys and Girls Club to get involved without risking their own funding.
- (3) Juvenile Mentoring: The police department helped the Juvenile Probation department establish a mentoring program. When juveniles emerge from the criminal justice process, they are partnered with a mentor who helps them navigate their reentry into society. Since the program began, none of the juveniles have returned to the criminal justice system.

The Netherlands

In 1992, the Dutch government faced sharply rising crime rates and significant political pressure from businesses to address the problem. A new, ambitious joint venture between government and the private sector succeeded dramatically in reversing the trends, but after a change in the

program structure and personnel, crime rates rose again. Victor Jammers of the Ministry of Justice drew several lessons from both the success and the difficulties.

In June 1992, the National Platform for Crime Control was founded to find solutions for commercial crime problems in six areas, including robbery and vehicle theft. Subsequently, the Platform established task forces in each of the six areas, divided equally between government and the private sector, and each task force established specific goals.

The Task Force on Commercial Robbery's primary goal was to decrease the number of robberies, which had risen 10 to 15 percent in the previous 3 years, by 5 to 10 percent each year. There were also several subtargets. In the first year, robbery rates started to fall. More employers took preventive measures, and financial losses declined. Police and prosecutors formed regional partnerships, and the number of cases solved rose. Managers of regional offices were trained in victim care, and a new prevention program aimed at youth was started. Partnerships played an important role. Specialists on different aspects of commercial robbery were brought together, as were researchers and practitioners. There was an active strategy involving use of the media, and the task force remained focused on its targets.

In 1996, a new team took over, the effort was reorganized, and several factors that contributed to the earlier success were no longer present. Private-sector groups delegated nonspecialists to the task force, research data were no longer fully used, and there was no longer a media strategy. Generally, the task force activities were "insufficiently purposeful," Jammers said. Commercial robbery rates rose in 1997 and stabilized in 1998. The effort once again is being reorganized and institutionalized with responsibilities clearly assigned to the business community and two government agencies.

The Vehicle Crime Task Force started in 1997 with an ambitious goal of a 50-percent decline in car thefts by 2000. "We won't reach that target," Jammers said, although he is hoping for a "good result"—a 25-percent reduction. The task force took a year to get sufficiently organized, but it has now achieved some successes. New cars are equipped with immobilizers, which prevent unauthorized persons from using the car, and owners of older cars are being encouraged to install them. Some experiments with tracking and tracing have been launched, and new procedures for handling damaged vehicles have been introduced. Most promising, Jammers said, is research that will link the chain of information and events between production and final destruction of a car, so that it is more difficult to change the identity of a stolen car. In 1998, there was a significant decrease in car thefts, he said.

"Crime can only be controlled when all partners involved cooperate," and when they are held responsible for commitments, Jammers said. When a task force representative's promises are not kept, "we quickly intervene at a higher level in their organization." The bonds of partnerships tend to loosen over time, and require substantial energy to sustain.

Australia

In 1993, the Australian government launched National Crime Prevention to identify and promise successful strategies for preventing and reducing violence, crime, and fear of crime. Initially funded for 3 years at \$8.19 million (U.S.); the program's priorities were burglary, domestic violence, youth crime, crime prevention practices, violence in indigenous communities, and fear of crime. The focus was to be on prevention and early intervention.

In turning this mandate into specific reality, the national government's challenge was to "add value" to the efforts of state government and police, who were directly responsible for criminal justice. Theirs had been a more traditional focus on crime detection. The new funding for crime prevention was "peanuts," Yvonne Korn said, but it was hoped that it would encourage local agencies to shift their priorities. The national government's essential roles were to foster these partnerships, provide direction and funding to them, and communicate best practices and other findings.

The program has five related strategies:

- (1) National research and demonstration projects, ranging over a wide variety of personal and property crimes. Most projects are aimed at documenting "what is going on on the ground," Korn said. All must provide direction for future action on the particular issue being addressed, and commonly cover an extensive literature review, program mapping exercise, and recommendations for action. Some have led to demonstration projects and/or changes in police practices and, in one case, to a new \$8 million commitment for a "Youth Crime and Family Breakdown Program," which will implement particular research findings.
- (2) Capacity building funds, very small amounts of which were allocated to the eight states and territories that supported existing but disparate strategies for specific crime prevention programs. For example, the West Australian state was focusing on communication between the police and the public, and the national program paid for better telephone connections between the two.
- (3) Communications, to raise awareness of prevention activities among practitioners and the public. Every research effort is published free of charge in several different formats and addresses different audiences. In addition, there is a national Internet site, and market research has been undertaken to better target future activities.
- (4) Education and training, including an audit of crime prevention training and a national training needs assessment. The quality and quantity of training programs have been very uneven across the states.
- (5) National coordination, especially among federal agencies, so that policies are not redundant and do not undermine each other, and between the national and lower levels of government.

Partnerships between government and private groups have been formed or invigorated on several issues and have been critical to the program's successes. One particularly promising partnership is a new consortium of academics, who are not accustomed to being asked to work together or to work directly with practitioners and government officials in such a group. They are documenting best practices in crime prevention around the world and how those practices can be applied in Australia. In addition, there have been several new crossdisciplinary partnerships, including one between National Crime Prevention and the Commonwealth Health Department on how to implement a joint program of early intervention and prevention of future delinquency. These crossdisciplinary initiatives are among the most exciting, in part because participants are working together for the first time.

Britain

After years of rising crime rates and relatively little activity at the national level, a new, comprehensive British crime reduction effort has had a very impressive beginning. But now the effort is in danger of collapsing as the more difficult work of implementation begins, and bureaucrats, having received new funding, go back into their silos instead of continuing to engage with local communities, argued Nigel Whiskin, Chief Executive and Founder of Crime Concern, one of Britain's leading criminal justice organizations.

In response to polls showing crime rates as the primary public concern, British Prime Minister Tony Blair campaigned on the crime issue, and once in office pushed through the Crime and Disorder Act of 1998. It required every local government to conduct a crime audit—the first for many jurisdictions—to form Crime Reduction Partnerships with private groups, and to consult with the public in developing 3-year community safety plans with hard targets for reducing local crime problems. To date, 380 new partnerships—in every urban, suburban, and rural community in the country—have been formed, and every local government has completed its crime prevention audit or is near completion without new money.

The law reformed the Youth Justice System, attempting to deal earlier, faster, and more effectively with youth offenders. At the same time, the British Home Office launched what it claims is the world's most ambitious crime reduction program—a 10-year, £400 million effort to fund evidence-based initiatives preventing burglary and domestic violence, to encourage problem-oriented policing, to work with offenders, and to make the justice system speedier. Irvin Waller called it “an amazing piece of social engineering” that has drawn international attention. The program is part of a larger government policy to reduce social exclusion by creating opportunities for people and communities living at the margins, so that they can move closer to the mainstream living standard and quality of life.

Whiskin drew the following major lessons from these initiatives to date:

- Crime prevention and reduction is not the primary mission of most partner agencies, such as school health providers, housing managers, and town planners. These agencies must devote a small percentage of their attention to criminal justice issues, yet have received little or no training to carry out these responsibilities.

- The quality of criminal justice data is extremely poor, and too little of the good data is analyzed to yield appropriate strategies. For example, in London, 30 percent of those arrested for domestic burglary and 40 percent of those arrested for street crimes are students. “That gives you a fantastic target,” Whiskin said. In addition, 40 percent of crime occurs in 10 percent of the neighborhoods, while two-thirds of the young people who “emerge as prison fodder, with jailbird stamped on their foreheads” come from those neighborhoods. “They are part of the neighborhood crime problem. The neighborhood is part of their crime problem.”
- The new community partnerships need to create ongoing information systems, and some crime issues will require more indepth audits to yield information valuable enough to criminal justice strategy. For example, until Crime Concern commissioned an indepth study in one part of London, there was little or no reliable data available about domestic violence. The study found that 1 woman in 10 experienced domestic violence, costing at least £5 million per year. An estimated 5,000 children were living in households where domestic violence was a problem, and two-thirds of the long-term childcare cases in the social service system came from violent backgrounds. Yet most government funding on this issue went to deal with immediate crises, haphazardly and disjointedly, rather than intervening at early stages to prevent the violence. Crime Concern made several recommendations to improve national policy, but the local partnership continues to lack relevant records or data to implement their own plans. Emerging from the recent audits, the best local areas could propose were “forums” to discuss the issue.
- The mantra “local problems demand local solutions” has limitations. One study found that local police do not use evidence and best practices in setting up programs, which contributes to the failure of many programs. One review of 335 local crime initiatives found that 101 were described as unsuccessful, 75 did not provide evidence of a problem, 95 did not analyze the problem, 17 were not monitored, and only 17 were evaluated as successful. While local ownership of problems is important and “off-the-shelf” solutions require local adjustments, too great an emphasis on local control can be unproductive. “The lesson here is about learning to replicate successful projects with dignity,” Whiskin said.
- Academic research needs to be more policy oriented. Too much criminological research is difficult to penetrate, is retrospective, and is not helpful to those on the front lines. “We need a new and much clearer style for evaluating crime prevention and community safety,” Whiskin remarked.

Despite the achievements, Whiskin said the program is “in danger of being a catastrophe” for three reasons: (1) political “spin doctors” feel they need to deliver good news and sound bites to Prime Minister Blair so he can appear to satisfy his campaign promises; (2) the program has been taken over by criminologists, whose expertise is not in program delivery; and (3) bureaucrats, having received funding allocations, return to protecting only their turfs.

Workshop 1.17—How To Start a Community Court

Presenters:

Eric Lee, Deputy Director
Center for Court Innovation
New York, New York

Rodney A. Sprauve, Project Director
Harlem Community Justice Center
New York, New York

Judith N. Phelan, Staff Assistant
Multnomah County District Attorney's
Office
Portland, Oregon

Summary of Proceedings

The development of community courts that involves local community stakeholders in justice issues has been quite popular in recent years. Community courts are essentially “problem-solving courts,” said Eric Lee, Deputy Director of the Center for Court Innovation in New York City. They are unique in that they “take the definition of what the problems are from a community and then build a court to address those locally identified problems.”

When developing a community court, he said, it is impossible to restrict involvement only to those issues that are typically thought of as justice issues—that is, arrest, arraignment, and sentencing. Community courts, by their very nature, are also set up to deal with other community and individual problems. Therefore, a community court tries to assess the needs of the individual and his or her family, and either provide health and human services or link them to someone who can meet those needs.

Each community court is unique in that the problems identified, the stakeholders involved, the action strategies developed, and the followup all are tailored to the needs and resources of a particular community. The problems addressed may even differ within communities, according to Rodney Sprauve of the Harlem Community Justice Center. For example, Harlem can be thought of as a community, but there are four clearly defined geographic areas within Harlem: East Harlem, Washington Heights, West Harlem, and Central Harlem.

There are diverse populations within communities, and it is important to involve stakeholders from each in the planning, implementation, and service delivery process. Success of a community court, according to Sprauve, is dependent on the development of trust through the creation of relationships between and among these diverse community members. Ultimately, it is the community that must support and sustain the community court's programs.

For a community court to be successful, Sprauve said:

- Key stakeholders from the public and private sectors, together with community/neighborhood residents, must be identified.
- A dialogue about problems that are important in that community must begin.
- Perceptions of problems should be well documented and hard data should be collected.
- Desired outcomes should be agreed upon.
- All stakeholders should be involved in developing appropriate programmatic responses.
- Communication should be expanded outside the stakeholder group to include other community members and organizations.
- Funding sources should be cultivated for implementing and sustaining the project.

Eric Lee also emphasized the importance of examining and documenting deficiencies in the traditional justice system's response to the problems identified by the community. He noted that typical deficiencies include: inadequate/inappropriate sanctions for the crimes committed; very slow processing of cases; lack of resources to deal with the multiple problems affecting a victim and his or her family; lack of respect for defendants; and little followup. These issues should be part of the discussion about making the community court more effective in solving problems rather than just moving individuals through a certain process.

It is also important to develop profiles of individuals who are being processed, particularly those charged with crimes related to the problems the community identified as important. Profiling provides good information that enables planning regarding the types of services that should be offered through the community court.

Judy Phelan, Staff Assistant in the Multnomah County District Attorney's Office in Portland, Oregon, also emphasized that developing multisector partnerships is the most critical factor in ensuring success. The partnerships involving community members ensure that the distinct characteristics and needs of the community can be addressed.

Phelan identified the following actions as key in building effective partnerships:

- Identify a champion within the justice system who has the clout to get people to come to the table and stay there.
- Recognize that collaboration takes time, yet is worth the effort.

- Integrate multiple systems—for example, probation, the courts, the police, the prosecution, the community, the public defender, social services, and faith communities. This many stakeholders will require clear ground rules and operating principles as well as ways of handling conflict that are agreed upon.
- Foster a team effort.
- Ensure that meeting agendas are clear and that starting and ending times are honored.
- Move from planning to project design to implementation.
- Emphasize communication between and among stakeholders throughout the process.
- Seek good technical assistance.
- Provide adequate and competent staffing for the effort, even if it means hiring a coordinator.
- Recruit a strong community advisory board.
- Celebrate successes publicly.

Phelan noted that it is important not to get stuck in a “forever planning mode.” The community court should be developed sufficiently to open the court, understanding that it will always be a work in progress. It will never be finalized, because the community is always changing and the services through the court will need to change with the community.

Workshop 1.18—Addressing Tribal and Nontribal Issues in Law Enforcement

Moderator:

Edward Krueger, Chair
Criminal Justice Department
Fox Valley Technical College
Appleton, Wisconsin

Panelists:

Tom Hinz, Sheriff
Brown County
Green Bay, Wisconsin

James Danforth, Chief
Oneida Tribal Police Department
Oneida Nation, Wisconsin

Bradley Gehring, Sheriff
Outagamie County
Appleton, Wisconsin

Summary of Proceedings

Over the years, concerns about policing across law enforcement jurisdictions have been raised routinely by federal, tribal, and local units of government. This workshop builds upon lessons learned from tribal and nontribal communities in the Green Bay (Wisconsin) area, which have enhanced lines of communication, shared resources, and are working together after many years of distrust. “Law enforcement is emerging and developing in Indian country,” panel moderator Edward Krueger reported, “but it has not always been an easy road.”

The ongoing efforts of Wisconsin’s Brown County, Outagamie County, and Oneida Tribal Police Departments recently have been recognized as a successful model in crossjurisdictional collaboration by *Law and Order* magazine. Sheriffs Tom Hinz and Brad Gehring and Chief James Danforth discussed the development of memoranda of understanding and cooperative agreements among the departments.

With over 65,000 acres, the Oneida Nation encompasses portions of two Wisconsin counties and several local municipalities; the two largest are Green Bay and Appleton. Called a checkerboard nation by Danforth, the Oneida tribe’s geographic distribution is not uncommon among Native-American communities in North America. Referring to a tribe located along the Mississippi River, an audience member described tribal lands that cover 8 counties, 7 municipalities, and 2 townships—in total, 10 sheriff’s jurisdictions.

The Oneida Nation, like a number of tribes across North America, has taken advantage of the economic windfalls generated by gaming establishments located on tribal land. From 1937 to

1996, the tribe's landbase was 1,270 acres; since then the Oneida have purchased more than 6,946 acres of land and anticipate, with a \$90 million investment, someday purchasing back all the land in their original reservation. Currently, tribal land ownership is held and defined in numerous ways: as trust property, individual trust property, tribal fee property, tax fee land, and mass land law property. This diversity of land ownership, across wide geographic areas often disassociated from each other, creates a checkerboard effect challenging jurisdictional authority.

Today, "we have some of the best cooperative agreements of tribal police agencies in the county," Danforth said. However, all the panelists were quick to note that these agreements did not come easy; years of litigation and political pressure had to overcome turf wars and bitter distrust. Gehring recalled a decision rendered by the Eastern District Court of Milwaukee giving the Oneida Nation enforcement authority over its land and people: "At the time, the county authorities saw the decision as a threat—there was a great deal of reluctance to deputize Oneida tribal enforcement officers." To overcome resistant stakeholders, Gehring and others worked "to identify the benefits as opposed to the adversities of cooperative agreements," and by so doing, "we recognized the tremendous advantage of having the Oneida as part of the community, as opposed to the disadvantages of having them outside the community."

Like Native-American tribes in California, Minnesota, and other parts of Wisconsin, which are currently forging partnerships with local jurisdictions, the Oneida initially entered into memoranda of understanding, seen as the first step in building relations between policing agencies, spelling out dispatch service agreements. Hinz recalled the initial "distrust and tentativeness" reflected in a 1988 Brown County Police Department memorandum of understanding with the Oneida. The memorandum outlined agreements on such issues as dispatch service and identified parties with jurisdiction in criminal cases, but failed to recognize the sovereignty of the Oneida Nation. Ten years later, in 1998, a new memorandum of understanding between Brown County and the Oneida Nation showed greater respect and mutual cooperation.

Hinz recalled that, before tribal officers could be deputized by the Outagamie County Sheriff's Department, they had to successfully complete law enforcement training, meet the state's Law Enforcement Standards Board criteria, and provide liability coverage because of their "sovereign immunity status." Gehring noted that "deputy cards recognized [several types of tribal land ownership]," but cross-deputation issues still had to be resolved through dispatch agreements.

Today, cooperation between the Oneida Nation and Outagamie and Brown County enforcement services has resulted in the joint participation of enforcement officers in the Byrne Grant Funds Drug Task Force (1989), the K-9 Services (1994), and the Brown and Outagamie County SWAT teams (1995). With funds from the Department of Justice, crosstraining, ride-alongs, critical stress debriefings, and the resolution of communications problems have brought these three enforcement agencies together. As Danforth concluded, "Our success comes on the back of political problems, which, working together, we've overcome in order to provide quality law enforcement, not only to tribal members but to nontribal members living within the reservation's boundaries."

Workshop 1.19—Community Responses to Alcohol-Related Crime

Moderator:

James E. Copple, Director
Coalition, State, and Field Services
National Crime Prevention Council
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Raymond Daw, Executive Director
Northwest New Mexico Fighting Back
Gallup, New Mexico

Gene Barnes, District Administrator
Department of Alcohol and Beverage
Control
San Diego, California

Alta Lash, Executive Director
United Connecticut Action for
Neighborhoods
Hartford, Connecticut

Summary of Proceedings

Half of all violent victimizations involve the use of alcohol by the perpetrator, according to a 1998 Bureau of Justice Statistics report. Two community organizers and a district administrator from the Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control discussed their successful efforts to reduce alcohol-related crime in their neighborhoods by defining the problem, building partnerships with local officials and community organizations, and implementing interventions.

“Drunk City, U.S.A.,” was the image of Gallup, New Mexico, just a few years ago. McKinley County, of which Gallup is the county seat, was rated by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism from 1974 to the early 1990s as the worst county in the country for alcohol-related mortality. A rural town of 18,000 to 20,000 people, Gallup is surrounded by the Navajo and Zuni Nations, and the total regional population is estimated at about 300,000. With an average of 34,000 protective custody pickups each year, or nearly 100 people per day, “Drunk City, U.S.A.,” outpaced Chicago. Alcoholics who had passed out on the streets of Gallup and along the roads and highways of McKinley County were a common sight. The population in Gallup swelled to 80,000 people on weekends, with the city’s police department drunk tank holding up to 200 people on any given Saturday night.

All that began to turn around in 1989 when a group of citizens came together to clean up Gallup and its tarnished image. Ray Daw recounted the determined efforts of citizens in Gallup, McKinley County, and the surrounding Native-American lands to reduce public intoxication and its related problems. Daw, a member of the Navajo Nation, is the Executive Director of Northwest New Mexico Fighting Back, an organization dedicated to reducing the demand for

alcohol and drugs through community mobilization, public information, and technical assistance. He works at Gallup's Na'nizhoozhi Center, a 150-bed facility that provides protective custody, social detoxification, Native-American treatment, and a shelter.

Change began when the four governments of the Navajo, McKinley County, the city of Gallup, and the Zuñi Pueblo agreed to form an intergovernmental coalition to address the problem. Through a series of community meetings, they agreed on a set of strategies that included: implementation of a local-option alcohol excise tax, with the proceeds going to prevention and treatment; elimination of driveup alcohol window sales; development of a responsible-server training program; lowering of penalties for DWI offenses; increased penalties for "nuisance bars," which Daw defined as one "where it was common to see someone passed out on the street in front of the bar or urinating on the side of the building—loud, raucous establishments"; elimination of Sunday alcohol sales; elimination of alcohol sales at gas stations and convenience stores; development of a more humane protective custody system; and full implementation of an Alcohol Crisis Center.

One by one, as each of the strategies took hold, Gallup's image changed. For example, prompted especially by fears that nuisance bars were deterring economic development, 10 were closed, 5 in the downtown area. The closure of these bars, one of which is now a senior citizens center, "created quite a change," Daw recalled.

In 1992, with the elements of a protective custody system in place, Gallup created an Alcohol Crisis Center, an alternative to the city's drunk tank. The center offers medical interventions and counseling services. Within the first year, Daw said, total admission was 23,786, and every year since "we've seen a decrease in the number of admissions." He proudly noted that "overall, we've seen a 48-percent decrease in protective custody admissions of intoxicated people." Other indicators of change: accidents in the past 10 years, other than those involving motor vehicles, have declined 59 percent; motor vehicle accidents, 64 percent; homicide, 50 percent; and suicide, 52 percent. Alcohol-induced mortality has been reduced by 42 percent, traffic crashes that are alcohol-related have declined by 35 percent, DWI arrests are up by 4 percent, and alcohol-related emergency room visits have dropped dramatically, from 24,028 in 1992 to 14,000 today.

Daw concluded that the outcome of the unified intergovernmental approach brought with it creation of several vibrant community-based coalitions that are actively dealing with domestic violence, DWI/issues, alcohol and drug treatment, homelessness, and pedestrian safety issues. There also has been greater acceptance of Native-American traditional practices in the treatment and prevention of alcohol and drug-related problems.

Like Daw, panelist Alta Lash was determined to see her neighborhood, plagued with alcohol-related problems, come together to solve what she saw as untenable conditions caused by a local bar. Lash, involved in community organizing for over 25 years, is a teacher at the University of Connecticut and Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut. She is Executive Director of United Connecticut Action for Neighborhoods and one of the principal designers of the Comprehensive Communities Partnership Program for the city of Hartford. Calling herself just an ordinary member of the community, Lash has helped to implement community-based policing,

community-oriented government, and “in every single neighborhood in Hartford” active problem-solving committees.

One committee took on a strip bar owner over public nuisance issues, she recalled. After years of frustration with the bar, which was located in a residential neighborhood, residents challenged the bar owner to address their concerns, which he had ignored. Over a period of 18 months, problems at the bar began to spill out into the streets. “What had been a very quiet problem—problems in the bar, fights, and underage drinking—began to occur outside,” she said. Neighbors reported that “people were having sex in the backyard of the bar, used needles and condoms littered the parking lot, drug sales and prostitution were openly conducted, loud music, the honking of car horns, and crowds of people lined the street when the bar closed at 2 a.m., and a stabbing and shooting occurred.” What enraged the residents most were patrons who harassed local high school girls going home after school.

A problem-solving committee, representing residents, merchants, police, and city departments, was organized. With the assistance of community police officers, committee members found a successful strategy. Local zoning ordinances were researched, resulting in a ticketing blitz of illegally parked bar patron’s cars. When the bar owner sought a parking variance, neighbors attended the zoning board hearing and defeated the variance bid. The committee next challenged the bar’s liquor license, bringing to light numerous violations, which resulted in a \$10,000 fine and a 15-day suspension of business. Taking advantage of a new state law, the “Nuisance Abatement and Quality of Life Act,” the committee lobbied for an investigation of the bar, ultimately resulting in a raid that uncovered \$50,000 dollars in cash, drugs, and drug paraphernalia and violations of underage drinking. The bar is now closed.

A key element in the success of the work of Daw and Lash was the committed support of enforcement officials. The same was true in the San Diego area, where Gene Barnes serves as the District Administrator of the Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control. Particularly concerned with underage drinking, he noted that 87 percent of high school students drink, that two-thirds of them will tell you that they can purchase alcohol in local stores themselves, that twice as many alcohol-related accidents involve people between the ages of 16 and 20 compared to the rest of the population, and that 65 to 90 percent of all crimes are related in some way to the use of alcohol. After recalling a number of tragic alcohol-related deaths and accidents in the San Diego area, Barnes observed, “When you put together minors, drinking, public nuisance, and driving under the influence” you quickly see a problem that needs to be fixed.

Barnes helped organize a coalition of community stakeholders to stem the alcohol-related accidents and crimes that victimized young people. Included were ordinary citizens, members of prevention groups, business owners, the PTA, D.A.R.E.[®] officers, drug abuse counselors, and educators. Surprisingly, he sought support from liquor licensees. At considerable effort he spoke with licensees, eventually persuading them to join the coalition. Reluctantly, they went to meetings, listened, and eventually organized themselves into an association of more than 400 members. Engaged, the licensees sought information on new laws, requested training, and began

to adhere to the requirements of their licenses. The result was a “big impact,” he recalled: violations of sales to minors in San Diego declined by 14 percent and in neighboring El Cajon violations declined even more dramatically, in some cases to zero.

Workshop 2.1—Hate Crimes: How Is the Criminal Justice System Responding?

Moderator:

Hon. Rose Ochi, Director
Community Relations Service
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Stephen L. Wessler, Assistant Attorney
General
Maine Department of the Attorney General
Augusta, Maine

Victoria Nute
Civil Rights Team
Lee Academy
Lee, Maine

Reuben Greenberg, Chief
Charleston Police Department
Charleston, South Carolina

Daphne Kwok, Executive Director
Organization of Chinese Americans
Washington, D.C.

Trenton Hargrove, Chief Deputy
Attorney General
Civil Rights Division
Civil Rights Enforcement Section
Office of the Attorney General
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Summary of Proceedings

“Hate crimes are the most visible sign that the promise of equality is not yet a reality,” said moderator Rose Ochi of the Community Relations Service in Washington. And yet, “the occurrence of a hate crime incident is not nearly as significant as the community and police response to that incident,” Charleston, South Carolina, Police Chief Reuben Greenberg argued. Panelists outlined the range of responses at the federal, state, local police, school, and community levels that are most likely to deter future hate crimes and restore a sense of community stability following an incident.

The federal strategy has been to beef up the capacity for federal prosecution of hate crimes and provide training and tools to local officials dealing with hate crime incidents. At the 1998 White House Summit on Hate Crimes, President Clinton announced support for legislation that would expand the number of classes covered by hate crimes laws and eliminate various obstacles to federal prosecution for violations.

The Attorney General convened a Justice Department working group to develop resources for communities, directed all U.S. attorneys to convene hate crime advisory groups or work with established ones, and approved a memorandum of understanding with the National District Attorneys Association to coordinate hate crime prosecutions. The Bureau of Justice Assistance has conducted train-the-trainers conferences regionally, a hate crimes question has been added to the National Crime Victims Survey, and the Community Relations Service, in coordination with the FBI, has developed state-of-the-art hate crimes curricula and supported local officials in the aftermath of hate crimes incidents, such as the recent dragging death of James Byrd, Jr., in Jasper, Texas.

At the state level, the task has been primarily to facilitate community partnerships and ensure a coordinated approach to hate crimes and resulting community tension among law enforcement and other agencies, said Trenton Hargrove, Chief Deputy Attorney General of the Pennsylvania Civil Rights Division. Pennsylvania has a decentralized law enforcement system, with more than 1,200 police departments, 67 district attorneys, and 3 U.S. attorneys. Until 5 or 6 years ago, Hargrove said, it was difficult to understand what was going on, especially across state and jurisdictional lines.

The state now has adopted a “response team approach.” Acting under the umbrella of a long-standing Civil Tension Task Force, there is an Intergovernmental Response Team, as well as community groups, acting as police advisory counsels. When a hate crime occurs, a response team contacts local government and community leaders to establish a community information system and monitor tension. In addition, a broad coalition of state and local agencies meet monthly to monitor and report on hate crimes, and there are similar task forces in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

While it is most effective at the local level, having a regional and statewide capability inhibits supremacist groups from being able to float, and it allows for a multijurisdictional response. Such coordination also can help provide “rumor control in the context of community cohesion.”

The task force work led to the first civil redress in a hate crime case against the Alpha HQ white supremacist group, headquartered in Philadelphia, which had issued threats against public officials on the Internet. First amendment issues ultimately were not resolved because the case did not reach the U.S. Supreme Court. The state used civil redress because the ubiquity of the Internet raised jurisdictional issues.

At the local level, police and other agencies need to develop a sophisticated response to hate crimes that deters hate groups and reinforces community strengths, Charleston Police Chief Greenberg noted. “We do a reasonably good job in this country” investigating and prosecuting hate crimes, particularly in the last decade. “What we need to do now is change the culture of law enforcement [in order to broaden the response to hate crimes]. The police can do a lot more than simply arresting someone,” he said.

Greenberg gave two examples: The Ku Klux Klan (KKK) had announced that its members would march in all 242 incorporated cities and towns in South Carolina within about 18 months. It had been more than 40 years since the KKK had marched in Charleston, so “even the old-timers” in the police department had no direct experience to draw on in preparing for the visit. Greenberg received a call from the police chief in Moncks Corner, about 30 miles away, begging for assistance because he had only 12 officers to deal with more than 100 Klansmen and counterdemonstrators. Charleston sent 75 officers, joined by detachments from other law enforcement agencies, and worked with church groups to minimize violent confrontations while providing opportunities for free expression for both Klansmen and the protesters. During the next 3 years, Charleston officers backed up local police in 50 other towns.

“The important thing,” Greenberg said, “was to let the KKK know that that [small] community did not stand alone. All of law enforcement was standing behind that sheriff, that police chief, saying we don’t want any violence in our community; . . .that was a very, very important message.”

In a nearby county, a 9-year-old African-American boy was choked, beaten, hit with a crowbar, and nearly shot as a bullet whizzed past his ear. The perpetrators were a family who lived across the road. This type of incident had been typical in the first half of the 20th century, but South Carolina had seen nothing like it in at least two decades, Greenberg said.

Because the local sheriff’s commitment to preventing such incidents was considered questionable, the boy and his family were afraid to live in their home but did not have the means to leave. Charleston police officers, in full uniform and driving a police truck in order to make a clear statement, took it upon themselves to move the family to a new house that a community group had found for them 30 miles away. Subsequently, the officers maintained a liaison with family members to ensure their safety.

These types of responses are necessary, especially because hate crimes are crimes against society, Greenberg said. “As soon as they finish with one group and think they have them intimidated, I can guarantee they’ll find somebody else.”

Greenberg said his department has ensured the capability to deal with these crimes by hiring an ethnically diverse group of officers, all college graduates, from 42 states. Diversity training occurs daily, he said, because it was built into the department at the beginning.

To prevent hate crimes by educating young people, Maine has established Civil Rights Teams in 96 high schools and middle schools statewide, and will expand the program to include 130 schools next year, some at the elementary level, said Stephen Wessler, Maine’s Assistant Attorney General.

A large percentage of those who commit serious, often very violent, civil rights violations are teenagers, he noted, and that percentage has increased every year. Until this program, law enforcement could arrest particular teens, but there was no formal method to change the atmosphere in teen environments to prevent the next case. “Every time we investigated a hate

crime in school, the hate crime was not the beginning,” Wessler said. “It was the end of a fairly long history. . .of harassment that started with the language of hate.” Very often, the student never told anyone of the harassment, nor did friends or witnesses.

There are 12 to 16 students on a team, with a faculty adviser. The state conducts regional training conferences in the fall and a statewide conference in the spring with 1,000 students. There is also in-service training for every faculty member in every participating school. The teams focus on two things: education and awareness building—with films, public service announcements, speakers, and a “Dear Abby”-style column about bias in the school newspaper—and providing an emotionally safe place where students can go to report being harassed. When incidents are reported, team members report them to adult authorities, who can choose whether to intervene when the problem is harassing language rather than violent confrontation.

Victoria Nute is an impressive 15-year-old student leader in the program and a sophomore at Lee Academy in Lee, Maine. The academy has about 245 students, 20 percent of them Native-Americans, some of whom live in dorms while others are bussed for as much as an hour every day. The remaining 80 percent of students come from 20 different towns across rural Maine. The diverse population needed help integrating and accepting differences among peers, Nute said.

Last year was the first for the team. They prepared a brochure with pictures of those on the team so students would know how and to whom they could report incidents. “We don’t try to change anyone’s views,” Nute said. “We don’t advocate anything, except no violence. That way, everybody feels comfortable with us. . . .They know we don’t judge them and we don’t try to make them feel guilty for what they believe and what they’ve been taught to believe.”

Among the team’s initiatives were a bulletin board about tolerance and nonviolence, using symbols such as a pink triangle, clasped hands, a Star of David, and a rainbow. In focusing on Holocaust Awareness last year, they distributed red paper clips as a reminder that Norwegians used the clips to signal Jews that theirs was a safe house. Students wore them as earrings or necklaces and on belt loops. This year, with a focus on relationship violence, the team sponsored a very powerful one-woman presentation about a woman who had been killed by her husband. As parents began to question the program, the team prepared a community presentation about stereotypes and biases.

While the state had not planned for teams to deal with crises, Lee Academy faced one last February when two men, one with a tire iron, went to the campus saying they would assault a Native-American student. About 10 to 20 Caucasian students from Lee responded with threats. Law enforcement officials obtained a restraining order against the perpetrators, but students on the civil rights team led the effort to restore civility and peace at the school. Meeting with Native-American parents, team members said they would support and help create a safe, friendly environment for Native-American students, and requested the parents’ support.

For the Organization of Chinese Americans, the primary mission is to educate law enforcement, editorial boards, students, and other groups about bias toward Asian-Americans and Asian immigrants and its consequences, said Daphne Kwok, Executive Director.

The group works with law enforcement to counter stereotypes and myths—for example, the stereotype of Asians as experts in martial arts, and that they are, therefore, potentially more violent in encounters with police, or the tendency among Caucasians to lump all Asians together. The group works with Asian-American police and with law enforcement departments generally to help them recognize bigotry as a motivation for assaults.

About three-fourths of Asian community populations are immigrants from countries where the police are feared, Kwok noted, and they must be educated about different ways of relating to law enforcement here. At the same time, Asian-Americans with deep roots in this country often are dismissed as “foreigners”—for example, in the recent discussions about Chinese and Chinese-American involvement in U.S. campaign funding. “We’re constantly having to prove our American-ness,” Kwok said.

Many of the Organization of Chinese American’s educational efforts are directed at youth. The group sponsors an annual national essay contest on hate crimes; this year, the topic is racial profiling.

Workshop 2.2—Minorities in the Criminal Justice System: Addressing Overrepresentation

Moderator:

Marc Mauer, Assistant Director
Sentencing Project
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Bob Boruchowitz, Director
Public Defender Association
Seattle, Washington

Dr. Luis Garcia, Chief Criminologist
Boston Police Department
Boston, Massachusetts

Representative Michael Lawlor
Connecticut House of Representatives
Hartford, Connecticut

Hon. Patrick Lee, Chief Judge
Oglala Sioux Tribe
Pine Ridge, South Dakota

Summary of Proceedings

Overrepresentation of minorities is “one of the most critical issues that we face in criminal justice policy and practice today,” said moderator Marc Mauer of the Sentencing Project in Washington, D.C. “It’s a very difficult issue and one that people are grappling with throughout the country.” This session examined the manner in which the criminal justice system responds to crime in America and explored policies and legislation that could create a more balanced justice system.

At the time of the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, African-Americans represented 30 percent of the offenders sentenced to prison in the United States. Nearly 50 years later, we have achieved gains through the civil rights movement, seen dramatic changes in opportunities for minorities, and seen increases in socioeconomic opportunities. However, that figure of 30 percent admitted to prisons has risen to 50 percent nationally. Hispanics represent 17 percent of the prison population and, in some jurisdictions, Native-Americans are overrepresented as well. An African-American male born today has a one in four chance of spending time in jail during his lifetime.

What do these figures mean and what questions should we ask? Mauer raised three questions:

- (1) Is this a problem of crime rates or criminal justice policy? The research is contradictory. Some studies say that the disparity is related to higher rates of crime for some offenses (e.g., violent offenses). But for more discretionary offenses (e.g., property offenses), we see more disparity. With drug offenses, we see dramatic differences: there are large gaps between who’s using and selling drugs, who’s prosecuted, and who’s going to jail for it. Lawsuits

have challenged this practice because minorities are disproportionately stopped, therefore increasing the chances that something will be found.

- (2) Are the disparities in the prison system a function of race or class? Evidence supports both perspectives. With police practices in many cities, race is a factor, at least in the more extreme behavior of officers. But class and resources also create disparities. For example, when a judge is sentencing two offenders for drug use, he or she is more likely to allow the one who has the resources to pay for drug treatment to get out of prison.
- (3) Even if crime rates were the sole explanation for the disparities we see in the system, is policy the only or best way to respond to some of these problems? What kind of balance should be created between social interventions and criminal justice interventions?

Dr. Luis Garcia, Chief Criminologist for the Boston Police Department, has conducted extensive research examining overrepresentation of minorities and suggested strategies for improvement based on his study of police-minority interactions in a major U.S. city. His study was based on three significant data sources: (1) police data files on all 37,000 arrests for serious crimes in the city between 1993 and 1997; (2) internal police data on all 907 citizen complaints filed against the police; and (3) a recent comprehensive telephone survey with a representative sample of more than 3,000 adult residents.

In the citywide survey, respondents were asked if they had had any interaction with a police officer during the past year. The responses were then categorized by race. The results did not show as dramatic a disproportionality as would have been expected. However, when respondents were asked to rate the police on being fair and respectful to people, responses varied among racial groups.

An examination of arrest data for the 5-year period showed that in each year, 55 percent of those arrested for the seven most serious crimes were African-American. This pattern is evident in many U.S. cities. The majority, regardless of race, were from lower income groups. Controlling for income, the researchers found that the lower the income, the higher the perception among people that the police used excessive force.

The data on citizens' complaints showed that excessive use of force and offensive use of language were the two most frequent complaints. People of color represented the largest proportion of complainants, and most involved motor vehicle situations. There was no apparent pattern in minority areas. However, the area where the pattern was consistent was at major roadways and high traffic areas. Therefore, motor vehicle situations generated the most complaints and also were the situations in which the most confrontations and violence arose.

Garcia made these recommendations:

- Standardize the methods used to classify and collect information about complaints against police officers to make them comparable across jurisdictions.

- Examine the degree of cooperation between police and minority communities. Communities where residents and police work together closely have fewer problems.
- Further study situations that are prone to conflict and experiment with behavior modification strategies. For instance, if motor vehicle stops or high-density traffic areas result in complaints, study neighborhood characteristics, reasons for the stop, race and age of driver and officer, time of day, time of police officer's shift, and traffic and pedestrian patterns.
- Recontact complainants to find out what happened with their complaints.
- Follow police officers over time.
- Examine whether having more stringent psychological screening for police officers results in fewer complaints.

Bob Boruchowitz, Director of the Public Defender Association, noted several troubling statistics:

- Racial and ethnic minorities comprised 11 percent of the Washington state population in 1982, but 30 percent of the prison population.
- In 1995, the Justice Department found that nearly 7 percent of all African-American men were in prison, compared with only 1 percent of all Caucasian men.
- According to an October 1995 study by the Sentencing Project, 32 percent of young African-American men, ages 20–29, were under criminal justice supervision on any given day. The percentage of drug offenders sent to prison is overwhelmingly nonwhite.

For many, prison is considered an ordinary part of life. As a result, “the idea that we’re incarcerating an entire generation of young African-American and Hispanic people is quite troubling,” Boruchowitz said.

Washington was one of the first states to develop a minority injustice commission. It found that bail rates for release and amount of confinement were affected by race. African-American and Hispanic offenders were less likely to be recommended for alternative sentences. African-Americans were also more likely to receive higher sentences than whites. They were also less able to afford the most effective legal representation. Racial identity and ethnicity also mattered in addressing challenges raised by cultural differences, such as the need for interpreters.

Within the juvenile justice system, juvenile probation officers sometimes viewed minority youth differently from Caucasian youth. For examples, officers would report to a court that the minority juvenile had a bad attitude, but report that the white juvenile came from a troubled home. The decisionmaking process of probation officers and prosecutors who file the reports should be examined further.

Boruchowitz described two places that were addressing racial disparities. In San Jose, California, in response to criticism about profiling disparities, the police chief has required that all information on traffic stops be recorded. Second, in a case that went before a federal court in Massachusetts last December, the judge ruled that, because there is a history of disparity in determining who gets stopped, punishing a person with a record of being stopped by police officers and not appearing before the court would exaggerate and continue racial disparities. The judge used that history of racial disparity to go below the guideline sentence range.

Judge Patrick Lee of the Oglala Sioux Tribe in Pine Ridge, South Dakota, noted that overrepresentation of Native-Americans in the criminal justice system can be explained by “politics and jurisdictional explanations.” A 1950s statute granted outright jurisdiction over Native-American tribes to states, except in states like South Dakota with larger Native-American populations, where jurisdiction was retained by the tribes.

Consequently, when Native-Americans are arrested outside the reservation and appear in a nontribal court, judges often deny bail because they fear the defendant will return to the reservation beyond the court’s jurisdiction. “That explains in part the overrepresentation of Native-Americans in county jails within the states like South Dakota,” Lee said. Under an 1885 law, the Federal Government has jurisdiction over felonies committed by Native-Americans on reservations, which accounts for the disproportionate number of Native-Americans in the federal criminal justice system.

One way to address this overrepresentation is through a waiver of extradition defenses. If a Native-American is arrested, released on bond, and returns to the reservation, a waiver would allow him or her to be apprehended and returned to the state through prosecution. The waiver would be preapproved by the tribe and thereby recognized by both sovereign nations.

Mike Lawlor, a Connecticut state Representative, noted that “there are a few radioactive topics in politics, and crime is certainly one of them, and the issue of racism within the criminal justice system is probably the most dangerous discussion to undertake.” However, it is “also the most important at the moment.”

Lawlor cited several state statistics that show an extreme disproportionality among races. In Connecticut, 17 percent of the general population but 73 percent of the prison population is African-American or Latino. The juvenile detention system has a more severe problem: 83 percent of its detainees are either African-American or Latino. About half of all those arrested for drug crimes were white, but only 10 percent of those were incarcerated for those crimes. Throughout the criminal justice system, the numbers tell a similar story.

The perception of the system’s fairness varies considerably by race, with whites tending to believe it is fair, and people of color believing it is not. However, “the perception itself, I think, is in and of itself a major problem that we have to contend with,” Lawlor said. “Whether or not you think the system is biased, you have to deal with the perception that the system is biased within those two [African-American and Latino] communities.”

Perceptions are important, he continued, because “in many cases, victims won’t call the police, witnesses won’t cooperate with the police, jurors won’t vote to convict. And those are all real problems for frontline police and prosecutors. If there’s that perception out there, you’re going to have a hard time successfully prosecuting cases. The police themselves have a perception that there’s animosity. The white cops feel nervous going into the African-American and Latino communities.”

To address the problem, Lawlor suggested that the best way to get discussion started is to “get statistics compiled by a nonpartisan, outside source—no commentary, just the facts—and reach out to the people on the frontline. You will be surprised by how cooperative they will be if, instead of confronting them, you ask them to work with you in a way that does not adversely affect public safety.”

In Connecticut, a commission consisting of all players in the criminal justice system examined the extent of racial disparities and potential solutions. From the beginning, all the efforts were bipartisan and reached out to law enforcement. As politicians, Lawlor and his colleagues are becoming more familiar with the statistics, but unfortunately, their constituents are not. As a result, politicians have to be more careful about who is sent to jail, because they easily can be accused of being soft on crime. Therefore, an important goal throughout the discussion was to reduce racial disparity without adversely affecting public safety.

Bills have been introduced in the state legislature to address the disparities. One includes modifications in sentencing rules, including (1) limited discretion for judges to depart from the mandatory minimum sentence only in cases where there’s no allegation of violence; (2) allowing anyone to come up for parole after serving half his or her sentences for nonviolent crimes, and after serving 85 percent of sentences for violent crimes; and (3) eliminating the sentencing disparity between cases involving crack cocaine and cocaine.

To address the lack of effective legal aid, a partnership will be created between the private and public sectors to provide partial student loan forgiveness for those who decide to go to practice in the legal aid system after law school. There is also an effort to ensure interpreters at all stages of the criminal justice system. The police unions have suggested sensitivity training for police. In a separate bill, racial profiling, defined as police stops solely on the basis of race, would be prohibited. Police would be required to record the race of those they stop. Finally, proposals would expand the number of drug courts and community courts.

Workshop 2.3—Responding to the Needs of Mentally Ill Offenders

Moderator:

Judith White McBride, Senior Advisor to the Assistant
Attorney General
Office of Justice Programs
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Hon. Ginger Lerner-Wren, Judge
Broward County
Mental Health Court
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Dr. Henry J. Steadman, President
Policy Research Associates, Inc.
Delmar, New York

Sam Cochran, Lieutenant
Memphis Police Department
Memphis, Tennessee

David Wertheimer, Administrator
Services and Systems Integration
Administration
Department of Community and
Human Services
King County
Seattle, Washington

Summary of Proceedings

A sampling of today's headlines speaks of a growing number of seriously mentally ill offenders and the challenges they place in our nation's criminal justice system: "Prisons Replace Hospitals For Our Nation's Mentally Ill," *New York Times*, March 5, 1999; "Mentally Ill Winding Up in Jails," *Orange County Register*, March 7, 1999; "Back to Bedlam," a special program that aired on NBC. With unique observations and innovative approaches, panelists answer the questions, "How do we best prepare criminal justice professionals to identify and manage offenders with serious mental illness?" and "How can the criminal justice system improve its response to their needs?"

Mentally ill offenders are individuals with disorders such as schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorders, and depression that has reached a level of severity resulting in psychosis. The statistics are grim.

On average, 9 percent of men and 18.5 percent of women in local jails are mentally ill. In state and federal prisons, the average increases to about 10 percent for men, with the percentage in juvenile cases reaching approximately 20 percent, according to a 1997 Northwestern University Medical School study cited by Judith McBride, Senior Advisor to the Assistant Attorney General. Nationally, about 10 million people are booked into jail each year; about 800,000

bookings, often repeat offenders, have serious mental illness, of which three-quarters have co-occurring substance abuse disorders, said Dr. Henry Steadman, a sociologist and President of Policy Research Associates. Male detainees are 3 times more likely to be depressed, schizophrenic, or manic than the general population, and female detainees are 11 times more likely to suffer mental disorders, particularly depression, according to a study of Cook County, Illinois, jail inmates cited by Steadman: “These individuals have symptoms matching people in acute psychiatric in-patient facilities.”

The Los Angeles County jail on an average day houses 1,500 to 1,700 severely mentally ill inmates; New York City’s Rikers Island houses about 15,000, or 15 percent of its daily population; and Miami’s Dade County and Fort Lauderdale’s Broward County jails house about three times more mentally ill people than South Florida’s State Hospital, McBride said.

“We are talking about people caught up in recurrent cycles [of neglect],” Steadman said. “They get arrested, and typically in most communities they go to jail; from jail, for the most part, they may go to a private home, some to group residence, shelter, or back to the street, or they go forward to prison. . . . What jail amounts to for these people is a place to live for some part of the year.” At the heart of the problem, he said, “We’re dealing with a group of people, continually cycling through these systems, systems that are not linked to one another, systems that are typically not responsive to their needs.”

To divert mentally ill people away from the justice system into treatment programs and provide a continuum of services, three innovative approaches described by panelists have been adopted in Memphis, Fort Lauderdale, and Seattle. Lt. Sam Cochran reported from the streets, Judge Ginger Lerner-Wren reported from the bench, and David Wertheimer described a program that works with the mentally ill before, during, and after an encounter with the criminal justice system.

Cochran, a 24-year veteran of the Memphis Police Department, is on the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT), which last year answered more than 7,500 calls for help in dealing with mentally ill people and has been emulated in Portland, Oregon; Albuquerque, New Mexico; San Jose, California; and Athens, Georgia. CIT was established following a highly publicized incident involving police and a mentally ill offender. Memphis’ mayor, in collaboration with the Alliance for the Mentally Ill, established a task force, and in 1988 it formed CIT. Today, from a total uniform patrol of 900 officers, 180 have volunteered for duty with CIT. Officers are offered 40 hours of training, with annual refresher courses, and respond to all calls involving mentally ill people.

“The charge is a commitment, responsibility, and accountability, and the mission is to ensure the safety of the officers, the safety of the community, and the safety of the [mentally ill] consumer,” Cochran said. He sees CIT as part of a larger team—police, mental health providers, and the community—who “must cooperate” to be successful.

Lerner-Wren of Florida’s Broward County Mental Health Court, the first of its kind, calls her practice “therapeutic jurisprudence”—more than a simple adjudication of justice, she sees it as a “therapeutic agent, part of a therapeutic scheme helping individuals to empower themselves in

their own recoveries, making them more productive citizens.” Mentally ill offenders, “when they need treatment, ought not to be arrested,” she said, and should be seen as “individuals separate and distinct from their symptoms. The symptoms are not the person.”

The Mental Health Court originated after a tragedy involving a mentally ill young man charged with homicide and the realization that mental health services had been inadequate. The “values-driven” court is used to intercept those who need mental health services before they enter the jail system.

Accomplishing that means “the back doors of the criminal justice systems have to be the front doors to the treatment,” said Wertheimer, Administrator of Washington’s King County Department of Community and Human Services. He suggested three primary “front doors”:

- (1) A prebooking diversion plan from jail developed by law enforcement officials.
- (2) A postbooking diversion service alternative to incarceration. As someone is booked into jail, the arresting officer, booking officer, classification staff, or jail mental health staff identify those who meet criteria for an alternative to incarceration.
- (3) Postrelease services with linkages to treatment.

“Communities need to recognize that mentally disordered offenders are not the responsibility of the jail but the community,” Steadman said. “Jails can act as intercept points, but they are not the place where these people can be ‘fixed.’ The cycle will not be broken here.”

Workshop 2.4—Youths Adjudicated as Adults

Moderator:

Rita Aliese Frye, Public Defender
Cook County
Chicago, Illinois

Panelists:

James R. Bell
Youth Law Center
San Francisco, California

Richard L. Stalder, Secretary
Department of Public Safety and Corrections
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Hon. Frank Orlando, Judge
Nova Southeastern University Law Center
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Summary of Proceedings

“Juvenile justice has come a long way since the founding of the first juvenile court in 1899,” noted panel moderator Rita Frye, a Cook County Public Defender. “Now it’s going backwards.” Many communities have begun to close loopholes that allow juveniles who commit adult crimes to go free when they reach the age of consent. There have been dramatic increases in the number of juveniles serving long sentences in adult correctional facilities, even though most research shows disappointing outcomes from this approach. Four experts in the field of juvenile justice explore the shifting expectations of communities, the changing responsibilities of justice systems, and other important issues related to the trend of adjudicating serious juvenile offenders as adults.

Richard Stalder, who has served as a superintendent and warden of major juvenile and adult correctional facilities, noted that “all 50 states and the District of Columbia have statutory provisions that enable, under varying circumstances, the weight of criminal prosecution to fall on the shoulders of very youthful offenders. It was a phenomenon that was born of violence, of people’s concern with public safety.” Frye ironically commented, “In 1899 the founders of juvenile court talked about rehabilitation, kids needing special treatment, kids being treated differently from adults, but here we are 100 years later talking about kids being tried as adults, seeing kids as mini-adults, where kids are now facing adult trials and adult penalties, and even in some states the death penalty.”

The debate about how to deal with juveniles ranges widely and in every state. “There are a number of people working in the criminal justice system today who are standing at a fork in the road,” noted Judge Frank Orlando, a 21-year veteran of the Florida Circuit Court. “Some say abolish the juvenile court altogether, others advocate keeping the system as it is, they support the concept of rehabilitation, and yet others advocate restorative justice, holding kids accountable,

keeping them in the system, making the victim whole, and doing what you can.” Judge Orlando’s observation sets forth the debate surrounding the adjudication of youngsters in adult court and the incarceration of kids in adult correctional facilities.

According to Orlando, who currently provides technical assistance to the Anne E. Casey Foundation’s Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative, “The public perception of transferring juveniles to adult court leads one to believe that when kids are sent into the adult system, they will receive harsher punishment.” Or as James Bell of the Youth Law Center in San Francisco put it, “You do the crime, you do the time—you do the *adult* crime, you do the *adult* time.” In Florida from 1997 to 1998, about 4,700 juveniles cases went to adult court, and of that number, 3,200 (or 68 percent) went to probation, with high rates of failure, Orlando said. He concluded that the public perception is wrong: punishing young people more severely by placing them in adult systems does not deter or control, but is “a fiction that has been put upon us by legislators and Congress, who do not pay attention to hard data and research.”

Various studies (see Donna Bishop and Charles Frasier’s *Juvenile Transfers to Adult Court Study: Impact of Changes in Transfer Law and Case Reporting* and the Coalition for Juvenile Justice’s *Juvenile Court Report After 100 Years*) indicate that young people emerging from the adult system return six times faster than those coming out of the juvenile system. Self-reports and personal interviews of juveniles indicate that “most youth felt that their life would get better after juvenile court; however, they indicated that they would continue a life of crime after adult court.” Bell concluded, “Children adjudicated as adults will become adults, but will become dangerous adults.”

Stalder, President of the American Correctional Association, argued for a reality test. “We need to face the reality that our adult and juvenile justice systems need attention and resources,” he said. “We can’t expect people who work in adult facilities, who haven’t been trained and properly prepared, to understand the rollercoaster ride that symbolizes the transition through adolescence without adequate help from us.” Stalder encouraged partnerships of juvenile judges, defenders and prosecutors, and adult and juvenile correctional administrators, bringing together “affiliates and people from all geographical areas and disciplines” to talk and develop strategies about these issues.

“Most young people aren’t going to be put away for the rest of their life,” observed Bell, who has represented children confined in adult jails, juvenile detention centers, and training schools for 17 years. “Society has not come to terms with the fact that they don’t want to pay for somebody to be put away from the age of 16 until they die in prison. . . .The ‘adultification’ of juvenile court is an orientation towards punishment, not an orientation toward hope.”

Workshop 2.5—The Third Leg of the Three-Legged Stool: Indigent Defense Supporting the Justice System

Moderator:

JoAnn Wallace, Director
Public Defender Service
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Dennis Murphy, Deputy Capital
Defender
Capital Defender Office
New York, New York

Ronald Earl, District Attorney
Travis County
Austin, Texas

Hon. Kevin S. Burke, Judge
Hennepin County Court
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Richard Wilson, Professor
American University
Washington College of Law
Washington, D.C.

Summary of Proceedings

The defense sector of the criminal justice system has been the fastest and most chaotically growing during the last 30 to 40 years and, within the defense sector, there has been a marked movement toward centralization and public defender systems. Yet in many parts of the United States today, the Supreme Court’s promise of a well-developed defense system made in *Gideon v. Wainwright* 35 years ago has yet to be fulfilled.

Defenders and judges discussed the role of indigent defense, highlighting the impact of weak funding for staffing and other resources, together with growing case overloads, which may make the defense a “weaker leg” in the justice system. The panel emphasized the role for partnerships in the adversary system as well as the importance of a strong and viable indigent defense system in the present-day, collaborative, community justice model.

Dennis Murphy, Deputy Capital Defender, defined defense as “a client-centered type of advocacy, a representation needing the involvement of social workers, investigators, and community outreach.” He emphasized, however, that “there is an undeniable starving of the *Gideon* case, meaning that defense systems are underfunded [and] many defense lawyers and public defender systems have impossible caseloads and are bankrupt in the sense that attorneys can’t do client-centered work. Defenders don’t have enough access to investigators, social workers, and sentencing advocacy.”

“Indigent defense attorneys are pariahs. We are particularly hard-pressed when it comes to resources—we don’t have the technology, the office infrastructure, the paralegals. On the other

hand, the typical District Attorney's office has access to not only police investigations, but also more support services. When indigent defense is asked to go into the community, it is difficult because we can't even meet the day-to-day needs of our offices."

To solve these problems, defenders must be treated as partners in the reform process and funding for defense resources, staffing, and salary parity must be seen as essential for achieving equilibrium in the criminal justice system. Projects such as prison construction are commanding limited government funds and diminishing the possibilities of appropriate funding of defense systems and the quality of defense representation, panelists said.

Richard Wilson, former defender and present Director of the Human Rights Law Clinic at American University's Washington College of Law, outlined five arguments to support more funding for defense systems:

- (1) Trained, experienced defenders become systemic actors who know the local legal culture. "They are less likely than random assignment lawyers to misstep in the system and because of their expertise are on an equal par with others in the system."
- (2) Centralized funding of organized defender programs offers economies of scale in case assignments, office space, supervision, and training in other arenas. A public defender's office is not simply another bureaucracy. Organizing defenders in a more rational system contributes to the efficiency of the entire system—in the same way that organizing judges and prosecutors bureaucratically makes them more efficient in their operations.
- (3) Time spent with defendants in which they are dealt with as individuals not only results in fair treatment, but means defendants are more likely to have a sense of obligation to pay back society. They are less likely to be disciplinary problems in correctional facilities, and more likely to be well-adjusted citizens when they are released.
- (4) The rule of law itself demands that one side of the adversary system isn't so seriously disadvantaged that it is unable to perform its work effectively. "If we are an adversary system, then the prosecution and the defense must be equally equipped to do battle—what the European's call equality of arms."
- (5) The best argument for full participation by the defense is to ensure system credibility—to ensure that convictions are reliable and to protect against the real risk that the innocent will be convicted.

Hon. Kevin Burke chaired the Minnesota State Board of Public Defense when it went "from a fairly disjointed, totally dysfunctional system to one of the better-funded, more well-organized defense systems in the country." In 1998, approximately 87 million cases were filed in state courts in the United States and Puerto Rico, meaning that 1 out of 3 people ended up in court in some fashion. That means delays and frustration. "In the face of all this case overloading, there really needs to be a collaborative effort between the judiciary, prosecution, and defense system just to deal with the massive number of cases."

He offered other statistics that help make the case for a strong defense system: 15 percent of Michigan's budget goes to prisons; the number of African-Americans in California prisons exceeds the number in California colleges and universities. Recently, 13 percent of African-American males nationwide could not vote because they were on probation, on parole, in prison, or permanently deprived of their civil rights due to felony convictions. "Over time," said Burke, "the large numbers of cases with disproportionate numbers of people of color coming into the justice system will help to crash our society. And the justice system will not work efficiently."

Funding indigent defense systems, as in Minnesota, makes very good economic sense also, he said. "Why should defenders have budgets for paralegals and social workers, et cetera.? Because they are cheaper than lawyers. It makes no sense to take the highest paid people to do work which they are not trained to do and are not particularly interested in doing. You could never run a law office which had only partners." Funding for defense systems is "the most efficient way to develop an effective system."

In addition, government is spending great sums on prisons and local jails, just for pretrial detention. If a defender system has too many cases and not enough resources, it takes much too long to get defendants out of a jail, into prison, or back out on the street when they are innocent. "A good defender system helps to avoid building a jail and closing a library for lack of funds," Burke said. "The judiciary has a responsibility to exercise leadership in making sure that the entire adversarial justice system is balanced and well funded."

Ronald Earl, District Attorney of Travis County and a former presiding judge in the Austin municipal court, commented on related societal issues: "In Texas, the law says the role of prosecutors is not to convict, but rather to see that justice is done—a duty to both the victim and the accused because justice is not simply vengeance, as many people think it is. What the justice system has become is a method of control, a kind of 'last plantation' for young African-American men, whose population in our prison system has risen 700 percent since 1985."

Earl pointed out that, although lawyers deal in "what's already happened," they need to reflect on the current problems of society, including the alienation and isolation of citizens from each other. "Lawyers are seen as part of the problem, not part of the solution—yet our role should be problem solvers. We need societal change aimed at connection and mutual respect—these are the twin pillars of democracy. We must not use the law as an end in itself. The end, the purpose of law, is the creation and maintenance of the positive caring social relationships upon which the law is based. Without relationships there can be no family and no community, and without community there can be no law. The law rests for its strength on the existence of institutions for community. It is those institutions that have atrophied and this has led to the imperilment of the rule of law."

Workshop 2.6—The Impact of Sex Offender Registration and Notification

Moderator:

Elizabeth A. Pearson, Senior Staff Associate
National Criminal Justice Association
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Joseph M. Beard, Detective
Sheriff's Office
Snohomish County
Everett, Washington

R. Lewis Vass, Captain, Division
Commander
Criminal Justice Information Services
Virginia State Police
Richmond, Virginia

John Kaye, Prosecuting Attorney
Monmouth County
Freehold, New Jersey

Summary of Proceedings

Elizabeth Pearson summarized various implementation issues and unintended consequences associated with state notification and registration systems as revealed in a study conducted by the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA). Individual panelists then described the New Jersey, Washington, and Virginia systems with respect to legislative developments, registration requirements, scope of notification, and implementation issues.

According to the NCJA study, data control and accuracy on released sex offenders for the purposes of community notification are critical in plea-bargain cases, tracking offender interstate movement, verifying and updating data, denotification, and program evaluation. Pearson points out that plea bargaining may remove offenders from the gambit of notification requirements when pleas accepted are for lower crimes/offenses that do not require registration. Sex offenders also may escape registration requirements through interstate travel—an action members of the Interstate Compact on Probation and Parole hope to address by recording such movement with FBI's national, online permanent sex offender registry (currently unavailable). Absence of standards on data verification and the frequency of data updates across jurisdictions complicate data control and accuracy.

Although the Jacob Wetterling Act goes one step further by requiring states to verify addresses, it does not identify which states are not in compliance. Nor is it clear when the interstate movement of sex offenders should be communicated to the community. Improvement of state systems requires program evaluation on the effectiveness of notification/registration laws, public and victim perceptions, as well as cost, implementation, and process structures.

Prior to the kidnaping, sexual assault, and murder of a young girl, Megan Kanka, by a recidivist pedophile during the early 1990s, only a few states like California and Washington had sex offender registration. Joseph Beard noted that, unlike most other jurisdictions, Washington allows information to be shared between the corrections department and local law enforcement agencies; this includes information on psychological and sexual deviancy. Originally, Washington released information on sex offenders to targeted audiences using a “level” classification system: Level 1 offender information was released on a “need-to-know” basis or to requesting individuals having the offender’s name; Level 2 information was released to schools and daycare providers; and Level 3 information was released to newspapers and television stations. Information on Levels 2 and 3 offenders was provided in a generic release notice containing only the offender’s residence, time of meeting with schools, daycare providers, and media, and the name of the corrections or law enforcement official convening the meeting.

Level classification of offenders established by agencies proved to be sometimes arbitrary and even cruel, prompting a review. End-of-sentence review committees were created to evaluate appropriate classifications and subsequent adjustments when warranted. Level classifications conducted by these committees consider in Levels 2 or 3 a requisite score of 47 points, an age of 5 or less for victims in a nonfamily member situation, and the acting out of sexual deviancies by offenders while in prison. Statutory revisions require offenders to complete a preregistration form and submit fingerprints. Registration requirements are also imposed on all felony offenders regardless of degree; failure to register may result in a maximum prison sentence of 1 year. Upon return from jail, offenders must re-register within 30 days and are subject to residence checks by patrol officers every 90 days.

Virginia law is considerably more stringent, as outlined by Capt. R. Lewis Vass. It requires annual fingerprint and photo registration with the police and the motor vehicle registry of those convicted of certain crimes for which they are either serving time or performing community service as of 1994. Sex offenders must re-register annually for 10 years, a period that runs in full each time the offenders serve subsequent prison sentences. Violent sex offenders must re-register every 90 days for life; those who do not are picked up by the police. Failure to register results in a 1-year prison sentence as a Class 6 misdemeanor for sex offenders and 5 to 15 years as a Class 1 felony for violent sex offenders. Last year’s amendments to the Virginia law expanded re-registration requirements to include recidivist nonviolent sex offenders who recommit the original charge two or more times.

Under Virginia law, state police must provide “need-to-know” communities and other entities information on all sex offenders located within the offender’s own and contiguous ZIP Codes. Those entitled to notification include private, public, and parochial schools; registered and unregistered centers for day, home, child, and elder care; hospitals; and child, public protection, and employment agencies. On December 29, 1998, the notification system became available online at sex-offender.vsp.state.va.us/cool-ICE/. Registry information available on the notification system includes background on Virginia law, listing of statutory registry requirements and code statutes, and offender information that is accessible by name, ZIP Code, and sound indexing.

New Jersey has adopted a similar scheme and, of the three states, is the most limited in notification on release of sex offenders to the community. John Kaye explained that notice on Tier 1 offenders issues only to police officers “likely” to encounter the offender. Notice on Tier 2 offenders issues to (1) community groups registered with the police to receive such notice; (2) schools “likely to be encountered” by the offender, defined as the site of children who belong to the same age as the sexually abused child; and (3) police agencies, schools, and daycare centers within 2 miles of the offender’s residence and residents living within 1,000 feet of the offender’s residence. Information on the release of offenders, however, may be barred if the offender has not been convicted of any crime within the last 15 years. Public perception of the New Jersey system has been negative, and was aggravated by the inadvertent release of information on sex offenders to community members.

The NCJA study considered the effects on communities from uncontrolled information “leaks” that widen the scope of notification beyond statutory authorization. It remains unclear whether increased control or increased dissemination would resolve this issue. Registration has also made it difficult for sex offenders upon release to the community to secure housing, as Beard detailed for Washington. Increasingly, real estate agents incorporate anti-Megan contract clauses to avoid personal liability for failure to disclose to buyers that a sex offender lives next door. Harassment of sex offenders (vigilantism) in the form of property vandalism, assault, arson, and attempted arson is a third unintended consequence of notification systems. Incidents of such harassment are frequently not prosecuted to the full extent of the law. Panelists suggest that antivigilantism measures include proactive media campaigns and public education efforts, as well as the formulation of antivigilantism provisions incorporating “intent” language found in hate crimes.

Finally, panelists discussed the possibility of state or jurisdiction shopping. Because of varying notification requirements among states, sex offenders can move to less restrictive states like New Jersey instead of more restrictive ones like Virginia. However, minimal notification requirements of federal law protect communities regardless of this interstate movement.

Workshop 2.7—Making Justice Work for the Elderly and Developmentally Disabled

Moderator:

Charles A. Moose, Chief
Portland Police Department
Portland, Oregon

Panelists:

Dottie Burkette
TRIAD
Stanford, Florida

Jerijeane Houchins
Texas Planning Council
Round Rock, Texas

Summary of Proceedings

The country's elderly and developmentally disabled populations are a particularly vulnerable group in the criminal justice system, and they are overrepresented in correctional facilities. Their vulnerability is exacerbated by a system that fails to train, teach, and expose people to recognize and address their needs.

Chief Charles Moose observed, "One of the things that we're finding is that offenders and victims who are mentally retarded and developmentally disabled represent a complex, troubling, and increasingly costly issue for our nation's criminal justice system. While we don't want to excuse the criminal behavior of criminals who are intellectually handicapped, we need to remember that many mentally retarded and developmentally disabled offenders are not so much lawbreakers as they may be low-functioning citizens who lack training on how to function responsibly in a complex society."

The rate of crime committed by the developmentally disabled is consistent with that of other populations. Misdemeanors and less serious felonies are the types of crimes most frequently committed. However, offenders with developmental disabilities are disproportionately represented in correction facilities. Offenders come disproportionately from areas with low-income populations and greater police presence. That environmental bias combined with a process in which law enforcement officials do not recognize people with developmental disabilities results in a system in which developmentally disabled offenders are more easily convicted and spend additional time in jail. Once in the system, they are more subject to abuse and victimization within the system and take up a disproportionate amount of staff time.

Jerijeane Houchins, a licensed counselor and member of the Texas Planning Council for Developmental Disabilities with more than 30 years' experience in the field, discussed the ways in which the needs of the developmentally disabled population have been addressed in Texas. In Texas, 17–19 percent of the criminals entering prisons are mentally retarded. In most states the

proportion is at least 11 percent and more likely 16–17 percent. Among women with disabilities nationally, 83 percent will be sexually assaulted, raped, or beaten because of domestic violence at least once in their lifetime.

Complicating the picture is that law enforcement officials know just enough about mental illnesses to be problematic. To many, she said, if a person “does not see elephants,” then they are not mentally retarded. Also, criminals are often good at covering up their developmental disabilities because they have been made fun of all of their lives. At the same time, they are more gullible, which can lead them to agree to do things that violate the law.

“It’s not that we want people off the hook,” Houchins explained. Rather she said she is seeking to reduce the victimization figures and to ensure due process rights and accommodations that the disabled need. Those efforts have been made more difficult by deinstitutionalization, so that many communities do not have services to accommodate the needs of the developmentally disabled. “Many states don’t even have state schools or state hospitals anymore.”

However, within the seven psychiatric prisons in Texas, Houchins has seen many cases of people who should not have been there in the first place. She gave one heartbreaking example. Marcus, a 15-year-old developmentally disabled Hispanic boy, broke into a house with several other young people who were not disabled. When the police arrived at the house, the others hollered to Marcus to stay there and that they would be right back. Marcus did as he was told, and sat on a bed next to a baby, who remained sleeping even after the police arrived. When Marcus was asked if he had touched the baby, he said yes, he had touched an angel. A policeman told him that if he made a mark on a piece of paper, he could go home. Marcus needed to go to the bathroom but was afraid to ask, so he made his mark. During a hearing, Marcus thought the judge was a priest because he sat on a “throne” and wore a black robe. The young man did not want to make the “priest” mad, so he agreed with everything that was said.

Marcus is now serving 40 years for child molestation and 13 counts of burglary. In prison every evening at 5:30, he would pack his bag and sit by the gate, waiting to go home. He was never recognized as mentally retarded. He was raped so many times in prison that he eventually had a nervous breakdown and was transferred to a psychiatric prison, where Houchins met him.

She argued that strategies to help the developmentally disabled require attacks on different fronts and the creation of several safety nets. Solutions can be created at the different stages of the criminal justice system: prevention, incident and arrest, and investigation.

At the first stage—prevention—developmentally disabled consumers should have personal safety training that is interactive and experiential. They often need to learn more about their bodies and how it is appropriate and safe for others to interact with them.

At the second stage—incident and arrest—law enforcement officials need training and education, if for no other reason than to avoid lawsuits under Title 2 of the Americans With Disabilities Act. Officers need a general understanding of developmental disabilities and an understanding of the difference between mental illness and mental retardation, identification skills, and

communications training, so they can ask questions that are understood and make reasonable accommodations. The training has been expanded to include other parts of the criminal justice system.

At the third stage—intake and booking at the jail—a 10-question screening tool was developed to identify those who are mentally retarded. The tool has been used successfully since April 1997.

Solutions created at the prevention, incident and arrest, and booking stages will tremendously decrease the prison intake level. In Texas, the number of developmentally disabled offenders who went to the jails dropped from 19 percent to 11 percent over 1½ years. This is tremendously cost-effective and will therefore sell to legislators.

Dottie Burkette, an elder service officer with the Seminole County, Florida, sheriff's office discussed elderly victimization. Accommodations are not made for the elderly in everyday law enforcement. For example, an elderly person might not be able to sign a ticket because of his or her arthritis. An elderly person might not be able to read his or her Miranda rights unless it is enlarged or an alternative Miranda rights list is read that helps him or her to understand those rights. However, it is not just law enforcement officials who do not understand the aging process. Public safety officials, community service networks, and social service providers can also be trained to better understand aging. Less than 2 percent—and 4 percent on average nationally—of the elderly population, 65 years of age or older, live in nursing homes. Unfortunately, 87 percent of them will be victimized by abuse, neglect, or exploitation and their “first-responders” will not have been trained on standard academy procedures to recognize the indicators of abuse.

Triad and Seniors in Law Enforcement Together (called “TRIAD”), a collaboration among sheriffs, police chiefs, and the American Association of Retired Persons, works first to reduce victimization of the elderly, and second to enhance the quality of life and services provided to senior populations, while developing collaborative networks. TRIAD ties together special needs populations at the local level and addresses legislation at the state level. For example, Illinois has passed progressive legislation that protects the elderly: If a crime was committed against a person 65 years of age or older, regardless of what the crime was, it is elevated to the highest degree of felony available. Now, no plea-bargaining is available in those cases. In 1992, TRIAD existed in 20 states and 56 communities. In 1999, TRIAD exists in 47 states, 3 countries, and 617 communities.

One strategy that aids the elderly is carrying cards that contain residential and contact information and a medication list. In Seminole County last year, TRIAD added features to 19 houses that assisted both the physically and mentally disabled, as well as senior citizens. These features included safety strips in bath tubs, night lights, peepholes in doors, crime prevention mechanisms, accessibility ramps, and reflective numbers on mailboxes and houses. Burkette believes that aid for the elderly must also include intergenerational solutions.

Portland, Oregon, developed a special prevention program for the developmentally disabled after the city realized that too many interactions between police and disabled citizens were hostile and confrontational, Moose said. An advisory group of caretakers, practitioners, and parents created a

crime prevention and awareness curriculum, including a video with developmentally disabled actors to model appropriate interactions with police. Moose noted training classes of the developmentally disabled are more successful when headed by police officers in uniform.

Workshop 2.8—Overcoming Cultural Barriers in the Criminal Justice System

Moderator:

Claire Johnson, Special Advisor to the Director
D.C. Initiative
National Institute of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Hon. James D. Cayce, Presiding Judge
King County District Court
Seattle, Washington

Charles Johnson
Bridging the Gap Project
Atlanta, Georgia

Weris Jama, Program Specialist
Outreach to New Americans
National Crime Prevention Council
Washington, D.C.

Edward Flynn, Chief
Arlington Police Department
Arlington, Virginia

Summary of Proceedings

How does the criminal justice system serve the diverse cultures in communities across the United States? This session addresses how criminal justice agencies define and understand cultural groups, and how they assist widely diverse populations in navigating the criminal justice system.

“The United States is characterized as the first universal nation—a multicultural society marked by unparalleled diversity,” said Charles Johnson of Atlanta’s Bridging the Gap Project (BGP). Born in Costa Rica, raised in Saudi Arabia, and educated in India, Johnson often cites U.S. Bureau of the Census data, which offer this snapshot of growing diversity: “With a population of 262 million people, there are 20 million foreign-born residents in the United States. By the year 2010, two-thirds of all children born in the U.S. will be Black, Hispanic, or Asian, and children of European descent will be the minority.” In his state of Georgia, the immigrant populations’ rate of growth is the second fastest in the country, with new immigrants arriving at a rate of 13,000 per year.

“As many as 20 different ethnic groups live side by side in apartment complexes and at least 50 different languages are spoken in the halls of an increasing number of schools,” Johnson said. “Mainstream public service providers, serious about assisting the community, must modify existing service delivery styles and methods of service delivery to accommodate linguistic, gender, age, cultural, and other differences.”

The Bridging the Gap Project seeks to “empower law enforcement, educators, and ethnically diverse communities to form partnerships” that can overcome these barriers. With a staff of 27 people who speak 22 different languages, BGP has provided cultural diversity training to more than 4,000 police officers and provides interpreter and translation services in crime-related incidents and in the courts.

The project’s Walk This Way youth initiative targets refugee and immigrant youth who are at risk of joining gangs. The program offers afterschool homework assistance, English as a Second Language courses, and crisis interventions. For police officers the BGP publishes ethnographies geared toward law enforcement personnel, giving background information about body language and other cultural aspects of ethnic populations.

Weris Jama, Program Specialist for the Outreach to New Americans (ONA) project of the National Crime Prevention Council, is a refugee from Somalia, having arrived in the United States in 1994. Much of her work has involved social and family outreach services to various cultural groups. “America needs to understand the situations that lead refugees to come to this country,” Jama said. “Many arrive traumatized by events in their homeland where law enforcement and criminal justice systems are feared.” Newly arrived refugees are an extremely vulnerable population subject to robbery, because “back home banks can’t be trusted”; gang activity, because “young people want to fit in”; and arrest due to bribery, because “that’s the way you handled police or government officials.”

ONA facilitates meetings between refugee communities and local law enforcement agencies; provides training and technical assistance through visits to communities, as well as by telephone and mail; established a Peer Assistance Network (PAN), consisting of law enforcement and refugee volunteers who help communities find solutions to problems; publishes topical resource packets on several issues ranging from neighborhood watch to mentoring and literacy; and maintains a translation bank of crime prevention and safety materials in 11 languages.

Jama named three publications that the ONA project designed to improve refugee and police relations: *Building and Crossing Bridges: Refugees and Law Enforcement Working Together*, which explains the benefits, the why, and the how of partnerships between the two communities; *Lengthening the Stride: Employing Peace Officers from Newly Arrived Ethnic Groups*, which discusses hiring peace officers from refugee communities as community liaison officers in law enforcement agencies; and *Powerful Partnerships: Twenty Crime Prevention Strategies That Work for Refugees, Law Enforcement and Communities*, which showcases 20 successful programs across the country dealing with youth, domestic violence, and collaborations among immigrants, refugees, and law enforcement agencies.

Judge James Cayce, of Washington’s King County District Court, created a court speakers’ bureau to help bridge the gap between the refugees/immigrants and the criminal justice system. The all-volunteer bureau, which includes about one-third of the bench, serves greater Seattle and provides “education about the services available in the courts while giving people the opportunity to meet elected officials in an informal atmosphere.” Interpreters accompany the judges and

provide translations. Initially, groups wanted legal advice, which the judges cannot provide, but the bureau schedules volunteer attorneys who can provide that service pro bono.

Cayce said symbolism also is important. “One thing I’ve done to convey the sense that diversity does matter in my courtroom” is place on the walls art created by local immigrant and Native-American artists and art associated with the county’s celebration of Martin Luther King Day. He contends that this simple act “does send a message that you will treat all people respectfully and fairly.”

Police Chief Ed Flynn, now with the Arlington, Virginia, department, has spent nearly 30 years in police work in different cities, many of them divided between cultural/ethnic groups and law enforcement agencies. When he became chief of police for Chelsea, a troubled city of 35,000 people packed into 1.8 miles of land surrounded by Boston, he was confronted with festering ethnic tensions that had long been unaddressed by the all-white city commissioners. Fifty percent of the city was Latino, and its Asian population was growing.

“On the one hand, our capacity to serve diverse communities was, in the technical sense, higher than it ever had been, but our access to some communities was greatly less,” he said. With the advent and growth of community policing, Flynn saw an opportunity to bridge the widening gap with a Weed and Seed grant that allowed the hiring of bilingual police officers.

Faced with a growing threat of organized gangs, the department began “negotiating permission” to inform the community and create an environment in which the officers could do appropriate tactical policing. Combining the concept of “geographical accountability” with a commitment to community-based policing, the department met with “advocacy groups that represented the Hispanic community and with first-time elected Hispanic officials.” This interaction, born out of trust established by the locally assigned patrol officers, was successful in keeping a gang from securing a foothold in a vulnerable community.

“As American society continues to change and evolve, so does the notion of public support,” Flynn said. “The best guarantee of officer safety is public support, the best guarantee of law abidance is public support—all of which has to be negotiated with many different communities.” He concluded, “You have to keep going back to the community for the ‘authorization’ for your tactics. It is absolutely my belief that, although diversity training for my officers has a role to play, there is no substitute for officer contact with the people who live in those neighborhoods. The building of alliances is a very personal bit of diplomacy.”

Workshop 2.9—Balance and Equality in Community-Based Offender Management

Moderator:

George Keiser, Community Corrections Chief
National Institute of Corrections
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Deputy
Commissioner of Probation
Office of the Commissioner of Probation
Boston, Massachusetts

Hon. Frances Gallegos, Judge
Santa Fe Municipal Court
Santa Fe, New Mexico

D. Alan Henry, Executive Director
Pretrial Services Resource Center
Washington, D.C.

Cranston Mitchell, Chair
Missouri Parole Commission
Jefferson City, Missouri

Summary of Proceedings

From front-end, pretrial administration to back-end parole supervision, the determination of offender risk and stability is key to balancing the high cost of incarceration against the increased risk of managing offenders in the community. “What does risk management mean?” asked George Keiser, Community Corrections Chief for the National Institute of Corrections. It’s about “who should be released and who should be locked up.”

Four leaders in the field of community-based offender management presented effective approaches to balancing the demand for punishment and the many costs of incarceration against the risks of managing offenders in the community. From the basement of a bullet-ridden church in Boston to the hearing rooms of the Drug Court in Santa Fe, innovative approaches to risk management were presented by pretrial, judicial, parole, and probation experts.

“Research carves populations into understandable groups and the risk they pose,” Keiser said. “We now understand what risk is, what contributes to risk, and how to be creative about how to start breaking up the things that make it possible to be at risk.” The ideas presented by panelists are “legitimate interventions, they are things that can be done in people’s lives that can cause behavior change—we are well beyond the notion that ‘nothing works.’ ”

Pretrial stage—Washington, D.C.

D. Alan Henry has been in the pretrial business since the late 1960s. As Executive Director of the Pretrial Services Resource Center in Washington, D.C., he has worked with very small rural to

extremely large urban jurisdictions dealing with the issue of risk management. He observes that risk management at the pretrial stage is about two issues: (1) “quantifying the risk at the pretrial stage,” which is a decision that must be made “quickly,” and (2) calculating how to “effectively assign risk without the assumption of guilt.”

“One should take apart that total [pretrial] population and segment [it] into some levels of risk,” he said. It is “reasonable to impose certain conditions, controls, and structures” around people because of risk, but as Henry observed, “you have got to have some reliable way to target what that risk is.”

Henry cautioned that there are few sure-fire tools or assessment instruments. “There used to be three or four that we would recommend, now there are none,” he said. The Vera Point Scale, based on the arrestee population in Brooklyn in 1961, is an example of an assessment scheme that’s outdated, even though it is used in counties across the country. Assessment, he said, varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction because of the “population, demographics, transience, the use of and types of drugs people are being arrested for, et cetera. . . . [We must] realize that the population doesn’t fit a yes or no category, that, in most cases, they are neither.”

Henry identified three “key factors” that are associated with predicting risk at the pretrial stage: (1) a prior history of failing to appear in court, (2) a prior record of convictions, not of arrests, and (3) a history of drug use. No factor is absolute, and all can be “overcome as far as some recommendation to get at the issue of jail crowding.”

“Community ties used to be the mantra that we preached,” Henry recalled. “If the person lived in the community at the present address, lived with [his or her] family, and worked at the same job for 10 years, then they were a good risk.” He cautioned not to overweigh community ties while acknowledging that they are good risk factors. “It does not mean that those who don’t have those ties are bad risks.”

Judicial—Santa Fe

Judge Frances Gallegos of the Santa Fe Municipal Court, elected to the bench in 1996 and the first woman to serve in that capacity, had a lengthy involvement in substance abuse issues before becoming judge in the city’s Drug Court. New Mexico has been the leader in the nation for DWI-related offenses.

The Drug Court clinic offers a 6-month alternative sentencing program to nonviolent offenders. “Sending people to jail is the easy way out,” Gallegos said. “Putting people into programs and tracking them is a lot harder.” She said that she believes the program “closes the revolving door that we have to deal with in the criminal justice system—you get arrested, you go to jail, you get out, you get re-arrested, you go to jail, you get out—a vicious and costly cycle.” Defendants and the community benefit because defendants can “hold down a job, pay their bills, pay their taxes, get the help they need for their alcohol or substance abuse problem,” and the community benefits because the defendants “become productive citizens.”

The program requires offenders to wear bright pink baseball caps while doing community service, such as building low-cost housing for Habitat for Humanity, delivering meals on wheels for seniors, or picking up trash. “People want to have their ‘piece of flesh,’ they want to see people punished, they want to see people doing time,” she said. “Because of the pink hat program, people driving down the street can visually see offenders doing time, they can visually see the seriousness of the problem.”

Gallegos said alternative sentencing is not only humane but also cost-effective. The Santa Fe Police Department jail bill is approximately \$80,000 per year for a metropolitan area of 180,000 people, low, in part, because of the alternative sentencing program. “Of all the cases I’ve seen in Civil Court, if I were to sentence each to 90 days for the offense, at the rate of \$74 per day, our jail bill would be as much as \$9 million—\$9 million that can be spent on pay raises for our officers, new cars, computers, and other much-needed equipment.”

Probation—Boston

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Deputy Commissioner of Probation for Massachusetts, has worked in virtually every job possible in the field, from line officer to commissioner. As a result of an “epidemic of youth homicide” in Boston in the early 1990s, “desperate to try almost anything to stem the tide of unprecedented levels of young kids killing each other,” Corbett and his fellow probation officers found that they could no longer sit inside from 9 to 5 and expect the crisis to be resolved. Realizing the inadequacy of traditional actuarial instruments used in risk assessment, Corbett and his colleagues developed other assessment methods: meeting in drafty church basements with community leaders, clergy, and street workers or sitting on stoops with grandparents to discuss the neighborhood’s problems.

To overcome institutional inertia, Corbett pushed the organization by identifying a “few champions” and selling a new approach to one officer at a time. The degree of community involvement—probation officers in collaboration with the community and police officers, working days, evenings, and nights, in the schools, homes, and on the streets—stemmed the bloody tide. One youth commented, “You’ve got us all tied up. We’re ready to go in another direction, not because it occurred to us that that was the right thing to do, but because you’ve shut off the other alternatives. There’s nowhere to move, nowhere to run, nowhere to hide. We got the message.” A key lesson for Corbett from this experience: “Where you couldn’t find a community, you could at least find a church, and the churches became a gateway into working with citizens.”

Parole—Missouri

Noting that “80 percent to 90 percent of the people who are in prisons will one day return to the community,” the state of Missouri has adopted an intensive supervision program for parolees, said Cranston Mitchell, Chair of the state’s Board of Probation and Parole. “Missouri has invested over \$700 million in prisons,” Cranston noted, but we were not achieving “any long-lasting safety for our citizens.” Recently, the state reevaluated its efforts and some money that

had been allocated to prison growth and managing prisons was invested in community initiatives, primarily the intensive supervision program.

In developing the program, Cranston said the state was trying to create a “new paradigm”—a balanced approach to treatment and control that involves imposing sanctions for inappropriate behavior but also rewarding people who do well. “We intervene to readjust, to impose sanctions, to redirect—it’s not just to ‘nail’ an offender and send them back to prison,” he said. By working more closely with the offender and with smaller caseloads, committing to community involvement, and practicing restorative justice, parole officers are getting out of the office and collaborating with police departments, prosecutors, and other interested parties.

Workshop 2.10—What About Girls?

Moderator:

Nancy Ware, Director of Technical Assistance and Training
Executive Office for Weed and Seed
Office of Justice Programs
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Mari Ann Daniels, Director
Baltimore Department of Juvenile Justice
Baltimore, Maryland

Dr. Marcia R. Chaiken, Director of Research
LINC
Alexandria, Virginia

Dr. Sheila D. Peters, Project Manager
Greene, Peters & Associates
Nashville, Tennessee

Margo L. Frasier, Sheriff
Travis County
Austin, Texas

Summary of Proceedings

Juvenile arrests of females have increased dramatically, both in absolute terms and relative to males, in the last decade. Yet females stay in detention up to five times longer than males, in part because there are so few programs to help them make a full transition back to the community, noted moderator Nancy Ware from the Executive Office for Weed and Seed in Washington, D.C. It has been extremely difficult to win support and funding for programs designed especially for girls. Panelists outlined the challenges facing those seeking to help female juvenile offenders and discussed three successful programs in Tennessee, Texas, and Maryland.

Not only are there few programs for juvenile female offenders, there is also little research, and it is often difficult to convince funders that allocating resources to girls is cost-effective, said Dr. Marcia Chaiken, Director of Research for LINC, a research organization in Alexandria, Virginia. In the absence of research, programmers have relied on myths about girls' behavior and psychology.

For example, early adolescent girls are as violent as boys, and then become relatively less violent as they progress through the teen years. But the preschool years are the most violent, Chaiken said. Girls tend not to report crimes, not because they suffer from low self-esteem or are too embarrassed, but because they often interpret withholding such information and working out their own problems as positive signs of adulthood.

The most effective programs for girls are age appropriate, comprehensive, and incorporate skill-building, Chaiken said. She cited Girl Scouts U.S.A. and Girls Incorporated as two organizations

that have established effective partnerships for dealing with problems such as school assaults and for delivering clear, positive messages to girls.

Tennessee

More than 70 percent of girls in the Tennessee juvenile justice system report a history of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse, said Dr. Sheila Peters, a licensed clinical psychologist with Greene, Peters & Associates in Nashville. To deal with the issues raised by these experiences, Peters and her colleagues developed a program to develop positive gender identity. The goal is to “help young ladies understand what it means to be a woman, what positive womanhood is.”

Because of their backgrounds, “we needed to provide space that is physically and emotionally safe,” with a clear structure so the girls could speak freely about various issues. Greene, Peters & Associates’ programs have used sports and quilting projects toward that end. Sports programs are a useful way to develop team-building and leadership skills and to help girls reconnect with their bodies. “When they are working on the quilt together,” Peters said, “they don’t think they are in a therapeutic context, and there is a great deal of dialogue and interaction,” and the girls see tangible proof of their progress at the end of each day. Peters adds a public service element by arranging for the quilt to be taken to homeless shelters or HIV-positive clients.

Other important elements in her program are job skills development and education about health, development, and sexuality, Peters said.

Travis County (Austin), Texas

Margo Frasier, the first female Sheriff and Chief Law Enforcement Officer in Travis County, outlined two programs to prevent female juvenile violence and offered suggestions to community groups seeking to work better with law enforcement.

Frasier has focused on the generational transmission of criminal behavior. A program she instituted with the Girl Scouts brings female offenders together with their daughters, both to develop familial bonds and to talk specifically about the daughter’s need to develop a life that does not emulate her mother’s behavior. The Girl Scouts meet separately with the daughters twice a month to provide positive reinforcement, show them positive adult female role models, and give them a chance to sort through their feelings about their mothers’ incarceration. Frasier said the program gives the girls a positive gang to belong to.

She also initiated a teen-dating, antiviolence program to help identify problems as early as middle school and help young women develop healthy relationships. Getting people committed to designing and executing programs for females is very difficult, she said.

Acknowledging that community groups often have problems establishing working relationships with law enforcement, she offered the following suggestions:

- Bring your own funding to the partnership. Don't assume law enforcement has the resources to do it all.
- Show what you want law enforcement people to do and protect them on the liability front.
- Show how particular cases will result in better prosecution of cases.
- Stroke the law enforcement agency, which is always under pressure to show a benefit or result.

Baltimore, Maryland

Mari Ann Daniels, Director of the Baltimore Department of Juvenile Justice, said many in the criminal justice system dislike working with girls, and prefer to incarcerate them rather than address the issues underlying their behavior. She cited cases where girls who ran away were put in jail, while boys charged with crimes were released.

To combat the problem, she established a wide range of partnerships with organizations that could offer programs to girls. Among the organizations were the Girls Scouts, local colleges, the Urban League, and the Baltimore Health Department. They offered conflict resolution groups, initiatives dealing with substance abuse, computer training, and career workshops, so the girls could examine options other than "hair and nails," she said. Results were quick and impressive. In the first year, commitments of girls to secure facilities declined 90 percent.

Workshop 3.1—Partnership Between Substance Abuse Treatment and Criminal Justice: Maximizing Resources With Shared Populations

Moderator:

Fred W. Garcia, Director
Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse
Olympia, Washington

Panelists:

Preston Daniels, Mayor
City of Des Moines
Des Moines, Iowa

Valera Jackson, Executive Vice President
The Village
Miami, Florida

Foster Cook, Director
Breaking the Cycle
Birmingham, Alabama

Summary of Proceedings

Collaborative efforts between the criminal justice system and chemical dependency agencies need to be better institutionalized because so many criminal justice clients are diagnosed as chemically dependent or substance abusers, moderator Fred Garcia said. There is a great deal of repetition and duplication in services and little information sharing, and often inadequate treatment is provided even when more appropriate, more individualized treatment is available in a community and might be used if a more comprehensive system were in place. Panelists identified the key components of a comprehensive system, barriers to creating one, and model programs.

Mayor Preston Daniels of Des Moines agreed that building comprehensive justice systems is important but difficult: not only are offender clients challenging, but the systems that are supposed to deal with clients are often resistive. Successful interagency collaborations are built on four components: screening and assessment, treatment strategies, management strategies, and systems coordination.

Currently, screening is repetitive, labor intensive, and nonproductive. Sharing of information is vital, and confidentiality barriers should be broken with the assistance of the courts. Effective screening and assessment can determine an individual's needs and an outline of how to proceed; they are especially important to increasing the accuracy of the data. In the initial assessment, information from all relevant agencies should be shared and treatments goals established. Reassessment should occur at the end of each stage and should be individualized.

Regarding treatment strategies, there are inconsistent data regarding the efficacy of various approaches, but it is clear that treatment should be individualized and that accurate diagnosis is essential for success. Dual-diagnosis clients offer special problems, and there is a severe lack of good programs to manage these clients. Collaborative efforts are especially important with these offenders.

Effective management strategies are necessary, especially in cases if clients have multiple needs that are addressed by multiple agencies operating under different laws and regulations. One example of a challenge to such strategies: while substance abuse treatment centers and mental health units can discharge offenders for being uncooperative, the criminal justice system cannot. However, no one benefits if an offender is discharged and the mental health and substance abuse issues go untreated.

Also key is effective systems coordination. Agencies need effective policies on how to coordinate and interact in the best interests of clients. There should be a consistent message and flow of information, and ways to facilitate the communication among the systems must be found. Technology can help here, and when necessary courts can help overcome barriers established by law or regulation.

For collaborative efforts to be successful, each cooperating agency must have a clear working mission, said Garcia, of Washington state's Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse. It is important that the agencies not rely on the enthusiasm and energy of one individual but that all involved be committed to the mission.

Garcia also stressed the need for early substance abuse treatment for juveniles, which studies have shown can be very successful and result in fewer arrests. Such abuse results in decreased school performance and increased arrest rates, and there is a direct correlation between substance abuse and the carrying of weapons in schools.

Treating substance abuse has saved money for Washington state, Garcia said. In a study of 534 welfare clients who received substance abuse treatment, clients who successfully completed treatment had fewer emergency room visits, fewer prescription drugs prescribed, and fewer mental health admissions after treatment. Garcia has been able to use studies like this one to convince legislators that substance abuse treatment for other populations is cost-effective and worth funding.

One model program operating in Alabama, called Breaking the Cycle, uses a systemwide, integrated approach involving both criminal justice and substance abuse treatment agencies from the time of arrest to the time of discharge. The premise of the program is that drug demand will decline if heavy drug users are treated.

The program focuses on early intervention, including substance abuse assessments and mandatory drug testing of all individuals within 48 hours of arrest. It includes systemwide use of information, graduated incentives and sanctions, and judicial oversight. The model is a combination of a supervised pretrial release program, with drug testing and drug court style

reviews, built on a Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) case management platform. The advantage of the TASC continuum-of-care model is that treatment can be individualized and the plan altered as needed.

The program's benefits have included expedited caseloads, decreased time in drug courts, improved assessments, earlier intervention of substance abuse issues, and creation of a deferred prosecution program.

Lessons learned from the initiative have included: the importance of collaborative planning; the importance of including everyone, from the bailiff to the judge, so that all activities are consistent; an understanding of the interrelatedness of the entire system, from overcrowded prisons to overloaded dockets; the impact of external factors, including medical problems on federal lawsuits; that information is important and must be managed responsibly, because abundance of information can create new problems; and that flexibility is important.

Conclusions are that early intervention is vital and important, judicial oversight works, drug testing is critical and provides credibility for the criminal justice system and a focal point for monitoring and reassessment, and use of information sharing and systemwide collaboration works.

Valera Jackson is Executive Vice President of The Village, a private, nonprofit, community-based substance abuse treatment center in Miami and the Virgin Islands. Offenders make up 60 percent of the program's clientele. Jackson agreed that treatment should be individualized, conducted early, and be part of an ongoing continuum of care. She agreed that collaboration between criminal justice and treatment agencies is in everyone's best interest, but argued that prison-based treatment centers are not ideal settings for substance abuse treatment and often offer too few services. She feels that most low-level offenders need treatment not jail, and that it is questionable whether mandatory sentencing is effective.

While many treatment skeptics remain, she explained that research supports the fact that treatment does work for offenders. Research also indicates that therapeutic models for substance abuse treatment are more successful than some other programs used in prisons. In addition, success should be measured by abstinence, not recidivism, she argued. Abstinence is the primary goal of substance abuse treatment.

Substance abuse treatment saves the state money. In Florida it cost less to treat 25,000 offenders for substance abuse than it would have cost to build and operate a 900-bed prison. She explained that treating offenders at private, nonprofit treatment centers saves the state even more money due to shared funding from resources such as the Department of Health, Department of Children and Family Services, and offender co-pays.

The coercive quality of the judicial system does assist in successful treatment of offenders. As an example, she cited a study done by The Village that revealed probation clients had a 100-percent treatment completion rate. When confidentiality was waived, the offender was even more cooperative during treatment, knowing that a probation officer had access to his or her records.

Private, nonprofit agencies, she said, are very familiar with collaborative efforts because they are dependent upon many different organizations for funding and are used to working with many different agencies simultaneously.

Workshop 3.2—Combating the Methamphetamine Epidemic: Shifting Tactics in Rural Law Enforcement

Moderator:

Hon. Stephen L. Hill, Jr., U.S. Attorney
Western District of Missouri
Kansas City, Missouri

Panelists:

E. Mick Mollica, Special Consultant
Learn Associates
Folsom, California

George Epp, Sheriff
Boulder County
Boulder, Colorado

Lou Pharo
Drug Enforcement Administration
Washington, D.C.

Guy J. Hargreaves, Staff Coordinator
Drug Enforcement Administration
Washington, D.C.

Summary of Proceedings

Reaches of the methamphetamine epidemic can be found in the safest-looking communities all across the country, from California—the site of superlabs and source area for supply and finish products and know-how—to Missouri, Kansas, and Iowa—the sites of startup and middle-state clandestine labs (clan labs). The number of clan labs has increased exponentially. Prior to 1998, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) seized 200–400 clan labs per year; since 1998, that number has increased to 1,600 (not including those seized by local law enforcement agencies). Panelists reviewed national developments in the epidemic as well as state and county tactics.

Guy Hargreaves attributed the dramatic increase in clan labs since 1994 to the Mexican drug groups that have organized bulk production in Mexico and California. Continued proliferation of clan labs followed from the ease of production, accessible know-how, and availability of materials. Last year, California maintained its position as the state with the largest clan labs (superlabs). Nevada, Missouri, and Utah, however, had the highest proportion of clan labs to population in the country. In 1992, the DEA reported only two clan labs in Missouri; the number increased to 679 in 1998. E. Mick Mollica contended that the increase in identified clan labs may also be a positive sign that law enforcement agencies are becoming better skilled in identifying them. Still, panelists agreed that learning from the California experience was important as was looking to California as a great resource for program developers and evaluators.

Despite the popularity of this class of drugs, they are triple killers. “They can kill you while you’re making [them], kill while you are taking [them], and exact a terrible economic price on communities,” including fires, explosions, and contaminated water and soil, Hargreaves said. As a result, DEA recommendations include:

- Developing training and training enhancement programs.
- Targeting domestic, nonbiker gang, non-Mexican producers through Operation Velocity.
- Conducting special operations that focus on syndicate and international smuggling activities.
- Operating back-track chemical companies that provide some of the precursor chemicals required in clan lab productions.
- Researching safety equipment.
- Making presentations to the public on safety and demand reduction issues.
- Evaluating cost structures.
- Analyzing environmental contamination.
- Conducting training programs.

The centerpiece of the DEA approach is its training programs. Training is particularly key in rural areas, especially among firefighters who often encounter toxic and waste dump sites while fighting fires and are neither full-time professionals nor trained in hazard management. Many law enforcement officers have never encountered such labs. The five steps of such training are: (1) proper execution of raiding, (2) assessment of hazard risk, (3) processing suspects and evidence, (4) containment, and (5) hazard waste disposal.

Learn Associates increased community awareness of the clan labs by developing 8- to 10-minute videos, which targeted different groups such as schools, law enforcement agencies, realtors, ranchers, and management consulting firms on the identification of clan labs. Mollica, a Consultant at the organization, advocated gathering information from the community (such as hotel workers and cleaning staff), perhaps through financial incentives, and from school district teachers to get a sense of the epidemic, as well as how they identify intoxicated people.

Sheriff George Epp of Boulder County, Colorado, listed markers that some community members use to identify those under the influence: generally blue collar, white, and engaged in a criminal lifestyle—“meatheads are dirty, exhibit bad personal hygiene, have bad teeth, are not interested in housekeeping, and keep their cars in a mess.” This information is used in the clan labs component of the police training for all California officers.

After mapping the history of the stimulant from its introduction in the 1880s as cocaine, Epp noted that stimulant use occurs in cycles. Regarding methamphetamine, the cycle is on the rise partly because of all the promises associated with such drugs: feeling good, weight control, alertness. Moreover, the drug exhibits a high that lasts almost twice as long as cocaine, but with a quality that equals cocaine. Because methamphetamine is cheaper to make and distribute, its price tends to be equal to or even less than that of cocaine.

Workshop 3.3—Retooling Prevention for Changing Times

Moderator:

Hon. Shay Bilchik, Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Barbara E. Thomas, Projects Manager
The Family Institute
Washington, D.C.

Linda Dahlberg, Senior Behavioral Scientist
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Atlanta, Georgia

James J. McGivney, Deputy Director for
Government Relations
D.A.R.E.[®] America
Dumfries, Virginia

Summary of Proceedings

Public outcry over programs like “midnight basketball,” increased doubts over the effectiveness of juvenile crime legislation, and mounting concern that prevention programs do not work underscore the need for empirical data to justify prevention programs, guide their retooling, and direct the development of new, effective ones. Panelists discussed the value of family and institutionally based prevention programs, best practices, and the components of rigorous, systematic program evaluation.

Effective programs are those that address a child’s development and the multiple risk factors that increase the likelihood of juvenile delinquency as the child moves from one context to another: from an individual, to family or close interpersonal relationships, to school, community, and societal-based environments, argued Linda Dahlberg of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The relationship between behavior and child development is complex and complicated by context and personality factors. But prevention programs are premised on the idea that violence, heightened risk behaviors, drug and alcohol use, and unprotected sex are learned behaviors and, as such, can be unlearned or never learned. Complementing this effort are parenting programs, which can effectively reduce child abuse and thus lower juvenile delinquency rates, noted Shay Bilchik of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Identification of effective prevention programs among the many that operate at an individual, peer and family, and institutional level (e.g., schools, detention centers, housing, and neighborhoods) requires systematic, rigorous evaluation, Dahlberg said. Such evaluation employs randomized, control trials that (1) measure baseline risk factors among equally situated control

and participating groups before and after program participation, (2) assess quality, and (3) monitor programs for implementation and long-term effects.

According to Dahlberg, individual-based programs that seek to change the child's cognitive and social competencies, such as problem solving, moral reasoning, decisionmaking, anger control, and coping with impulsiveness do not work. Individual-based programs that teach conflict resolution, provide rights of passage, and develop social skills, however, exhibit evidence of some positive benefits. Evaluation must confirm this.

By contrast, evidence of success is much stronger for programs influencing the interpersonal environment of a child: his or her family and peers. Successful interpersonal-based programs, like the Healthy Program in several states, address multiple components: family risks, family dynamics (e.g., cohesion, communications, and parent/child interaction), family involvement with a child's peers, school, and neighborhood.

Ineffective interpersonal-based approaches include psychotherapy efforts to mitigate antisocial and violent behavior as well as information-based programs. Sufficient evidence does not exist to determine the efficacy of peer group intervention and peer mediation programs on juvenile delinquency.

The Healthy Program operates on the notion that multiple stress levels (rather than economic condition or single or teenage parenting) contribute to child abuse and neglect. Since its initial pilot in 1988 in Hawaii, it has expanded its reach from injury prevention to promoting the best environment for children up to 5 years old through homecare visits by nurses to children at risk for child abuse and neglect. Its success was demonstrated internally and through randomized trial evaluations conducted by state and outside agencies like the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse (NCPCA) between 1988 and 1991.

Findings confirm that participating families at high risk for child abuse and neglect (1) exhibited reduced levels of child abuse and neglect over high-risk families that did not participate; (2) demonstrated higher immunization rates, increased maternal involvement, and child responsiveness to the mother and improved parenting skills; and (3) raised children that developed appropriately.

Continuation of the NCPCA study 3 years after its initial testing revealed long-term benefits to participants in the Healthy Program such as (1) average to above-average parenting skills and parent/child interaction; (2) reduced potential for child abuse; and (3) increased levels of social support. The study did find below-average cognitive abilities of participating children, perhaps due to lower education levels of their parents. State evaluations in Florida, Oregon, Virginia, and Arizona confirm these findings. The Arizona study, in particular, revealed decreased dependency on public aid and fewer days on food stamp and Medicare relief: these savings financed 50 percent of the Healthy Program's costs in Arizona.

Barbara Thomas identified the correlates of success for the Healthy Program: limited caseload for visiting homecare staff; linked families and medical care agencies; trained staff and supervisors;

homecare staff with a nonjudgmental and culturally appropriate perspective; technical support for infrastructure development, program assessment, and staff hiring; and development of training curricula at all levels. Since 1995, free technical support has no longer been available; the Family Institute expects to provide this free technical support through the Internet in the future.

The program has broadened its focus from mother/child relationships to include fathers, based on evidence that fathers can positively affect child development and behaviors. The success of the Texas program, which involved fathers—some of whom had been involved in gangs, experienced unemployment, or were then unemployed and had exhibited violent behavioral patterns—resulted in the Dads Make a Difference Training and Technical Support Program, piloted by the Institute throughout Washington, D.C.

Within schools, prevention programs range from altering teacher management practices to changing the school climate through antiviolenace awareness, security surveillance, and security police programs. While efforts directed at teaching practices have shown some benefit in improving academic performance and instilling discipline, Dahlberg noted no such effects on antisocial or aggressive behavior. Systematic evaluation still is required to evaluate school security systems. The results may prove less significant than the community pressure being exerted on legislators and educators to “do something.”

One such school-based prevention system is the D.A.R.E.[®] program, which addresses drug abuse by: (1) providing accurate information on alcohol, drug, and tobacco use; (2) teaching resistance against drug, alcohol, and tobacco use; (3) developing decisionmaking skills; and (4) increasing positive self-esteem and resistance to peer pressure. Developed by teachers of the Los Angeles School District in collaboration with the police department, the program is intended to provide K–12 students with information and skills to live through experiences with drugs and violence and establish positive relations with law enforcement officers, other adults, and students. Operating in 70 percent of all school districts nationwide, 33,000 D.A.R.E.[®]-trained law enforcement officers conduct the program. D.A.R.E.[®] also provides a parent program to enhance parent/child relationships, promote child self-esteem, and provide information on the risk factors for drug abuse, as well as existing drugs and their effects.

In the face of increasing drug use and gang violence, the efficacy of D.A.R.E.[®]'s approach is being questioned. Following an open meeting conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice, Jim McGivney of D.A.R.E.[®] reported that the organization will: (1) participate in a longitudinal test on prevention programs that include research-based middle school curricula and a revised D.A.R.E.[®] middle school curriculum; (2) consider team-based training; (3) consider input from the scientific community on state-of-the-art findings for modification of elementary school programs; and (4) implement two middle school “best practices.”

Among communities, increasing attempts at juvenile prevention include “taking back the neighborhoods,” instituting neighborhood watches and community policing, dispersing housing projects, revitalizing the community through empowerment zone investments, and enhancing physical safety. As with school security systems, many of these community measures have not been justified by empirical evidence; they are, nevertheless, politically driven. Dahlberg argued

that the primary benefit to action such as community policing is its proactive nature and effect on increasing awareness, building collaborative relationships, and forming cohesive organizations. With respect to correctional institutions and boot camp training schools, which are most widely evaluated, they simply do not work.

Workshop 3.4—Creating a Blueprint for Community Safety: Planning and Action

Moderator:

Theresa Kelly, Director of Special Projects
National Crime Prevention Council
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

RaeAnn Palmer, Coordinator
Special Projects and Community Programs
Hartford, Connecticut

Jeanne Robison, Assistant City Prosecutor
City Prosecutor's Office
Salt Lake City, Utah

Patricia Smith, Assistant Director
CCP/Hotspots
Mayor's Coordinating Council on
Criminal Justice
Baltimore, Maryland

Summary of Proceedings

A strategic planning framework developed by the U.S. Department of Justice's Comprehensive Communities Program (CCP) has been used by several communities, moderator Theresa Kelly of the National Crime Prevention Council noted. Its key feature is involvement of citizens in the strategic-planning process. The framework has helped communities identify problems and solutions, assign priorities to each, develop strategies, and determine measurable outcomes. Ultimately, it has helped them balance prevention, intervention, and enforcement efforts and become more effective in dealing with quality-of-life issues.

Panelists representing three cities that have used this strategic-planning process—Hartford, Baltimore, and Salt Lake City—described their communities and the crises that led them to adopt the framework.

Hartford

Hartford changed dramatically in the 1990s, according to RaeAnn Palmer, Coordinator of Special Projects and Community Programs in Connecticut. Many of the insurance companies for which the city is famous began moving out, while small industries were relocating to other parts of the country. This migration took much of the middle class with it, leaving a very diverse city that was ranked as 1 of the top 10 poorest cities in the country.

Crime rates rose significantly, making people fearful to leave their homes, but the incident that "pushed the people over the line" was the shooting of a young girl in gang crossfire while she

was sleeping in her father's lap, Palmer said. The gang fighting was related to drugs and had been going on for years.

The child's death galvanized the community. The government and community institutions began exploring the idea of a community-oriented government and collaborated to develop solutions. Palmer summarized what they learned:

- Develop a shared vision that will keep multiple stakeholders at the table.
- Develop an organizational structure that directs how the process operates.
- Conduct a needs assessment to identify problems, detail current responses to those problems, and outline the results achieved.
- Develop new responses if current ones are not working.
- Assess conditions and outcomes in an ongoing process—it is critical to continuing success.
- Have patience and recognize that this is a long-term process.
- Provide adequate staffing to support the planning process.

Baltimore

Drugs and open-air drug markets were major problems identified in Baltimore City, according to Patricia Smith from the Mayor's Coordinating Council on Criminal Justice. Areas of the city had been overtaken by drug dealers, and citizens were afraid to walk on the streets. The city's strategy was modeled after one outlined in a book by Roger Conner, *The Winnable War*. Those strategies are:

- Deny space for the drug trade by cleaning up drug areas—remove trash, paint over graffiti, plant trees and gardens, and perform other housekeeping tasks.
- Maximize participation and accountability of all stakeholders in the community.
- Identify citizens to participate in the planning process and assess the community's resources to direct them toward neighborhood reclamation.
- Involve the community in sharing information with police.
- Express community intolerance for drug dealing.
- Provide positive programs for children and adults, making sure to involve youth in the planning process.

- Develop the capacity to sustain the effort over time.

Salt Lake City

Gang violence brought stakeholders to the table in Salt Lake City, according to Jeanne Robison, the city's Assistant City Prosecutor. The city created juvenile drug courts and restructured the probation program. However, she said, the most unique response was the creation of Community Action Teams—multidisciplinary problem-solving teams that coordinate services. The teams “started out small with just a few folks from the Mayor’s Office, Prosecutor’s Office, Boys and Girls Club, and school district.” Before long, however, the teams expanded and now are geographically based in five of the seven community council districts.

Success has been based on six key factors, she said:

- (1) Providing a centralized place for seeking answers to questions or help with problems.
- (2) Eliminating organizational “buck passing” by having everyone at the table working together.
- (3) Increasing accountability dramatically because all the players are working together and are accountable to each other.
- (4) Understanding each collaborating organization’s capacity for service delivery.
- (5) Generating creativity because “out of the box” solutions are common.
- (6) Maintaining confidentiality of client information as a nonnegotiable principle.

In each example, there is extensive involvement of citizens, including youth, in developing solutions; change and taking risks are encouraged. Definitions of the desired outcomes are clear, and successes are celebrated.

Workshop 3.5—Expanding the Concept of Sanctions To Increase Offender Accountability and Public Safety for the Long Term

Moderator:

William H. Carbone, Director
Office of Alternative Sanctions
Rocky Hill, Connecticut

Panelists:

Gary Hinzman, Director
Sixth Judicial District
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

Mary V. Leftridge Byrd, Superintendent
State Correctional Institution
Chester, Pennsylvania

John F. Gorczyk, Director
Vermont Department of Corrections
Waterbury, Vermont

Summary of Proceedings

Being “tough on crime” must include expanding the concept of alternative sanctions to increase offender accountability and public safety, according to William Carbone, Director of Connecticut’s Office of Alternative Sanctions. Carbone acknowledged that when Connecticut was building prisons “like crazy” and spending great sums of money in the 1980s, the new prisons would open and soon become overcrowded, and this resulted in early releases that undermined the integrity of the entire criminal justice system. This dynamic is certainly “not tough on crime” Carbone underlined. “The only winners in this scenario were the offenders who knew how the prison game worked and reasoned that the profit of their crime outweighed any punishment that the state could actually impose.”

Although it is widely known that prisons are not the only way to define punishment, this concept had been largely ignored until recently. “In Connecticut we were forced, however, to look at other ways of defining punishment—because of economic reasons.” What started in Connecticut as a pilot program for alternative sanctions has now grown into mainstream justice, into an accepted way of imposing punishment, and Connecticut’s program offers a model for other states.

When an offense occurs, an offender benefits materially or emotionally and the victim and community lose—the scales of justice are out of balance. In classical, retributive justice, society attempts to bring the offender to a level of pain and suffering commensurate with the material and emotional loss of the victim and community; this is called “just desserts.” “But this turns out to be negative economics,” said John Gorczyk of the Vermont Department of Corrections, “because there is no value added in this equation. The victim who lost the television set cannot

get it back and, in fact, is asked to pay taxes so that the offender can be incarcerated for a time. It's a lose-lose situation for the victim and the community. . . . This is why there is a lot of public concern about the services provided offenders during incarceration whether recreation, education, television sets, et cetera. There's an understanding at a visceral level that there's something wrong with this process."

Gorczyk maintained that "we need a value-added model for resolving conflict and dispute." The traditional model is one in which government has been providing services directly to individuals, bypassing community and family. Experience, however, has shown that government is not very good at providing services to individuals—families do that best. The community's role is to support families through school, meaningful work, and other programs that increase the ability of people to interact collaboratively with one another.

In the private sector, when a company provides millions of dollars in services, the customer's expectations must be known and fulfilled to be successful, he noted. In the criminal justice system, market research/focus groups must be done with segments of "customers" to design appropriate services and products. The justice system in Vermont has been evaluated in this manner since 1991.

Vermonters wanted safety from violent criminals, accountability for violators of the law, repair of damage done, assurance of safe releases, involvement of the community in the process, and assurance of quality and efficiency from the criminal justice system and the Department of Corrections, Gorczyk said. "We invented two new legal statuses: a supervised community sentence, which is essentially a front-end parole that the judge sentences directly. We also took our furlough programs, furlough authority, and extended them to the courts and gave the judge the authority to sentence offenders directly to furlough without ever going to jail. We set down a plan stating how we wanted to use our correction resources: We wanted to target correctional beds for violent felons particularly those who pose a high risk of repeat; we wanted to put in place an intermediate sanctions program and new legal statuses for offenders who are less of a threat, but may represent a significant risk; and we wanted to implement a restorative justice model using community boards."

Gary Hinzman, Director, Sixth Judicial District in Iowa, focused on two themes: the value of involving the community in community-oriented corrections and the important need to provide victim services. He said that Iowa was the first state in the nation to implement community-based justice and correction systems. In Iowa, community correction means pretrial release, presentence investigation, probation, parole, and residential facilities—the whole continuum. The state has about 7,800 offenders in the prison system and about 24,000 in the community-based system. "The programs are resource-rich, and we use them rather effectively," he said.

As a result of statewide citizen surveys, Iowa's system includes participation from victims and from communities. A community justice task force meets every 2 weeks. Offenders are introduced into community environments again "because when communities have the power to deal with offenders, we have found that they will say, 'let us help you and your family get whole again,' and not so much 'we don't want you in our neighborhood.'" The public wants holistic

services delivered to offenders and wraparound services for the whole family. The public also wants partnerships in the community with law enforcement, human services, and neighborhood associations. “Those who thought 10 years ago that our society could build itself out of the prison crisis, surely no longer believe that today,” he said. “People who advocated that are now asking for help.”

Moving from historical or traditional sanctions is a process, not an event, noted Mary Leftridge Byrd, Superintendent of the State Correctional Institute in Chester, Pennsylvania. When mobilizing partnerships in justice settings, wardens and prison administrators should not be overlooked, she said. “It is not an oxymoron to include a warden’s perspective in this discussion. The expertise of correctional institution administrators and others who are institution-bound is usually an untapped resource; often these persons are an uninvited partner in contemporary dialogue.”

The justice system continues to focus on crime control rather than on crime prevention, Leftridge Byrd said. She noted these statistics: in 1959, there were 10,000 drug arrests; in 1963, there were 480,000; in 1985, there were 800,000. “Substance abuse and crime are joined at the hip.” With 1.4 million arrests in 1995 for drunk driving, alcohol may be a bigger culprit in connection with murder, rape, assault, and spousal abuse than any illegal drug. Second to alcohol is the relationship between illegal drugs and violent crime, particularly crack cocaine, which is cheap and accessible. Drug and alcohol users and addicts—the majority of prison inmates—are likely to re-offend after release.

In response to these issues, the 1,000-bed Correctional Institute at Chester, designed specifically to house male inmates who had been in intensive drug and alcohol treatment, has provided many approaches to treatment including in-patient and out-patient treatment, individual counseling and group counseling, Narcotics Anonymous and Alcoholics Anonymous meetings, and detoxification.

The Chester institute is richly staffed, which is unusual in a public institution. The staffing reflects a belief in the importance of a holistic approach to treatment. The institution is a first for Pennsylvania and one of just a few in the country where an entire state prison provides primary treatment in a therapeutic community, followed by at least 6 months of aftercare. Recognizing that relapse is a part of recovery, Chester might eventually have a residential substance abuse treatment program, if funding becomes available. “We are optimistic about affecting the long-term reductions in prison populations in Pennsylvania,” Leftridge Byrd said.

She emphasized that broad inquiries into criminal justice issues must include women. “Having worked exclusively with women for 11 years, shame on us if we ignore this population,” she said. “Enlightened persons must continue to investigate, and talk about, and understand, and share, and replicate, and nurture what works for women. One size does not fit all.” Nationally, of those women sentenced to serve state time, 66 percent were regular drug users; of those women serving federal time, 35 percent were regular drug users. She noted that the costs of incarceration for women typically includes the cost of provision of child care and custody.

Reviewing the Connecticut program, Carbone emphasized that alternative sanctions for offenders are now not so much “alternative” as a part of the mainstream, but it took several years to make that true. Not unlike other states, Connecticut went through significant prison overcrowding. During the 1980s, the Connecticut prison population tripled from 5,000 to 15,000. “We had a major prison building program; we spent \$1 billion between 1985 and 1992 to add 11,000 new beds to Connecticut’s prison system. At that time we had one of the largest prison building programs in the country, and the state legislature was eager to build out of this problem; [it] did whatever was necessary to make building stay on schedule. But each time a new facility was opened, we continued to be overcrowded.”

In 1991, the majority of offenders going to jail were serving only 10 percent of their sentences. This was strictly a function of overcrowding. “We couldn’t exceed federal caps on institution populations. There was no alternative but to let offenders out early,” Carbone said.

A group organized by the Connecticut chief court administrator devised three goals: offenders should serve at least 50 percent of their sentences before they are eligible for release; jails should operate at or below 100-percent capacity; and there should be meaningful alternative sanctions for people who would be offered opportunities in the community. The Office of Alternative Sanctions was created and charged with providing alternative sanctions to 3,500 people per day by the end of the third year, with 4,000 people diverted from the correctional system. The office had a budget of \$25 million. To minimize expenses, the program called for limited use of in-patient treatment but placed a majority of offenders in day-reporting-type programs.

The program achieved its goals, and now has been running for 8 years. By 1994, offenders were serving an average of 50 percent of their time; now, they serve 75 percent. Carbone noted: “That’s more than a 700-percent improvement over where we were at the beginning of this decade.”

Workshop 3.6—Tools To Measure Program Effectiveness

Presenters:

Robert A. Kirchner, Senior Program
Advisor
Program Development Division
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Washington, D.C.

Craig Cussimano, Manager of Web Site
Development
Justice Research and Statistics Association
Washington, D.C.

Jean F. O'Neil, Director
Research Policy Analysis
National Crime Prevention Council
Washington, D.C.

Summary of Proceedings

The field of evaluation is changing, becoming much more applied policy-oriented. This trend was prompted by the 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act. New rigorous mandates were given to the U.S. Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) helped in the implementation of both formula and discretionary programs. "The agency no longer could identify effective programs, model programs, whenever it wanted to; now it had to build evaluation components routinely into every funded activity, every funded program. The ultimate goal was to come up with effective model programs," said Robert Kirchner, Senior Program Advisor in BJA's Program Development Division.

In the last decade, the evaluation system has evolved to include more powerful measurement tools, but, Kirchner said, "There are three key indicators for the success of an evaluation: Prepare programs for evaluation, prepare programs for evaluation, and prepare programs for evaluation."

Many people want their programs evaluated when they are not ready for it; this is true at various stages of program development. It is critically important at the outset to build proper evaluation frameworks. In developing guidelines and a framework for the Partners Against Violence Network, Kirchner's program published a handbook series, *The Assessment of Criminal Justice Programs Model*, which has become the basis for evaluation of more than 500 programs and analyses at 9 major meetings and in 9 major publications.

The BJA Evaluation Partnership Program, founded last year, now has 23 active evaluations in 27 states. Handbooks on the nature and profiling of drugs and crime in particular jurisdictions, for determining the effectiveness of programs, for releasing and communicating the results of evaluation, and for developing and assessing performance measurement have been issued.

About 2 years ago, the Program Development Division began incorporating the Internet as a tool for developing and sharing information. Most of its work is on its Web site at

www.bja.evaluationwebsite.org, which is organized by criminal justice programs and topical areas. It includes a public interest orientation on how evaluations are done.

The program has not forgotten print resources. It publishes three introductory booklets: *An Orientation to Program Evaluation*; *The Basics of Program Evaluation*; and *Beyond the Basics*, which prepare readers to take full advantage of the Web site's resources.

For some community groups, preparing for evaluation is difficult because their projects are large and diffuse. "Some of the messiest evaluations to perform are with big and chaotic community efforts," said Jean O'Neil of the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC). NCPC has developed models of community process to help local groups recognize their needs and to help them build evaluation into their programs from the beginning.

Community organizations should conduct evaluations for the following reasons:

- Prove to others that they accomplished something.
- Help celebrate their work, which is one of the greatest motivators for getting people to do more.
- Encourage others to do something.
- Tell the community what they did.
- Impress funders.
- Help make good future decisions.
- Check their progress and efficiency at manageable intervals, rather than after a period of years.

Program funders and other evaluators should understand that "community people involved in projects are doers," O'Neil said. "They're not observers, not writers, not great abstractionists. So when you ask them to write 20-page reports, don't hold your breath." Community people know what information is kept and where it is, and can provide most of what evaluators need if they are involved in the process. "Their engagement is what buys interest and support for the evaluation," O'Neil said. "And because the evaluator understands their needs, he/she will be better able to think of helpful ideas. You bring them in, and they feel a part of it."

It is critical that the evaluator be part of a project from the outset. The evaluator's initial mission is to create an evaluation plan that fits the vision of the work to be done; in addition, he or she should know who wants the evaluation done and why. The community ought to have answers to certain questions even before putting in a Request for Proposal for an evaluation: What are we setting out to do? Who is involved? What do we expect to change? What process do we want to use?

Crime statistics and victimization survey data do not necessarily give an accurate picture of a community's health. For example, the project on Human Development in Chicago neighborhoods surveyed 80 neighborhoods to determine the most significant factor in predicting a neighborhood's crime rate. They found that it was contact and connection among people in the neighborhood. Measures of such a neighborhood included the degree to which neighbors could ask others to watch over their children and even whether pizza companies were willing to deliver to the neighborhood.

O'Neil offered these further suggestions for a successful evaluation:

- Know what interests and motivates the audience for your evaluation presentation. Evaluators must learn different ways to report, including color graphs, transparencies, executive summaries, and photographs. Videotapes containing interviews with people describing how programs have affected them can also be effective.
- Do not bore your audience with data that are not applicable.
- Be accurate.
- Have an energetic attitude.
- Remember that an evaluation is not a dead document, but rather a live set of results, lessons learned, information that means something.
- Be brief—if you have 1 minute, do not use 12.
- Be believable; it does not matter how accurate the results are if people do not believe you.
- Let the audience know what is in it for them—how they can continue to make a difference.
- Be clear; try to remember your audience was only a part of the report you are presenting, and even if the report is accurate, few will follow it if it is not clear.
- Refer to problems as challenges, failures as lessons.
- Use a “big picture” to frame the report.

Workshop 3.7—High-Tech Crime and High-Tech Justice: Responses to Computer Crime and Terrorism

Presenters:

Kevin Jackson, Program Manager
Research and Technology Division
National Institute of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Keith Chval, Supervisor
Internet Criminal Activity Unit
Office of the Attorney General of Illinois
Chicago, Illinois

Summary of Proceedings

As personal computers and the Internet have made electronic commerce and instant communication a reality, the technology is also making things easier for criminals. Local law enforcement agencies are hard pressed to keep up with computer crime, and often lack resources, expertise, or understanding of the problem, which makes interagency cooperation critical.

Kevin Jackson's Research and Technology Division of the National Institute of Justice, which previously served as a testing and development center for police equipment, is now more heavily involved in computer crime and determining what local departments need to fight it. The division serves as an information clearinghouse for local agencies. There are some pockets of success in battling computer crime, but they are scattered and fragmented, he said.

Computer crime is more pervasive than most think, and fraud, hacking, gambling, and child pornography are some of the most common online crimes, said Keith Chval, a former county prosecutor who now runs the Internet Criminal Activity Unit in Illinois. It was formed in 1997 and is one of a handful of such units in the country. All states, except Vermont, now have laws specifically aimed at computer crime, defined as any crime in which a computer is used to commit a crime or is incidental to the crime.

About half of American homes now have personal computers, almost doubling since 1995. Americans send 2.2 billion e-mail messages a day, and that is expected to increase 50-fold by 2005. By 2001, more than 150 million Americans are expected to use the Internet, with electronic commerce accounting for \$600 billion by 2005. These numbers describe a rich target.

The FBI estimates computer intrusions increased by 250 percent in 1998, with the stolen data valued at \$100 million. At the same time, only one-third of the companies or agencies who suffered intrusions reported them to the police. Chval attributed this primarily to ignorance and distrust. Most people do not know their computers have been hacked, since intruders are taking only copies of the data. There is also an element of distrust in the private sector toward law enforcement—a fear that police are incompetent in computer crime investigation and a desire to hide the knowledge of the intrusions from competitors.

One federal agency intruded into other agencies' computers, using standard hacking techniques to test their security. They were able to penetrate U.S. Department of Defense computers in 65 percent of the incidents; they were detected in only 27 percent and reported in only 4 percent of the incidents. "There's a whole lot out there that we don't know about," Chval said.

Private companies spent \$6 billion on computer security in 1996. The public sector has not been as diligent. As of 1997, 72 percent of police departments and 88 percent of sheriff's departments did not have computer crime units. For most law enforcement agencies, the top priority is policing the streets and the first thing that they'll hear about from citizens. In addition, there is resistance from department officers. "Most police officers become police officers because they want to solve crimes," he said. "They want to get the bad guys. When they go to the academy, they don't think about sitting in front of a computer all the time and being a geek."

Investigating computer crimes is also difficult and time consuming. Compared to conventional crimes, Chval said, a computer crime investigation "is expensive, complex, and can go all over the country and even the world. It takes a lot to get these [investigations] done and not many agencies can afford to have an officer tied up doing this."

Given the computer hardware and software, the training needed to use them, and the time and effort required to pursue criminal activity in an arena that has no set jurisdiction due to the amorphous nature of cyberspace, it is easier for many police departments to just ignore computer crime, Chval said. But they cannot afford such an approach. Nearly 90 percent of all criminals are expected to be computer literate by next year, primarily because young people are technologically savvy, according to the U.S. Department of Justice. "We're going to be in trouble if we don't get moving soon, because it will be tough to catch up," said Chval.

Since most computer crimes take place in multiple jurisdictions, it is critical for agencies to cooperate with one another. "Look in your own backyard and see the resources that are available," said Jackson, arguing that agencies must share their success stories. "There are a lot of committed people out there working in computer labs around the country that would love to put away the bad guys."

The Federal Government's computer labs can aid local departments. By using private contractors to do the work (and thus avoiding restrictions on the use of Defense personnel), local agencies can have access to the best facilities to pursue cases, he said. Chval said it is important for police departments to hire people who are computer savvy and keep them on the computer crime beat full time. The nature of computer crime is too complex, and experts are too hard to find to allow specialists to be diverted by other police work. Also, with the speed of change in technology, training has become a somewhat continuous process.

Other help is available from some state agencies, such as Chval's office, which has specialized prosecutors and investigators who provide training to local departments. Departments can establish "cyber tip" lines that allow the public to e-mail police departments about suspected illegal activity. Others suggested school programs to make children aware of computer crime and adult training to make parents more computer literate.

Workshop 3.8—Domestic Terrorism Preparedness

Moderator:

Andy Mitchell, Deputy Director
Office for State and Local
Domestic Preparedness Support
Office of Justice Programs
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Stan M. McKinney, Director
Emergency Preparedness Division
Office of the Adjutant General
Columbia, South Carolina

Martha Gilland, Director
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
Atlanta, Georgia

Donna H. Burns, Director of Special
Projects
Office of the Governor
Georgia Emergency Management Agency
Atlanta, Georgia

Summary of Proceedings

As the number of terrorist acts in the United States has increased in all types of communities, national, state, and local governments have begun to build a response capability to sort out their appropriate roles and to form new working relationships among criminal justice, emergency preparedness, and healthcare organizations, which often have not worked together systematically. Funding for various programs has increased, especially to train and equip local emergency units, but major gaps remain in integrating resources, personnel, and management systems.

“This is the single, most complex intergovernmental issue I’ve ever been involved with,” said moderator Andy Mitchell of the Office for State and Local Domestic Preparedness Support, which was founded a year ago.

Terrorist attacks are essentially “local events with national implications,” for which state governors have ultimate statutory responsibilities, said Stan McKinney, Director of the Emergency Preparedness Division in South Carolina, and formerly President of the National Association of States’ Directors of Emergency Management. For the national government, “enhancing existing local capability with trained and adequately equipped responders is key to a viable national terrorism response,” he said.

Because so much is at stake, he said, “real partnership,” not just rhetorical acknowledgment of the importance of partnership, is required to deal with terrorist threats.

There are several critical shortfalls in our domestic terrorism preparedness:

- Lack of timely federal response capability, which is now being addressed.
- Lack of integrated state and local management and response strategies. States should use some of their new technical assistance money from the Federal Government to develop comprehensive plans that maximize limited resources. More integration of services is needed, especially between medical and public safety organizations.
- Lack of specialized equipment and training.
- Inadequate medical capability, especially for chemical or biological incidents.
- Lack of baseline information on response capability.

At the state level, the challenges include:

- Defining an acceptable level of preparedness for known risks.
- Ensuring development of a national strategy and a corresponding workplan.
- Developing state-specific consequence management strategies and plans.
- Enhancing public health system capabilities to manage terrorist events.
- Protecting civil liberties and states rights in preparing for terrorism (e.g., who has the right to quarantine?).
- Establishing an appropriate role for the National Guard.
- Recognizing existing federal, state, and local emergency management capabilities and systems in dealing with the new hazard of terrorist events.

Because of its experience with the Olympic Park bombing in 1996, Georgia was one of the first states forced to deal extensively with issues raised by terrorism. Following Presidential Directive 39, which outlined a framework for response to terrorism, the state was well positioned to address “preparedness for, response to, recovery from, and mitigation of the rise of terrorism,” said Martha Gilland, Director of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, the administrative agency for all state criminal justice programs.

The end result was a Consequence Management Program with five components:

- (1) Excess Property Program, which distributes excess military equipment to public safety officials at no cost.
- (2) Public Safety 'Net, a remarkable communications project that links public safety agencies not only in Georgia but across the country.
- (3) Victims of Terrorism Program, which distributes information and trains local community providers about victims' rights and needs.
- (4) A program to provide counterterrorism training, planning exercises, and technical assistance to local emergency management agencies.
- (5) A school violence program.

The Excess Property Program has been "a tremendous success in Georgia," said Donna Burns of the Georgia Emergency Management Agency (GEMA). More than 650 law enforcement agencies in the state annually get equipment worth \$6 million to \$8 million entirely free of charge from military bases that are being downsized. Because there were so many bases in Georgia, the amount and range of equipment are enormous. From boots to helicopters, helmets to vehicles—"You name it, they get it," she said.

The Public Safety 'Net (safetynet.gema.state.ga.us) is "a mechanism to electronically exchange information among all public safety disciplines"—law enforcement, fire, emergency medical, the district attorney, 911, emergency management, and others, Burns said. It is limited to public safety personnel use; the media, vendors, and the general public do not have access. Use is free of charge, but access is controlled by registration and password. Users must be members of public safety agencies, and agency heads must determine their level of access: read only, read and write, and "official spokesperson" who can make announcements on behalf of the agency.

Started a year ago, the Web site now has 1,100 users and 600 agencies online from several states and even Bermuda. Several smaller intranets are within it for each of the various public safety disciplines—for example, fire departments and district attorney offices—and GEMA will prepare a password-protected intranet for any group that needs to communicate, such as the Joint Terrorism Task Force. Contained on these sites are everything from meeting notes to phone directories. Called "Secret Squirrel" pages, the icons that indicate their presence on the Web appear only to users with access to them.

Among the services available to all registered users on the main site are:

- News announcements.
- Alerts, such as one reminding officials to take precautions on April 19, the anniversaries of the Oklahoma City bombing and the tragedy at Waco.

- A special section on terrorism.
- A marketplace page for postings of equipment for sale, jobs, and excess property. Participants can order items directly from the site.
- Requests for assistance, such as one from a sheriff who needs bed space.
- Notices of meetings, events, training sessions, and conferences.
- A listing of available government and private-sector grants.
- Professional practices page, with innovative ideas, training models, and operations manuals.
- A library with articles from various publications and links to other useful sites.
- Links to other government and public safety Web sites.

Because terrorism is a “high-risk, low-probability event” and one that cannot be predicted, it can be difficult for officials to obtain funding locally for preparedness needs, Mitchell said. Noting that federal funds are available for these projects, such as the Public Safety ’Net, he noted, “These are the first steps in developing a national program to address domestic preparedness. . . . Success or failure is going to rest at the state and local levels.”

Workshop 3.9—Back From the Edge: Changing the Future of Street Kids and Gang Members

Moderator:

Jerel Eaglin, Director
Youth Services
National Crime Prevention Council
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Wayne Sakamoto, Violence Prevention
Coordinator
San Diego County
San Diego, California

Waunetta Lonewolf
Oglala Nation
Glendale, Arizona

Luis Cardona, Director
Barrios Unidos
Washington, D.C.

Rico Rush
Alliance of Concerned Black Men
Washington, D.C.

Summary of Proceedings

“If you saw the numbers 311 scrawled on a wall, would you know what that means?” asked Wayne Sakamoto, a specialist in gang and youth victimization prevention training. “The number 11 refers to the 11th letter in the alphabet, the letter K; the number 3 represents 3 times K, which equals KKK.” This, he noted, is a code that indicates evidence of a hate gang in your area.

Leaders of frontline prevention and intervention programs discussed ways to reach youth who are on the verge of, or caught up in, a high-risk lifestyle. Comprehensive methods for developing working relationships with youth and adults seeking to exit gang activity and for building effective collaborations among community groups were presented.

Citing research on gang violence in *Assessing Risk Within Communities*, Sakamoto described five risk factors for gang activity: “family problems, personal issues, difficulty in school, the environment of one’s community, and pressure from peer groups.” Waunetta Lonewolf of the Oglala Nation, who works with ex-offenders and former gang members, elaborated five stages of gang life:

- (1) Party stage. Gang recruits are attracted to, and find appealing, gang activity. A sense of “family love” develops. There are people to hang out with, chill with, and get high with. Friendships develop, and the gang is seen as a primary source of socialization.

- (2) Target stage. Becoming a gang member means “making and identifying one’s enemies.” Gang members start carrying weapons, begin to be known as gang members, claim “territory,” earn their “stripes” through criminal activity, and move in and out of jail or prison.
- (3) Grief or loss stage. “Feelings, emotions, consciousness” are heightened. Legal problems begin to consume time, the gang member has grown weary of “being locked up,” he or she begins to miss family and to witness or hear of homeboys and homegirls getting killed on the streets. Some can only think of the moment and ask, “Will I live today?”
- (4) Change stage. Gang members become reflective, “look back on life,” are “happy to be alive.” They begin to rebuild relationships with families.
- (5) Life stage. Gang members are faced with a critical decision. They have survived incarceration or street life, and they can either return to the party stage (relapse) or find legitimate employment, embrace life, and start “giving back.”

Providing adult role models is one of the best gang prevention tools, according to several panelists, and it is the keystone of many programs. For example, the National Latino Fatherhood and Family Institute of Los Angeles encourages “reconnecting the lives of our elders [men and women] with the lives of our children,” explained Luis Cardona, Director of Barrios Unidos.

“The absence of significant adult role models leaves young people to learn their values from their peer group or television,” argued Sakamoto, who has provided technical assistance to municipal- and state-sponsored crime prevention programs in more than 500 schools. Only a small number of youth get involved in gang activity. “We need to look at the reasons why kids do *not* get involved,” he said.

Echoing Cardona’s observations, Sakamoto identified three “protective factors” that can prevent gang involvement: “A caring adult role model, having a clear set of norms/values, and providing rewards/recognition.” As Rico Rush of the Alliance of Concerned Black Men put it, “We need to use the same factors that keep gang members in gangs to keep gang members out of gangs.” Ask yourself, Sakamoto challenged: “Do gangs promote bonding? Provide a clear set of rules? Teach skills? Provide recognition?”

“We must take risks, open our hearts to engage gang members, teaching hope, teaching what it is to dream,” said Cardona, a former gang member. For other youth at risk, “we need to develop and build ‘protective factors’ in neighborhoods,” he said.

Moderator Jerel Eaglin, Director of Youth Services for the National Crime Prevention Council, offered four directions in addressing the challenges of gang prevention and intervention. In response, panelists, by the use of personal examples, offered illustrations to these approaches:

- (1) Establish more effective partnerships among youth, law enforcement, prevention practitioners, agencies, community residents, and educators. Sakamoto offered the following

example of effective youth/adult partnerships when dealing with gangs in schools: “When assisting schools, form a partnership between the administration, teachers, security personnel, and the students to look at crime and victimization in and around the school. Find out, through hard numbers, but also through surveys, self-reports, or having students talk about the issues (gangs, violence, or drugs) what is happening on campus. Students need to be an active part of the process. They can identify gangs better than adults and can come up with solutions.”

- (2) Create programs that focus on involving youth as resources in preventing violence and building communities. Sakamoto supported “bringing young people to the table,” training them as peer educators so they can teach other teens how to avoid joining gangs.

One example, born out of tragedy and the will to survive, illustrates the success of one community coming together to prevent violence and reclaim a neighborhood. Rush reported:

Ten minutes from the White House, in a neighborhood called Simple City, over the period of 18 months, 59 people were murdered within a 5-block radius due to gang activity. Gangs named “Avenue” and “Circle” marked the neighborhood. Outrage over the kidnaping and murder of a 10-year-old boy sparked community involvement (organized by a group of eight men, later to be called the Alliance of Concerned Black Men). The Alliance persuaded opposing gang members to meet in a secret location, sat them down at a table—most had never been in the same room together—and asked them to come up with a solution to the violence.

For the first time in this neighborhood, youth were involved in their own reclamation. Operating on the concept of family— “we want our family to grow”—gang members began communicating with each other, solutions were suggested, and gradually over time local agencies were brought in to collaborate. Working together, “the broken window was fixed,” the neighborhood was cleaned of graffiti, and a basketball court was built for recreation. Gang members were seen as people—someone’s daughter or son, a neighbor—and adults were seen as caring mentors. Violence diminished, 2 years later there was a 58-percent decrease in crime (a 78-percent decrease in crime against people) and a 100-percent decrease in homicides.

- (3) Use hands-on strategies that, combined with municipal strategies, prevent youth violence, help youth exit gang activity and stay gang-free, and recognize windows of opportunity for reaching gang-affiliated youth, even the hard-core entrenched members. “Gang prevention should begin as early as elementary school, Sakamoto said, “and prevention should be targeted: looking for, and working with, the siblings of gang members, engaging them early, involving them in afterschool activities. ‘Pull-out programs,’ courses designed to take kids out of classes to look at gang activity, should be offered to all students as educational tools.” To those already involved in gang activity, Lonewolf offered this advice: “How to get out? Slowly drift away. Involve yourself in other activities. Act or be ambivalent when homies come by to pick you up. Be man or woman enough to brag that you’re man or woman enough to get out.”

- (4) Identify the logic behind the appeal of youth violence and gang activity and use it to counter these influences. Lonewolf and her staff of ex-gang members suggested: “In schools, promote nonviolence among all youth, explain the negative aspects of gang life, show the dangers of tattoos and gang signs, share stories of youth leaving gangs, offer advice on peer pressure, discourage copying of gang clothing, address how gangs destroy families, speak of the false sense of unity and loyalty, encourage self-pride and identity.” Rush concluded: “You need to think of what to put in the place of gang lifestyle. Gangs provide a community to their members. If you remove gang members from the gang, you need to provide them with a support system and teach them how to deal with the issues they face every day.”

Workshop 3.11—The Evolution of Drug Epidemics

Moderator:

Richard H. Ward III, Deputy Director
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Washington, D.C.

Presenter:

Dr. David F. Musto
Department of History
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

Panelists:

Jack Riley, Director
Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program
National Institute of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Randy Weaver, Chief
National Drug Assessment Group
National Drug Intelligence Center
Johnstown, Pennsylvania

Summary of Proceedings

Over the past two decades, the major drug-trafficking problems in the United States have shifted from heroin to powder cocaine to crack cocaine to methamphetamine and heroin. This session identified the legal, social, and medical responses to the many different drug epidemics that have occurred throughout the course of American history. By demonstrating the cyclical nature of drug use, drug tolerance and intolerance within this historical context, the session considered the value of modern information systems and intelligence to predict future changes in drug trafficking and to stop epidemics before they start.

Because alcohol consistently has been used since the founding of this country, has undergone alternating periods of high and low consumption, and reflects the use of other drugs, such as cocaine and opiates, it is particularly useful in identifying the characteristics of drug epidemics, said Dr. David Musto, Professor of History at Yale University. In the nation's history there have been three major temperance movements, each one demonstrating the public's shifting attitudes toward alcohol use and the increased role of government as a tool for creating a healthier society. All the temperance movements—in the mid-19th century, in 1920–1933, and in 1980—occurred at times when the consumption of alcohol was actually in decline. The movements reflected changes in medical and social attitudes regarding alcohol.

The initial perception of alcohol as a valuable tonic in the early 1800s, which saw three times as much alcohol consumption per capita as today, shifted in the mid-1800s toward a belief in an upper limit of use, a distinction between distilled spirits and other types of alcohol, and, finally, a

call for abstinence. According to Musto, by 1855, a third of the United States and all of New England was under prohibition. The medical and social perception of alcohol had shifted so much that its consumption was seen as, according to Abraham Lincoln, “a very bad thing, rather than the abuse of a good thing.” However, alcohol, unlike cocaine and opiates, was an everyday consumable and part of religious ceremonies, and thus, even at its peak, the prohibition forces did not have more than 60 percent of the public on their side. “Alcohol prohibition illustrates that in some of these crusades for health or temperance, reform may go farther than it can be sustained,” Musto said. Indeed, the subsequent temperance movements of the 1920s and 1980 resulted from a similar pattern of increased consumption followed by an increased negative public perception of alcohol use and a decline in consumption coincidental to legal restrictions.

Musto charted the rise of other drug epidemics throughout American history. Throughout the 19th century, there were no laws against the availability of narcotics; thus, in the 1890s, consumption of opium and its active ingredient morphine peaked with a quarter million opium addicts in a U.S. population of 60 million. Unlike alcohol, legal controls on narcotics were slower to develop yet, ultimately, were more restrictive. Regulation of medical practice was reserved to states and, through the 1800s, there were no strong national organizational or licensing requirements for physicians or pharmacists. As with alcohol, the first antidrug laws were developed in response to fear associated with the consequences of unrestricted drug use. The first federal drug law in 1906, the Pure Food and Drug Act, merely mandated the identification of the types and amounts of narcotic ingredients in products. The Harrison Narcotics Act of 1914 was intended to harmonize the country’s drug policy and reflected a growing nationwide consensus against drugs such as opiates and cocaine.

Increasingly, narcotics control measures were influenced by international events, notably World War I, Musto said. Previously, the United States had sought help from other countries with its drug problem and cooperated with international treaties, such as the 1912’s Hague Opium Convention, the precursor to the United States’ own Harrison Narcotics Act. After the war, suspicion of foreign influence was growing, with many feeling that other countries trafficked drugs into the United States to undermine its stability, and those perceptions continued throughout the century. For instance, the heroin epidemic of the 1950s was blamed on Communist China. The nation’s response to narcotics control in the mid- to late-20th century was largely dictated by the Federal Government’s action and reflected national security concerns.

Against this backdrop, Musto identified the three strategies that emerged in the 1930s to prevent the use of drugs: threat of severe punishment, well-intentioned exaggeration of the effects of drugs, and the preferred policy—silence. The last strategy explains the lack of any long-term, sustained antidrug campaign. For example, by the 1930s, all but two states mandated K–12 antinarcotics education. However, as drug use appeared to decline, this policy was soon replaced by silence for fear of inciting drug use. The silence had the opposite of its intended effect, he said, and by the 1960s we “had re-created an almost virgin population with regard to the drug issue.”

Musto noted similarities between the current cocaine epidemic and that of the 1880s and the 1930s, because people had no “public memory of working through these problems.” In the late

1880s, cocaine was presented as an “all-American drug” that increased productivity and reduced depression. Gradually, however, cocaine became implicated in other social issues of the time. During the decline phase of the epidemic in the early 1900s, cocaine use was perceived as dangerous and believed to cause hyperactivity and strange behavior. These beliefs coincided with the movement that took away voting rights from African-Americans and that perpetuated lynching. Musto explained that scapegoating of particular ethnic groups is common during the decline phase of drug epidemics. For instance, smoking opium became associated with Chinese people; cocaine, with Southern African-Americans; marijuana, with Mexican immigrants; and alcohol, with Catholics and urban immigrants.

Jack Riley, Director of the Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (ADAM) Program, detailed the complexity of modern epidemics. He identified the four major mechanisms used to measure drug abuse in the United States: the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (overall picture), Monitoring the Future (youth drug-use patterns), Drug Abuse Warning Network (emergency rooms and medical examiners), and ADAM (prison populations). Using these mechanisms, regional and subpopulation issues related to drug abuse can be identified.

For instance, Riley noted that overall cocaine use in major cities has stabilized in the past several years due mainly to the reduction in the use of crack cocaine; however, particularly among youth entering the criminal justice system, powder cocaine use has increased. Regarding methamphetamine use, there are great regional and age variations, with well over 30 percent of the arrested population in the Western United States testing positive for methamphetamines. The highest concentration of use occurs among young adults. Using these various mechanisms, Riley explained how the unique local impact associated with specific drug epidemics can be identified and specific activities can be undertaken based upon local problems.

Randy Weaver of the National Drug Intelligence Center (NDIC) briefly explained the use of intelligence from a variety of sources, including federal, state, regional, and local law enforcement; the monitoring programs described by Riley; and treatment and rehabilitation education programs to analyze the current trends in drug use and epidemics and to forecast the future. NDIC’s primary purpose, he said, is to give policymakers, law enforcement, and treatment education personnel the tools to employ proactive measures for addressing drug epidemics.

Workshop 3.12—Handle With Care: The Hazards of Investigating Clandestine Methamphetamine Laboratories

Moderator:

Thomas J. Pagel, Director
Division of Criminal Investigation
Cheyenne, Wyoming

Panelists:

Michael Cashman, Special Agent
Drug Enforcement Administration
Quantico, Virginia

Troy Derby, Officer
Drug Enforcement Administration
Quantico, Virginia

Michael S. McCampbell, Project Director
Circle Solutions
Tamarack, Florida

Summary of Proceedings

Known as speed, street, tweak, crack, and dope, methamphetamine is being produced in clandestine laboratories (clan labs) in increasing amounts, particularly throughout the Western and Midwestern United States. Nearly 98.7 percent of all methamphetamine labs in the country are clan labs. The proliferation of these labs, combined with the risk of severe physical harm to those handling volatile and toxic precursor chemicals and waste byproducts of methamphetamine production, necessitates rigorous training programs and education. Panelists started with a primer on these drugs, then examined the risks associated with use and exposure, and finally discussed the components of proper training.

Methamphetamines are Schedule II stimulants used to control weight, maintain alertness, and increase sexual interest. They may be eaten, smoked, snorted, or injected (slamming). Depending on the dosage taken, one can stay awake on half a gram for 24–36 hours without sleep. Side effects include weight loss, loss of color, sweating, strange body odor, bad teeth, scars and open sores (speed bumps), and large pupils that do not dilate even under direct bright light. Their increasing popularity is due to the ease of production methods (e.g., Nazi, ether, cold medicine, martini, and traditional) and the availability of ingredients needed for its production (precursor chemicals)—both of which are enabled by the Internet. Thomas Pagel and Mike Cashman indicated that through a few keystrokes, novice producers access drug recipes and purchase materials and equipment on the Internet. Efforts by certain states like Utah to aggressively suppress clan labs have only pushed them to neighboring, less aggressive states like Wyoming. Panelists contended that the increase in clan labs would likely continue given low barriers to entry, very high profits, and easy access to know-how, recipes, and materials.

These drugs can be made easily within 2 (Nazi method) to 72 hours (traditional method). They frequently require only household or easily accessible precursor materials: ephedrine found in bronchial dilators or distilled from cold medicine and vasodilators; iodine crystals; red phosphors found in road flares and matches; starter fluid available in ether containers; lithium metals found in camera batteries; and hydrogen ammonia found in farm fertilizer. In fact, materials of so-called Walmart clan labs may be entirely purchased at Walmart. Clan labs may be found in California superlabs, Midwest America "Beavis and Butthead" labs, mobile homes and trailer campers, suitcase labs in car trunks, and homes, apartments, and motels.

Clan labs can hurt, even kill, officers. Physical danger exists in all stages of methamphetamine involvement: producing it, taking it, and disposing of it. Exposure to these drugs through inhalation and physical contact has resulted in lung and liver damage, Parkinson's disease, and multiple sclerosis. Yet, as Cashman pointed out, it is not always clear whether the site involved is a clan lab. For example, when stopping vehicles for investigation, police officers frequently are unaware that deadly precursor materials like hydrogen ammonium (farm fertilizer) are stored in the car trunk.

Given the real risk of physical, even fatal, injury throughout all phases of clan lab investigation, cleanup, and disposal that patrol officers, detectives, social workers, and community members face on entering the site of methamphetamine production, training is of utmost importance. Individuals must be trained on:

- OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Act) requirements and companion state requirements on safety.
- Environmental Protection Agency requirements on the handling, treatment, and disposal of hazardous waste.
- Types of precursor materials used in production, their availability, and their storage.
- Handling of toxic and volatile precursor chemicals and waste byproducts.
- Monitoring of the existence of these chemicals.
- Equipment use.
- The erratic, unpredictable, and violent behavior exhibited by drug producers under methamphetamine influence.

A few programs provided by the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and in Nevada and California meet OSHA standards and code regulations. One such program teaches safety through specialized training, conducts state and local safety (SALS) training, and gives trainees \$2,000 in equipment. Special training covers the areas of safe clan lab entry, raiding clan labs, conducting investigations, inspecting equipment, and proving cases in court. Officer Troy Derby of the DEA provided a brief presentation on equipment, including personal and respiratory protection

equipment and air and explosive monitoring equipment. Such equipment must meet federal requirements as stated in Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations, section 1910.

A successful program should be, as Michael McCampbell of Circle Solutions explained, based on a multidisciplinary plan developed by those encountering clan labs, supported by interagency agreements to define responsibilities, and implemented by trained personnel. Planning teams must include representatives from police and fire departments, the court system, prosecuting agencies, health and environmental agencies, and schools and community groups. These agencies must be informed of the risks and methods of production to better ensure their involvement and support. Interagency agreements must define the purpose and goals of the program as well as the scope of authority for the program and its participating agencies. Goals should not be limited merely to arresting drug offenders and producers, but should include, for example, the handling and financing of cleanup costs and community education. Funding must be a priority and come from operational funds and grants.

McCampbell did not recommend the seizure or forfeiture of assets as the costs involved with ensuring decontamination will likely outweigh the asset's value. Insurance and workers' compensation must be in place for individuals who are likely to be exposed to, work with, or handle chemicals. He suggested a program coordinator be employed to administer the program, a law enforcement officer be appointed to supervise onsite operations, and one person be charged with controlling media relations. Finally, he recommended that prosecutors and judges be educated on the risks and dangers so that drug production is not inappropriately considered or treated as a misdemeanor.

A few final lessons offered by Cashman include:

- Assume the worst risks in the lab, such as existence of huge hydrogen gas tanks that may explode.
- Inform Emergency Medical Services (EMS) staff who have been exposed to chemicals to avoid subsequent contamination of EMS staff, assisting nurses, and doctors.
- Train firefighters on how to handle the existence of precursor chemicals as part of their regular training. Safety is always an issue, because even when the clan lab no longer exists, toxic fumes can harm those present.

Pagel emphasized the need for coordination among all agencies dealing with the various aspects of drug investigation, prosecution, and prevention. For example, the removal of hazardous wastes from the clan lab is typically and effectively handled by the DEA; this, however, does not end the cleanup process by other agencies. Coordination to ensure compatibility of equipment is also valuable in reducing costs. On average, site cleanup costs for mom-pop situations run from \$25,000 to \$35,000—the bulk of these costs is for equipment. Landlords must be educated on the identification of possible clan lab and drug-manufacturing activities. McCampbell suggested that landlords maintain a watch of excessive pedestrian traffic at all times of the day, people standing

outside the apartment to smoke, the smell of rotten eggs, and strange chemical containers, such as starter cans, opened at the bottom in garbage dumps. On the basis of these markers for possible clan lab activity, landlords should contact their local law enforcement agency and, under no circumstances, handle the situation themselves.

Workshop 3.13—How Young Is Too Young? Children in the Criminal Justice System

Moderator:

Spurgeon Kennedy, Program Manager
National Institute of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Presenter:

Janet K. Wiig, Associate Director
Institute on Criminal Justice
University of Minnesota Law School
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Panelist:

Samuel Payne, Youth Coordinator
Phyllis Wheatley Community Center
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Summary of Proceedings

Crime and delinquency rates among children 10 years of age and younger have been rising sharply, and local justice systems are struggling to respond. In one study, crimes against people (more serious than crimes against property, especially when committed by the very young) accounted for only 23 percent of the incidents involving these children 4 years ago, but now account for approximately 51 percent. In addition, youth committing minor offenses that are unaddressed are more likely to commit serious offenses later. Two programs in Minnesota are attempting to make sure that does not happen.

Janet Wiig dealt with the problem as an Assistant District Attorney for Hennepin County (Minneapolis), Minnesota, and now studies it as Associate Director of the Institute on Criminal Justice at the University of Minnesota Law School. She outlined recent research and showed how it could guide the development of effective programs.

Information compiled from police reports and interviews in 35 of 38 police jurisdictions produced the following profile of very young children involved in crime:

- Average age was 9 years old (51 percent).
- Children were likely to be male and of color—49 percent were African-American, 16 percent were American Indian, and 31 percent were Caucasian.
- Most lived in single-parent, female-headed households (70 percent).
- Most were from families that had a larger number of siblings than the average family.

- Their mothers were young at the time of birth of their first child—70 percent of the mothers were under 20 years old, and 37 percent were under 18.
- They tended to have school attendance, performance, or behavior problems.
- Most of their families (91 percent) had received Aid to Families with Dependent Children at some point.
- More than 80 percent had been the subject of a protective service report.
- Seventy percent had at least one parent or a sibling with a history of delinquent behavior.

Using these profiles in combination with a review of literature, the researchers compiled a list of predictive indicators for youth at risk:

- Age of child at first contact with police involving some delinquent activity—the younger they start, the more likely they are to continue and graduate to more serious offenses.
- A family history of abuse, neglect, and/or violence in the home.
- Family environment with multiple, severe problems (e.g., mental health, employment, housing, or alcohol/drug problems).
- Poverty.
- Single-parent family with a mother who was young at the time she gave birth.
- Poor attendance and performance in school.
- Absence of positive relationships with adults and peers.

Using this set of predictors, Hennepin County developed the Targeted Early Intervention program that focuses on prevention and early intervention with high-risk youth. Even though the program is based on sound research, Wiig said that there is some hesitancy in placing large numbers of youth in the program because it labels them in some ways. Therefore, the program tries to involve only the most at-risk youth. Child Protective Services (CPS) agencies potentially could use these data most effectively in identifying children at risk because it is common for these children and their families to be CPS clients, she noted.

One organization that provides intensive, special support is the Phyllis Wheatley Community Center in Minneapolis, which works directly with youth and their families. Samuel Payne, Youth Coordinator for the center, said it is very important for a child to understand that he or she has a “critical support person” or someone on whom they can depend to be available to them for an extended period of time. Ideally, he said, the support person is the parent; however, since parents often are unable to provide this support, the center provides adults to play that role.

Even if the parent cannot assume the critical support role, it is still important to involve them at some level, Payne said. The center uses Individual Success Plans, an approach that includes talking with both the child and the parents about the problems that are being exhibited, action steps to change the behavior, identification of responsibilities within the action plan, and a timeline. By involving the parents, the center tries to empower them to be part of the solution.

The center services are not a quick fix, nor can it solve parents' and children's problems for them. At the same time, Payne emphasized that every little victory should be cause for celebration. Both parents and children respond well to rewards for positive behavior changes. To identify progress and note successes as well as challenges, the center staff—the Integrated Services Delivery Team—meets as a group once a month and reviews the case plan for every child in the program. This ensures that appropriate community resources are being used.

In all, Payne said, the biggest single struggle is dealing not with the children but the capacity and accountability of parents. Some family problems are so overwhelming and entrenched that it is almost impossible to have an impact. The question left unanswered in this situation is what is to be done with the child in that environment, a question that raises major public policy and legal concerns, Wiig noted.

Workshop 3.14—Life Savers: Technology To Protect and Serve

Presenters:

Lluana McCann, Operations Chief
State and Local Assistance Division
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Washington, D.C.

Michael Burdeen, Grant Program Specialist
State and Local Assistance Division
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Washington, D.C.

Robert T. Murray, Chief
(accompanied by Officers Bock and Freed)
Falls Church Police Department
Falls Church, Virginia

Paul Belkin, Grant Program Specialist
State and Local Assistance Division
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Washington, D.C.

Neil R. Woodcock, Director
Law Enforcement Support Services
Department of Crime Control and
Public Safety
Raleigh, North Carolina

Summary of Proceedings

Panelists detailed provisions of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership (BVP), the 1122 Equipment Procurement Program sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and the 1033 Surplus Program sponsored by the North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety, while two officers from the Falls Church, Virginia, Police Department vividly described why the bulletproof vest program is important.

Falls Church is a bedroom community 15 miles from Washington, D.C., which, before January 21, 1998, had not witnessed gunfire in a half century. In fact, during Officer Freed's 20 years as a police officer and his 12 years in Falls Church, he has never used a gun. As a result, there was no mandatory bulletproof vesting policy for law enforcement officers in the area, but several officers, including Freed, still wore vests.

When Officers Bock and Freed were sent to investigate an individual who was painting a car without any tires, they had little reason to assume a danger of gunfire. They were taken off guard when the individual fired two shots at them. One shot struck Freed who returned two shots and successfully took the individual down. Later the examining physician indicated that had Freed not been protected by a bulletproof vest, the bullet would have traveled to his liver and spleen and even struck a fatal blow to his heart. Citing this 8- to 9-second incident, Bock and Freed argued that officers should wear bulletproof vests at all times, even in the safest areas.

The Federal Government has earmarked \$25 million for 3 years under the Bulletproof Vest Partnership (BVP) Grant Act of 1998. This act enables “any unit of government with a law enforcement officer”—states, tribal governments, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories—to purchase bullet and stab resistance body armor on a matching basis. The BVP, as administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, covers 50 percent of all costs associated with the purchase of such armor. Eligibility requirements include: (1) engagement of the law enforcement officer in the prevention, detention, or investigation of any criminal violation of the law or the supervision of criminal offenders; (2) approval by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) of the body armor that is purchased; (3) allocation of one-half of the funding to jurisdictions with less than 100,000 residents; and (4) allocation of one vest per field position for each law enforcement officer.

The purchasing entity may cover its match from state and private grants but not from federal funds. The allocation of 50 percent of the funding to smaller jurisdictions ensures distribution throughout the country. Consequently, during the first year of operation, large jurisdictions like New York cannot be guaranteed that they will receive funding. An average of \$120,000 to \$126,000 matching funds will be available to every jurisdiction.

Requests must be made through the Internet on the BJA’s BVP Web site (www.vests.ojp.gov/). The chief executive of the jurisdiction—often the governor of a state—applies for all the law enforcement agencies within the jurisdiction interested in purchasing such armor. The requesting agency then locates its individual listing on the home page, places an order for bulletproof vests, and provides banking and wire instructions to BJA for immediate electronic payment. Orders may not include amounts for future officers. There are no restrictions on pricing or type of vests, and no application deadline. An additional order for stab-resistant vests may be ordered no sooner than August 1999. Applications may be submitted at any time and will be considered on a rolling basis as funds become available. The act gives BJA some discretion in granting a funding priority to jurisdictions having a high need for mandatory vests, high crime, and a large percentage of officers. Lluana McCann of BJA said the agency will not exercise this discretion until the data required for such a determination are collected.

In selecting the appropriate bulletproof vest to purchase, agencies should consider wearability, tailoring and fit of the vest, and the gender of the user. NIJ provides a brochure that considers these factors along with a Web site listing 1,500 available vests and a directory for local distributors.

Michael Burdeen of BJA introduced the 1122 Equipment Procurement Program. State and local governments can purchase new law enforcement equipment for counterdrug activities through the Federal Government, which permits all participating jurisdictions to benefit from the Federal Government’s purchasing power. The governor must first appoint a State Point of Contact (SPOC). The process is as follows:

- Agency requests a price quote from SPOC.

- SPOC confirms that the equipment is suitable for counterdrug activity, then secures price quotes from vendors serving the Federal Government (e.g., GSA).
- SPOC forwards the quotes to the agency, which decides whether to purchase from SPOC.
- Agency wires the purchase amount to SPOC, which holds it in escrow pending delivery of equipment.
- SPOC orders the equipment directly from the vendor.
- Vendor delivers the equipment directly to the agency.
- Upon certification of receipt by the agency, SPOC releases payment to the vendor.

The benefits of the program include cost savings and price shopping. Agencies can leverage the cost savings provided by vendors like GSA, typically about 10 percent, to negotiate lower prices from other vendors.

North Carolina also administers the Surplus Program as a companion to the Equipment Procurement Program. The Surplus Program gives law enforcement agencies excess property from a downsizing of the U.S. Department of Defense free of charge. To date, Neil Woodcock calculated that agencies collectively have saved \$300 million in surplus items ranging from film, vehicles, locks, fuel, night vision equipment, and helicopter parts.

Workshop 3.15—Youth Leadership Forum: A Report

Moderator:

Michael Smith, 1999 Youth Forum Coordinator
12th National Youth Crime
Prevention Conference
Arlington, Virginia

Panelists:

Thomas Sweed
National Youth Forum
Denver, Colorado
Michael Serra, Youth Forum Representative
Meriden, Connecticut

Tony Truong
National Youth Forum
Des Moines, Iowa

Tammy Tramble
National Youth Forum
Denver, Colorado

Summary of Proceedings

Panelists discussed the outcome of the 12th National Youth Crime Prevention Conference (NYCPC), a collaboration between the National Crime Prevention Council and Youth Crime Watch of America. Attended by more than 220 young people, ages 12 to 22, the conference's Youth Forum was created to explore ways young people and adults, working together in partnership, can achieve the common goal of reducing crime. Moderator Michael Smith, the 1999 Youth Forum Coordinator, presented a panel of four young participants who reported on creative approaches to reducing youth-related crime.

The Youth Forum identified what it believes to be the causes of youth crime and offered possible solutions. "Eighty-seven percent of young people surveyed are willing to prevent crime if they only knew how," Michael Serra, a teenage panelist from Meriden, Connecticut, observed. As noted further in the *Youth Forum Report*, six causes of crime were identified: peer pressure, lack of education, others' perceptions, substance abuse, discrimination, and lack of community involvement.

Tammy Tramble, a 22-year old from Denver, Colorado, outlined the goals of Project Respect, a key program designed by the Youth Forum to fight crime. The project addresses the danger of low self-esteem—seen as a pathway to gang activity and negative outcomes. The work of the project focuses on creating a strong, positive sense of self-worth and an understanding of one's place in the world. Smith observed, "If a young person is raised in a household or an environment that constantly tells him or her that they will never succeed, never amount to anything, they'll believe it." Using positive affirmations, Project Respect teaches young people that "they can succeed, and that there is a place for them in the world, a world in which they can achieve their goals."

In exercises calling for role playing, adult perceptions of youth and youth perceptions of adults are acted out, illustrating the need for “respect for oneself as well as for others.” Other exercises with poetry and readings to encourage the expression of feelings are used to enhance personal identity. The theory underlying the program is that once individuals respect themselves, they begin to give voice to their own ideas, make themselves heard, and become “individualized” in a world of peer-driven conformity.

Project Respect also encourages strong youth-adult partnerships. Successful adult mentors point young people in the “right direction,” “give them ideas,” and encourage their achievements, but also allow young people to “set limits themselves,” several panelists said. Praising his childhood mentor and the need to “give back,” Thomas Sweed, a 17-year-old student, now mentors children in an elementary school because he believes that it is “important for young people to see positive role models.”

Panelists also acknowledged the importance of community in deterring youth crime. They cited a recent Harris Poll, “In Between Hope and Fear: Teen Crime in the Community Program,” which reported that 57 percent of teenagers volunteer in some activity—in their schools, churches, and communities—while 87 percent said they would volunteer in specific crime prevention activities if given the opportunity.

With lively audience interaction, other programs that are part of Project Respect were outlined by the panelists. Two programs, one dealing with discrimination and the other with the need to stay in school, were briefly described (all detailed in the *Youth Forum Report*). The Ism’s program teaches that one needs to understand discrimination and that there is a power in cultural differences that can be used for the good of the community. The program advocates “counseling centers” to train high school students to respect each other’s differences. The Imagine program takes aim at the high rate of school dropouts; the project created a stay-in-school program that encourages kids “not to give up on their dreams,” but to visualize a “bright future.”

Referring to a previous conference program on youth gangs and negative outcomes, an audience member from Phoenix concluded, “We need to recruit young people just like gang members do.” The Youth Forum’s presentation of Project Respect offers a recruitment tool designed for and by youth that not only counters youth-generated crime with creative solutions, but also offers young people a model of hope, encouragement, and self-actualization.

Workshop 3.16—Supporting Crime Reduction and Drug Elimination at the Local Level: HUD’s Role

Moderator:

Sonia L. Burgos, Director
Community Safety and Conservation Division
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Maude Saunders, Assistant Director for
Resident Services
Richmond Housing and Redevelopment
Richmond, Virginia

Nancy Odierno, Coordinator
Drug Elimination Program
Menominee Tribal Housing Authority
Keshena, Wisconsin

Carl R. Greene, Executive Director
Philadelphia Housing Authority
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Hezekiah Bunch, Jr., Chief
Housing Authority of Baltimore
City Police Department
Baltimore, Maryland

Summary of Proceedings

Since 1988, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has spearheaded the Drug Elimination Program, issuing 600 to 700 grants each year, totaling \$310 million in 1999, to provide public and Native-American housing authorities assistance in drug and crime prevention. In public housing developments around the country, security guards and investigators have been hired, environmental designs have been improved, antidrug and afterschool care programs are under way, and partnerships have been established to create safer environments for those who live in public housing.

Very often the biggest challenge is the integration of housing authorities with law enforcement, noted Carl Greene, Executive Director of the Philadelphia Housing Authority, 1 of only 12 nationwide to have its own police force. Often the tenants are blamed for all the crime in the community, and law enforcement abandons them. It is convenient because often the housing is separated on “isolated campuses” by geographical boundaries and the physical structures.

Greene stressed that if public housing is abandoned by a city, it will become a safe haven for criminals who set up shop to deal drugs and fear little from the police. At the heart of Philadelphia’s crime and drug programs are partnerships. Greene said that there are three elements to successful partnerships: (1) community mobilization, (2) problem solving to facilitate and improve the quality of life, and (3) a change in the police culture from reactive to proactive. HUD grants have facilitated such partnerships with local agencies, universities, and

the police department. "We have to abandon the one-size-or-strategy-fits-all approach, stress the individual's responsibility for public safety, and find ways to measure the results," Greene said.

Hezekiah Bunch of the Housing Authority of Baltimore, also with its own police department, agreed and said the biggest challenge for partnerships is the memory of too many broken promises over the years. He said that the key to any successful program starts with the residents. Too often, law enforcement comes in and tells the residents what it is going to do. What is necessary, from the first day, is to ask the residents what they have done. Very often he said that police learn something they could not have known otherwise. He said, "[That] is how you start building the partnerships."

Drug Elimination Program grants have helped fund Baltimore's Echo Program (Extraordinary Comprehensive Housecleaning Operation), which takes a holistic approach to the crime problem. One organization trains residents and helps them find jobs, and the Baltimore City Health Department provides counseling and health care. Bunch said that other partners include the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, Juvenile Services, and public schools. A tenants-on-patrol program has contributed to a marked reduction in crime in the last 6 years. Critical to the success of HUD's program is its incorporation into a larger effort to restore communities, he said. In the absence of a holistic approach, failure is likely and citizens will become even more disillusioned.

Maude Saunders from the Richmond (Virginia) Housing and Redevelopment agreed that partnerships are crucial to success. Much smaller than Baltimore or Philadelphia, Richmond elected to use HUD funds for prevention and to leverage other funds and resources. A major partnership was established with the Richmond Police Department. Richmond residents patrol their neighborhoods, with special attention given to children and the elderly.

A Safe Neighborhoods Program to promote drug prevention brought together resources from faith communities, private nonprofits, police, human service agencies, and residents. Its key elements are outreach, prevention, and treatment, with a premise that until residents are drug free, other support services will not be successful. Residents are not evicted for drug use if they sign a contract agreeing to treatment. Giving people a chance to change their lives is more effective than the punitive approach, Saunders said.

A different perspective was offered by Nancy Odierno of the Menominee Tribal Housing Authority in Wisconsin. Her programs are funded not by HUD but by the Drug Free Communities Support Program through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

There are unique challenges to managing crime and drugs on a reservation. With the success of casinos, many Native-Americans are returning to reservations, bringing with them the crimes of big cities, she said. In addition, some residents commit crimes in the city, then return to the legal safe haven of a reservation, adding to its burden.

The tribal drug program has three elements: prevention, intervention, and suppression. Very early intervention is critical. Odierno's research shows that half the sixth graders drink, and there is an

inordinately high suicide rate among youth. She hired a youth-at-risk coordinator to form partnerships with other service agencies and to institute talking circles. In these circles, a traditional Native-American tool, students pass around a feather. While the feather is in a student's hand, the floor belongs to him or her. There can be no interruptions. Here students learn to express their feelings and are heard, perhaps for the first time. Odierno also started a summer culture camp where students divide into clans, each developing its own disciplinary standards. There is also a teen intervention program and a recently signed memorandum of agreement with the police department that Odierno hopes will build trust between the police and the community.

Workshop 3.17—Multi-Jurisdictional Task Forces (MJTFs) and High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTAs)

Moderator:

Hon. Saul A. Green, U.S. Attorney
Eastern District of Michigan
Detroit, Michigan

Panelists:

Eric J. Bergstrom, Assistant District
Attorney
Multnomah County District
Attorney's Office
Portland, Oregon

Robert Bodisch, Sr., Director
Texas Narcotics Control Program
Criminal Justice Division
Austin, Texas

Thomas H. Carr, Director
Baltimore/Washington HIDTA
Greenbelt, Maryland

Summary of Proceedings

The declaration of the war on drugs in 1987 promoted the development of two types of task forces by state and local law enforcement agencies to address drug enforcement challenges: Multi-Jurisdictional Task Forces (MJTFs) and High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTAs). MJTFs bring together local, state, and federal agencies to respond to illicit drug abuse and street- and mid-level trafficking; HIDTAs address mid- and high-level trafficking through partnerships and use of state-of-the-art drug control programs. Both foster information and intelligence sharing. MJTF and HIDTA representatives presented various examples, compared the two types of task forces, examined their impact on drug enforcement, and offered recommendations on effective operations. Although the task forces discussed in this session primarily deal with drug activity, they address related issues of violence and gang activities.

Task forces maximize the efficiency of law enforcement efforts by coordinating and directing federal, state, and local resources to address a particular problem. For Eric Bergstrom of the Multnomah County District Attorney's Office in Portland, Oregon, their primary benefits are the development of creative solutions through interagency participation and information sharing across disciplines and agencies. The key issues faced during their formation include, as the Hon. Saul Green, U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, noted: (1) composition of the task force and its personnel; (2) governance and, in particular, establishment of a structure that facilitates decisionmaking; and (3) duration.

Bergstrom has directed an MJTF on violent gang crimes and a larger-scale MJTF on youth violence. The task forces successfully conducted a racketeering case against a Cribs gang; a 6-month fake storefront sting operation against two large Asian gangs; and a traditional undercover drug buy mission against an active Bloods drug-dealing program. As the scale of the project has increased to the current Youth Gun Anti-Violence Task Force, it now draws from the offices of the U.S. attorney, district attorney, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, state police, sheriff, school police, probation and parole units, and juvenile state parole unit. It represents an unprecedented collaboration of these groups. During the first 6 months, more than 40 warrants were served and over 175 guns were seized, while both gun dealers who sell to juveniles and juveniles who possess and use weapons were targeted.

The Texas Narcotics Control Program (TNCP) is a law enforcement initiative created by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 and funded by Byrne grants. Director Robert Bodisch explained that Byrne grants help states and local governments implement programs that:

- Enforce state-established and locally established offenses in line with offenses created by the Controlled Substances Act.
- Improve criminal justice system functioning.
- Emphasize prevention of violent crime and control over serious offenders.

The program requires participating task forces to match 25 percent of funds provided, a controversial condition that has caused some MJTFs to downsize or close.

The 47 task forces that TNCP directed and coordinated in 1998 were made up of 800 people from the sheriff and police departments and the district and county attorney offices. Some task forces had commanders assigned from the Texas State Police, while task forces working in border areas had federal agents. Advisory boards that include the sheriffs and chiefs of participating agencies handle the day-to-day operations of the task forces, lending their local knowledge of community needs.

TNCP has seized almost \$6 billion in drugs coming into Texas over the last 10 years, confiscated \$132 million in assets, and forfeited about \$64 million in assets. It redirects forfeited assets back to the individual MJTFs to meet Byrne grant-matching requirements.

HIDTAs operate from a larger perspective by handling mid- to high-level drug offenses and trafficking. They are completely funded by the Office of National Drug Control Policy for office space, technical resources, overtime, and nearly all material resources. Any program that reduces drug-related crime and violence and drug trafficking is eligible for HIDTA funding. The key here is establishing a connection between the program and drug-related activities and violence, and the tools are data, measurement, and evaluation.

The best HIDTAs that Tom Carr, Director of the Baltimore/Washington HIDTA, has directed have included the following actions:

- Conduct a threat assessment on the nature and extent of the drug problem by using school and police data.
- Formulate a strategy based on a threat assessment that considers jurisdictional reach.
- Formulate creative strategies that are consistent with national goals and objectives.
- Measure efforts on the basis of drug crime data and the number of arrests and seizures to develop pre-HIDTA and post-HIDTA pictures of the area.
- Promote intelligence sharing, outcome-based actions, and goal-driven thinking.

In addition, the 26 HIDTA task forces in Washington, D.C., meet on a regular basis and share information across federal, state, and local agencies. HIDTAs promote such collaboration by requiring that all participating task forces work in an integrated environment. Carr noted, “It is difficult not to build relationships with people you work with every day, share lunch, and collaborate on projects.”

There are some distinct differences between MJTFs and HIDTAs, although the similarities and opportunities for collaboration are increasing. MJTFs tend to work on street- to mid-level drug problems, whereas HIDTAs address mid- to higher-level drug traffickers. Some overlap exists, but in Texas collaboration is promoted by the assignment of MJTF agents to HIDTAs. Proceeds from asset forfeitures are used by MJTFs in Texas to satisfy the Byrne grant’s matching requirement, while HIDTAs may share these forfeitures directly with participating agencies.

Bodisch argued for improved communications to avoid repetition of effort and crossassignment of agents for better interagency communication and shared intelligence. Bergstrom emphasized the importance of recruiting people with contacts and credibility. People on the task force who have established relationships with other agencies and credibility within and across agencies are the ones who give the task force substance at the line-management level.

Workshop 3.18—Who Are the Victims? Who Are the Offenders?: Applying Current Crime Data to Federal, State, and Local Policy

Moderator:

Hon. Jan M. Chaiken, Director
Bureau of Justice Statistics
Washington, D.C.

Panelists:

Richard Moore, Director
Criminal and Juvenile Justice
Planning Division
Des Moines, Iowa

Bethany Blakey, Director
Crime Mapping Research Center
National Institute of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Summary of Proceedings

In a survey of the field, panelists discussed how national, state, and local criminal justice agencies generate, analyze, and use data for a wide variety of purposes. As technology makes both the data and their analysis more easily available, researchers are refining their analyses and law enforcement agencies are using sophisticated data-mapping techniques—even at the beat level—to target and solve problems.

Moderator Jan Chaiken, Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, outlined four levels of crime and offender data:

- (1) National and international statistics used nationally and internationally. These influence national legislation and the types of funding made available to state and local governments.
- (2) State data used at the state level. The priorities of governors and state legislatures often differ from national priorities, and state-generated data can be used differently at various levels of government.
- (3) National, state, or local data used locally for problem definition and planning strategies. Data-driven analysis of local problems has increased dramatically in the last 5 years, especially with the development of various comprehensive community planning activities. Similarly constituted groups in different parts of the country looking at the same data may draw completely different conclusions about the nature of a problem in their area and develop successful solutions.
- (4) Local and micro-level data for tactical operations, used mainly for law enforcement and planning. Much of these data concern physical and other characteristics of neighborhoods and are used on a rapid turnaround basis.

At the national level, the National Crime Victims Survey and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI's) Uniform Crime Reporting Program are the primary sources, and they are produced very differently, Chaiken noted. In the National Crime Victims Survey, interviewers talk to 100,000 people in their homes about criminal victimizations they have experienced during the previous 6 months. The survey is based on a sample, is conducted continuously, covers households but not commercial establishments, and obtains information from victims regardless of whether they reported the crimes.

The Uniform Crime Reporting Program, based on law enforcement agency reports of crime, generally has been considered inadequate because of poor data collection techniques at the police department level. There was a large gap between the data reported in the National Crime Victims Survey and those of the FBI program, and a gap between what people said they reported to police and what police said was reported.

However, these gaps have gradually diminished. "Over time, there has been a great improvement in the quality, accuracy, and completeness of police crime record systems," Chaiken said. However, problems remain. The FBI reporting program is voluntary and has suffered from lack of compliance in recent years. Only 56 percent of governmental units reported data to the FBI in 1997, compared with 97 percent in the 1970s. Further, local law enforcement units report data differently. Some fill out a summary sheet containing the number and types of crimes, while others send entire crime incident records to a state agency, where they are assembled and forwarded. The latter is called incident-based reporting, and both types are included in the FBI report. The FBI must then estimate the incidence of crime in nonreporting agencies.

As a result of these differences, there have been major discrepancies in the data reported by the National Crime Victims Survey and the FBI. For example, through the last 30 years, the FBI data showed violent crime increased fairly steadily, while the National Crime Victims Survey showed it fluctuated. However, the public tends to hear about and respond to the FBI data which, Chaiken noted, has resulted in steadily increasing funding to combat crime.

Taken as a whole, the data can be used to identify long-term patterns and in making judgments about the future deployment of resources. Chaiken used the following examples:

- Property crime rates (for burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft) have declined steadily since 1973. Although greater use of security systems has helped, it cannot be the only reason for the decline, because that technology is available in other countries, such as Great Britain, where burglary has increased. Other factors might include, for example, the alternatives available to drug users to obtain money to buy drugs. In any event, because the trend has been steady and long-term, "You can confidently predict that this will continue into the near future," Chaiken said.
- Crimes against men have declined steadily, and in the last 4 to 5 years, precipitously. Crimes against women also have gone down but not nearly as much, making them a larger proportion of the total and generating more concern about violence against women. Chaiken predicted

the two rates would converge in the next century, consistent with the pattern shown in other areas between men and women.

- There has been a general downward trend in sexual assault rates, and this is a component in the decline of violent crime against women generally. Chaiken attributed the improvement to public policy changes that focused more resources on the prevention of and response to rape, and predicted that the decline will continue. Rape continues to be one of the least-reported crimes, especially within certain age groups and communities. For example, among college-age women, the reporting rate is only about 15 percent, and efforts to boost this rate appear not to have had a “substantial influence,” he said.
- The number of arrests for drug violations has skyrocketed since the beginning of the drug war in the 1980s, with its attendant funding and focus on drugs by local police departments. However, despite a lapse in that attention, drug arrests continue to increase, making it difficult to predict a trend in this area.
- State prison populations, as measured by the number of felons sentenced to a year or more, have increased dramatically due to increases in violent crime and especially drug crimes since 1985. In 1980, the drug-crime population in prisons was small enough to be relatively insignificant. By mid-1998, the number of drug offenders in state prisons had exceeded the number of property-crime offenders. These numbers have produced a growing strain on state budgets and corresponding criticism that more prisons have not been cost-effective. “My personal prediction,” Chaiken said, “is that the backlash against spending so much money on housing people who are drug offenders will continue, especially since, if they have long sentences, you don’t know if they still are drug offenders, and also they’re not violent offenders generally. This eventually will lead to another downturn [in the drug-crime population].”

At the state level, crime statistics “provide information to help identify and prioritize problems, to monitor system activities, to guide police and practice actions, to allocate resources, and to justify grant and budget requests,” said Richard Moore, Director of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning in Iowa. He said that most actions of criminal justice agencies are reactions to reported crimes, so accurate and well-analyzed crime data are critical.

In Iowa, crime data are used as indicators of other system operations, such as pretrial release program development, anticipated changes in the demand for jail space, indigent defense needs, court-processing levels, victim services, the need for juvenile programs, adult correctional caseloads, and others. It is used to support grant requests, to assign priorities to programs, and to decide which programs should be funded at the state level.

Crime data have also been used to evaluate system reform. For example, in considering the creation of a new sentencing commission, the state invited representatives from other states to talk about their experiences and compared their crime rates, incarceration rates, and other data with those of Iowa. They have also been used to plan proactively. Two examples:

- (1) A few years ago, Iowa was experiencing a resurgence in the “youth of today concern,” Moore said. The governor convened town meetings to address juvenile crime, and school administrators sought help to deal with an increase in violence. Several people proposed distributing resources widely for an all-out assault on the problem, but the crime data showed a general decline in juvenile crime. The one exception was for aggravated assault (simple assault and violent crime generally had declined) and that varied by jurisdiction. School administrators’ perceptions that there were more young people fighting more aggressively may have been correct, but the data did not then support a broader attack on juvenile crime. The state initiated a multiagency effort to fund and assist local collaborations in identifying factors that contribute to risk or protection of children and their families.
- (2) The methamphetamine problem is growing in Iowa, and legislators had proposed mandating longer sentences for its manufacture and distribution. Examining the impact on prisons, which already were filled beyond their capacity, analysts demonstrated that longer sentences would result in a significant increase in prison populations. The resulting legislation was more narrowly focused and minimized the impact on prisons.

A key goal in the coming years at the state level is to use crime data as indicators of community risk and to combine them with economic, social, and demographic data so a more complete picture of communities emerges and policymakers can tailor solutions more effectively.

Analysis and use of data have improved most dramatically at the local level in recent years. Bethany Blakey outlined how the National Institute of Justice Crime Mapping Research Center is building models that local law enforcement at every level is using to prevent and solve crimes. She also staffs an internal working group, including the Vice President’s Partnership for Reinventing Government and the U.S. Department of Justice, to identify how the Federal Government can support data-driven management for crime reduction.

In an initial survey, the Crime Mapping Research Center found that 75 percent of law enforcement agencies do some crime analysis, approximately half do statistical analysis, and 36 percent of large departments (with 100 or more sworn officers) do crime mapping, while only 3 percent of smaller departments use the technique. Good mapping depends on good data. Each piece of data is assigned an x,y coordinate and placed on a map. One can create several layers of these data, such as time of incidence, jurisdiction, and address, which, taken together, can identify patterns.

The following five models of crime mapping in a data-driven management program are currently in use:

- (1) New York—Accountability: Perhaps best known, New York uses the CompStat system, which collects data based on calls for service. Managers look for emerging hot spots, discuss them with responsible parties, and hold them accountable for addressing the problems.
- (2) San Diego—Problem Solving: San Diego uses the SARA (Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment) method to identify patterns and related problems. Police officers on patrol

can draw directly on the crime analysis unit's mapping and use that information in working with community members.

- (3) **Chicago—Community Policing:** Chicago has used a community policing method for many years because the city has active neighborhood groups. Mapping activities are performed directly by officers. They work with the data and make their own maps to deal with problems on their beats.
- (4) **Baltimore County—Tactical Analysis:** The county looks for larger trends, trying to identify serial-crime patterns. For example, after a rash of burglaries, the police identified the location and the related factors, and integrated that information into an autodialer system, which automatically called people in targeted neighborhoods to warn them of the problem. The county is seeking to integrate its information systems electronically into other departments in the region.
- (5) **Redlands, California—Comprehensive Data:** This small city incorporates nontraditional data into its models, including data about public works activities, schools, street lights, the environment, and social/economic indicators. All are overlaid on a single map to identify patterns more comprehensively.

Blakey identified five cases in which mapping has been used successfully:

- (1) **Overland Park, Kansas,** in suburban Kansas City, saw police facing a string of “garage shopping” incidents, starting in January with just 1 incident and continuing to April with 11. After mapping the incidents by neighborhood, time of day, and other factors, patrol units canvassed the affected area on foot, going door-to-door and warning residents to close their garages. The investigations found the data helpful, and the crime prevention unit launched a Close the Door on Crime campaign, in which they distributed door-knocker flyers. Planned in May and implemented the following month, the campaign helped to decrease garage-shopping incidents from 9 in July to 5 in August and only 1 in September.
- (2) **Nottingham, England,** police researched the difference between officer perceptions of “hot spots” and what the data revealed. Officers identified the areas correctly for domestic burglaries, but their perceptions of vehicle crime were skewed, perhaps due to poor information flows. The information was used to change reporting mechanisms to capture better data and improve dissemination to officers.
- (3) **Cook County, Illinois,** suffered a large increase in fatal crashes. The data in incident reports were too generic, and to map the crashes, officers literally had to go back to the scenes and reenact them. After identifying specific problems with on-off ramps, the county used a “wolf pack” strategy to concentrate officers at the hot spots, rather than post several randomly. They also identified five offenses, such as speeding, and adopted a zero-tolerance policy. From 1995 to 1996, fatal crashes had increased 157 percent. In the 6 months after executing the new strategy, they declined 42 percent.

- (4) Hartford, Connecticut, gave neighborhood activists the tools and data to draw their own maps. Neighborhood groups generated 5 reports with lists of all crimes, the top 10 problems in given time periods and areas, event trends and comparisons with other periods, time trend graphs, and other data. In the Blue Hills area, the mapping demonstrated a gap between the available data and reality. The area's civic association insisted that there were drug dealers throughout the community, while police insisted that, based on calls for service, there was no drug problem. Police insisted that residents report activity to generate a police response. When the program began, there were 10 calls per month with no arrests. Within the first month, there were 27 calls for service and 11 arrests.
- (5) Shreveport, Louisiana, used mapping to identify the perpetrators of burglaries. The city discovered that most were committed by students, and it was able to concentrate resources. Residential burglaries declined from 58 to 19 in 1 month.

Three developments will be prominent in the next few years, Blakey said:

- (1) As crime-mapping technology improves, users will be able to perform predictive modeling. Just as water must go some place and hydrology can predict where based on various factors, so must crime, and its path can be mapped.
- (2) Specific crime analysis software for law enforcement applications will be improved.
- (3) More regional community policing institutes will train law enforcement officers in crime-mapping techniques.

The mapping center maintains a Web site at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/cmrc.

Workshop 3.19—Knowing the Unknown Offender: Building a History, Psychology, and Image of a Suspect by the Facts of a Case

Presenters:

Mike King, Lieutenant
Utah Attorney General's Office
Salt Lake City, Utah

Gregory M. Cooper, Chief
Provo Police Department
Provo, Utah

Summary of Proceedings

By using information from past cases, along with cases from other jurisdictions and interviews with offenders convicted of similar crimes, investigators can develop surprisingly accurate profiles of unknown perpetrators. This session focused on the resources provided by the Utah Criminal Tracking and Analysis Program (UTAP), a privately operated program that does not operate from any state or federal authority or funding. It enjoys the support of local, municipal, city, state, and federal agencies that voluntarily seek out its services and resources. UTAP serves as an example of what other jurisdictions can establish with minimal funding, independent of any statutory, legal, or otherwise official, mandate.

According to Lt. Mike King, UTAP is a resource program that responds to the specific and changing needs of police departments throughout Utah. With the objective of providing resources, expertise, training, and, in some cases, funding, UTAP assists local law enforcement and investigative agencies in identifying, tracking, and apprehending criminals. Intentionally, it seeks not to supplant, but rather to supplement the profiling and behavior analysis services provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI's) behavioral sciences bureau. In fact, UTAP has responded to FBI requests for resources and training.

First and foremost, UTAP connects law enforcement agencies with experts in:

- Investigatory and crime analysis drawn from criminal labs, forensic science, universities, and pathology departments in the areas of offender profiling, assessment of an identified suspect, interviewing and interrogatory techniques, and investigative techniques.
- Search warrants for the identification and location of items that offenders tend to hide and techniques to expand the scope of search warrants effectively through the establishment of probable cause.
- Psychological profiles from state and mental health hospitals, as well as private practices specializing in deviant behaviors.
- Forensics involving fingerprint and blood analysis, firearms trace evidence, and scene reconstruction.

- Prosecutorial and defense tactics relating to jury selection, cross-examination, trial strategies, and use of expert witnesses.
- Threat analysis (i.e., likelihood and probability that individuals will reoffend) based on corrections and supervision experience as a primary concern in sentencing, probation, and parole grants.

Second, upon request, UTAP reviews cases and provides resources so that local law enforcement agencies can complete case matters. Of special value is UTAP's assistance in analyzing crime scenes that were disturbed by fire and flood.

Third, UTAP provides funding for officers coming from fiscally strapped counties to further investigate and close cases. It coordinates its funding programs with the National Risk Progress Program.

Finally, central to its services, UTAP conducts a profiling training program, which helps law enforcement officers identify unknown perpetrators through analysis and elimination of various behavioral filters. Chief Gregory Cooper explained that profiling goes beyond merely identifying personality characteristics and analyzing behavioral patterns of unknown offenders to derive the perpetrator's image. It also involves understanding the individual, his or her personality type, and his or her weak points that may be susceptible to an investigating officer's effective interviewing and interrogation techniques. Profiling filters include analysis of the following:

- Crime scene.
- Victim with respect to character, background, criminal history, profile, associations, sexual orientation, and skeletal remains.
- Initial contact/abduction scene.
- Disposal site.
- Nature of a sexual assault.
- Nature of the physical act whether repeated, overkill, or minimal.
- Offender risk-taking behavior.
- Offender's modus operandi and other characteristics enumerated in the victimology analysis.

Data supporting these various filters derive from statements made by the victim, witness, and suspect; direct, circumstantial, and forensic evidence; and information provided by doctors, medical examiners, and expert witnesses.

These filters serve as the foundation for a behavioral analysis of the offender. They are particularly useful in establishing the offender's state of mind prior to, during, and after the crime. Attendees of these training sessions, limited to 150 participants, conduct question-and-answer sessions with convicted serial sex offenders at their prison sites. Prosecutors and defense attorneys analyze the strengths and weaknesses of past cases. Cases analyzed in past sessions, supplemented with direct question-and-answer sessions with convicted offenders, included:

- Bleigh Nelson, a sex offender who had committed 80 offenses in 11 Western states.
- Ian Wing, a father whose stated preference for having only two children, denial of homosexual acts, control of past wives and his current wife, and crushing of hamsters helped identify him as the murderer of his 7-week-old baby.
- Dan Lafferty, of the Lafferty brothers, who acted on a self-imagined order of God in killing his two young children.

Workshop 3.20—Making Connections: Managing Offender Reentry to the Community

Moderator:

Dr. Robert E. Roberts, Director
Project Return
New Orleans, Louisiana

Panelists:

Dennis Gabriel, Director
Addiction Services
Project Return
New Orleans, Louisiana

Dr. Mario A. Paparozzi, Associate
Professor
The College of New Jersey
and
President
American Probation and Parole
Association
Sergentsville, New Jersey

Hon. Gary L. Acevedo, Associate Judge
Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes
Pablo, Montana

Dr. Carmen Peña, Director
Bureau of Evaluation and Assessment
Administration of Corrections
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico

B. Diane Williams, President/CEO
SAFER Foundation
Chicago, Illinois

Summary of Proceedings

This session explored the issues and challenges facing communities, tribal and criminal justice systems, and service providers in preparing ex-offenders to return to their communities. Panelists sought answers to some crucial questions: How do we develop innovative practices and partnerships that ensure public safety and offender accountability and better prepare ex-offenders, their families, and communities for successful reentry? How can we rethink the traditional institutional roles of criminal justice systems to reduce recidivism? How can we create partnerships that help offenders make the transition from prison to the outside world and restore their roles as citizens in the community?

Dr. Robert Roberts, Director of Project Return, a community offender reentry program in New Orleans, Louisiana, discussed the psychological healing necessary before practical programming can have an effect on the lives of ex-offenders. People leave prison with the same problems that they had when they entered, he explained. At Project Return, participants undergo a process of “initiation” in which they can voice their grief about their difficult pasts. If it is not expressed, he said, “grief becomes violence and rage.”

In Project Return’s “grief circles,” ex-offenders tell their stories of past trauma, begin to process these experiences, and move forward. Roberts shared the story of one such participant named Beverly. When she was 10 years old, she witnessed her father slam a coal/oil lamp over her blind mother’s head, setting her on fire. Beverly bore scars on her hands and arms resulting from her attempts to put out the fire. Although she vowed never to become involved in such a destructive relationship, at 14 years old, she married a man who abused her. At 16, Beverly killed her husband, and then spent the next 17 years in prison. Like others in the group, Beverly confided that she “had never told this to anyone.” In grieving the losses in her earlier life, Beverly was able to take advantage of Project Return’s concrete services, such as addiction treatment, education, conflict resolution, relationship building, communication and skills building, and job placement. She has been a cook and supervisor on an offshore oil rig for the last 5 years.

Roberts introduced Dennis Gabriel, a 15-year repeat offender, Project Return graduate, and currently a substance abuse counselor in the program. Gabriel discussed his life of robbery and drug use and his multiple incarcerations in Louisiana, Texas, and California. He never received any drug treatment in any of the prisons. As a condition of probation, Gabriel was required to join a church, undergo drug treatment, and provide proof that he was engaging in productive activities. The difference this time for Gabriel was his participation in Project Return.

During a community-building class, in which participants “sit in a circle and . . . throw out all their garbage,” he shared for the first time his experience as a 9-year-old boy watching helplessly as his 8-year-old sister was raped. The experience of telling his story and “getting rid of the pain” allowed him to begin to become a productive member of his community, he said. “Today, I can honestly say that I have been free for 5 years and 6 months. That’s the longest I have ever been free. . . . All those years that I had been a failure, I finally did two things right. I finished this program at Project Return and saw my son head off to college.”

Dr. Carmen Peña, Director of the Bureau of Evaluation and Assessment for the Administration of Corrections in Hato Rey, Puerto Rico, identified the particular needs of incarcerated women. The rate of incarceration for women is 12 percent greater than that of men, yet there are few services to meet their specific needs. More than 70 percent of female inmates are substance abusers, single mothers of childbearing age, and unemployed at the time of their arrest. Without appropriate interventions, she explained, these women’s children are at an increased risk of repeating their mothers’ behaviors.

Peña directs a program that accepts inmates who are in minimum custody and are ready to assume responsibility for themselves and their children, and connects them to a variety of services within their own communities. The program provides a safe and positive environment and focuses on relapse prevention and social skills to reintegrate offenders more successfully into society. Through a variety of evaluation devices conducted both in-house and outside, this pilot program has proved highly effective compared with 46 other stateside programs. In conclusion, Peña emphasized that, “for it [treatment] to take hold. . . there also has to be a transformation of emotions which are the passage to the soul. Those of us who intervene with other people have to learn from the alchemist who transforms common metal into gold.”

The importance of statistical evaluation of community reentry programs, such as Peña's, was highlighted by Hon. Gary Acevedo, Associate Judge in the Confederated Salish and Kootenai tribal community in Montana. Acevedo detailed the findings of an evaluation of Montana's community corrections program. Through this program, individual judges could sentence arrestees to direct commitment to the Department of Corrections. Using a risk and placement matrix, the community corrections officers would determine whether to place these arrestees in prison or in an intensive supervision program. In the latter, participants remain in the community, assume responsibilities, and are required to be available for both scheduled and unscheduled visits by the community corrections officers several times each week.

One evaluation of Montana's program compared three groups: early release parolees, regular release parolees, and those in the community corrections program. For all groups, those who attended substance abuse treatment programs, received mental health assistance, and were employed were less likely to violate parole and return to prison. However, those in the community corrections program were the most successful at reentering the community. Acevedo stressed the importance of further evaluation in providing real numbers with which to achieve legislative change to support more successful community reentry programs.

The SAFER Foundation in Chicago administers another such model reentry program. SAFER's mission is to reduce recidivism through the provision of a variety of services, said B. Diane Williams, President and CEO. Participants are given an intake assessment to identify issues that need to be addressed before they can successfully reenter the workforce. Many ex-offenders require mental health and substance abuse services, family support, and the opportunity to process the experiences that led them to prison in the first place. SAFER's focus is on employability, providing preemployment training that teaches participants the discipline and skills required for a job, including time management and team building.

Williams asserted, "You cannot walk in from an institution to a job and believe people will understand how they should relate to their coworkers and to their supervisors. You have to help them with that." She stressed the need for a continuum of ex-offender services within the institution and during their release into the community, as well as aftercare to ensure that their skills development continues. In addition, she highlighted the need for tax credits to employers as incentives for hiring ex-offenders and, like Acevedo, called for additional resources targeted to expand research to substantiate the true benefits of reentry programs for society.

Dr. Mario Papanozzi, Associate Professor at the College of New Jersey and President of the American Probation and Parole Association, agreed that evaluation of these programs is crucial, yet argued that all of "these best practices are easy to understand, but hard to implement." He discussed the importance of information systems in "speaking to the value of the agency" and the need "to abolish activity-oriented MIS systems [sic]." Papanozzi called for systems that count how many offenders are working, not just how many applied and how many are actively engaged in drug treatment.

The correctional system needs to form a continuum of care with effective and linked interventions from the time of sentencing through the prison term to release and reentry in the community, he said. For this to develop, we need to acknowledge that punishment is only one aspect of the system and agree that the ultimate goal is ensuring future public safety. According to Paparozzi, “Managing reentry means getting down to the fundamental level of our business and thinking about how we can change that foundation so these programs will grow because of, not despite of, the criminal justice and correctional systems.”

KEYNOTE SPEECH TRANSCRIPTS

Keynote Address—Henry Gardner Managing Partner, Gardner, Underwood, and Bacon

About 17 years ago, shortly after I was appointed City Manager of Oakland I was asked if I would provide welcoming remarks for a very large convention. I readily consented. The person presiding was introducing me and during the introduction I became concerned because the introduction was longer than the comments that I had planned to make.

And just as that thought occurred to me, the person said I'm very pleased to introduce to you this morning our keynote speaker. I went to the podium and whispered to him that I was not the keynote speaker, that my role was simply to bring greetings.

He said, did you not receive our call, he said, our keynote speaker had to cancel and we asked if you would be the keynote speaker. Whereupon I took a deep breath and spoke for 30 minutes. Now I was given more notice than that for this morning but not much.

I understand that the designated keynote speaker is a very prominent person here in Washington and one who I'm sure you would have been very pleased to hear from. And so it is your misfortune that I have been designated to speak instead.

I thought long about what I would talk about and I had conversations and voice-mail message exchanges with Patrick Coleman. And I looked at the program and I thought what I can I talk about that others are not going to talk about.

And what could I talk about that the designated speaker probably would not have talked about. And I decided that the title of my speech and the nature of the speech is the Color of Justice. Now you can relax, this is not going to be one of those in-your-face speeches.

But I do want to talk about something that I think is extremely important to us as a nation and very important to me as a person of color. Almost 100 years ago a very fiery individual who had a sharp pen wrote:

Between me and the other world, there is ever an unasked question: unasked by some through feelings of delicacy; by others through the difficulty of lightly framing it. All, nevertheless, flutter around it. They approach me in a half-hesitant sort of way, eye me curiously or compassionately, and then, instead of saying directly, How does it feel to be a problem? they say, I know an excellent colored man in my town; or I fought at Mechanicsville; or, Do not these Southern outrages make your blood boil? At these I smile, or am interested, or reduce the boiling to a simmer, as the occasion may require. To the real question, How does it feel to be a problem? I answer, seldom a word.

And yet being a problem is a strange experience. . . . I remember well when the shadows swept across me. I was a little thing away up in the hills of New England.

. . . In a wee wooden schoolhouse, something put it into the boys' and girls' heads to buy gorgeous visiting-cards—ten cents a package—and exchange. The exchange was merry, till one girl, a tall newcomer, refused my card—refused it peremptorily, with a glance. Then it dawned upon me with a certain suddenness that I was different from the others; or like, mayhap, in heart and life and longing, but shut out from their world by a vast veil. I had thereafter no desire to tear down that veil, to creep through; I held all beyond it in common contempt, and lived above it in a region of blue sky and great wandering shadows. . . . [I decided that I would beat them at everything] by reading law, by healing the sick, by telling the wonderful tales that swam in my head—some way. With other black boys the strife was not so fiercely sunny: their youth shrunk into tasteless sycophancy, or into silent hatred of the pale world about them and mocking distrust of everything white; or wasted itself in a bitter cry, Why did God make me an outcast and a stranger in my own house?—W.E.B. DuBois, *The Souls of Black Folk*, 1903.

Could have been written today, if we changed two words, perhaps for “mayhap” and Black for “colored.” Otherwise it could have been written today. Race matters. And it’s uncomfortable to say that, but it matters in our justice system. Race matters.

There are several things that are uncomfortable for us to talk about, but talk about them I believe we must. Americans have had a historic problem talking about race, about religion, about sex, and about politics among strangers. And those are some of the most important things to us that affect us more profoundly than most others except perhaps one, and that’s family. And many of us don’t want to talk about that either. But it’s important that we do so.

We spend, at the last count that I saw, over \$200 billion on crime control. That is a lot of money—\$200 billion. I made several trips to Hong Kong and their currency is tied to the U.S. dollar and it takes several of those to make one U.S. dollar. And whenever I talk about big numbers I tell people that, the number I just gave you, those are U.S. dollars, those are not Hong Kong dollars, \$200 billion annually.

I was talking to the past superintendent of Oakland public schools several years ago. And he told me that he had visited several of the schools and during the question and answer period one young boy raised his hand and he said, “Dr. Mesa (phonetic) nobody cares about us, nobody cares.” He said the community does not care and the school does not care.

And Dr. Mesa said, “But that is not true.” And went on to explain what he and the school board and the community were doing about public education. The young boy would not back down. He said, “I visited my brother in San Jureto (phonetic) the county jail.”

And he said the jail looked better than our school. Dr. Mesa said he looked around him and saw the peeling paint and he did remember being concerned about the exterior of the building as he approached it and the surrounding community. And he said he went back with the resolve, if nothing else, at least they were going to paint the school.

But it speaks volumes to us when a child can say truthfully that the jails look better than the schools. And who is in the jails? Now before I even go through this recitation, I want to tell you that coming from a minority community and having been raised in a minority community, a poor Black community, safety is as important to minorities, in some ways more important to minorities than to the majority.

And the reason for it is that people of color in American communities, for the most part, witness crimes every single day. It is not a television story. It is real and I can think of nothing more urgent to them than to rid their communities of violence.

Nonetheless, in 1991 one-third of all Black men between 20 and 29 living in Los Angeles had been jailed at least once in that same year—one-third between the ages of 20 and 29. [There are] similar patterns in other large cities. Nonwhite males are three and one-half times more likely to be arrested for a felony than a white—three and one-half times more likely.

Ninety percent of nonwhite males can expect to be arrested sometime in their lifetime for a misdemeanor or some more serious offense. Two-thirds are likely to be arrested by the time they're 30. In inner cities the rates are much higher. We have to ask ourselves, what kind of a society is this?

Now is it that all of these young men are born criminals? I think not. In 1990, and it has not changed, it was estimated that one in every four African-American men between the ages of 20 and 29 was in prison, in jail, on parole, or on probation on any given day—one in every four. That is alarming.

It does not paint a bright future for us as a society. In the great state of California, Black men make up 3 percent of the adult population; they make up over 40 percent of the prison population. Race matters. They're not all there for homicides and rape and violent assaults—not all.

A young African-American man suffering from asthma and pneumonia was in jail for 22 days on a \$1,500 bond. He had been jailed on violation of probation for not paying \$35 in court costs on a 4-month-old shoplifting charge. While in jail, he lost his job as a truck driver.

A 38-year-old African-American electronic engineer, middle class, was jailed for allowing an unauthorized operator to drive. The woman did not have a driver's license, and he was arrested. A mentally disordered 59-year-old African-American man was arrested for breach of peace at the gate of a nearby naval base.

He tried to enter the base and refused to leave. An 18-year-old African-American was sentenced to 60 days for selling fake crack [to] vice police for \$20. A 21-year-old was arrested for stealing candy—all African-Americans. All crimes should be punished, and they should be punished equally.

Several years ago a stockbroker working for a very large investment banking firm on Wall Street violated every securities law on the books, enriched himself with hundreds of millions of dollars. He was arrested, tried, and convicted; charged an enormous fine; served less than 3 years. He's now on the national speaking circuit.

Now when I think about the person who stole the candy at Woolworth's that was worth all of \$1.38 and who spent 3 months in jail, [it] seems to me that the stockbroker, to be fair, should have been in prison at least for 2 million years. That is justice; race does matter.

I said when I was preparing my remarks that I would not talk about something that would make everybody in this room uncomfortable, Black and white, Hispanic and Asian; that's the O.J. Simpson trial. But I just changed my mind; I am going to talk about it because I remember during that trial how people were glued to their televisions.

There were people, friends of mine Black and white, who taped the proceedings so that they wouldn't miss any of it. It was a grand soap opera, and I couldn't figure why are people so fascinated about this trial. And then it occurred to me; it had all of the ingredients of absolute major sensation.

It had what gets everybody riveted. It had race and sex and murder and stardom. It had all of those things, and it put out in the open, all of those things that I said we as a nation do not want to talk about. But what was stunning to me was not the verdict, but the reaction to it—as I heard bits and pieces of the evidence, I must confess that I watched very little of it.

But I was intrigued by the evidence that I thought was incontrovertible, it was the DNA testing. And I did see a little bit of that chief criminologist who was called into court and ripped apart by O.J. Simpson's attorneys. And I thought, but criminologists don't generally go to trial, they don't generally testify. They generally do what they do and mark the exhibits and say that they did it and it's introduced and that's the end of it.

And so I kept asking why this fascination, and the press heard this question asked by so many people. And the press' response was, but this is a good chance for us to show the American people, to educate the people on how the justice system works.

How many of you believe that that's the way the justice system works, that a person accused of murder can spend several million dollars regardless of color—and only ten of those who can, do that—several millions of dollars defending himself against a murder charge. And I thought this is not the way the justice system works.

Let me tell you how the system works. It works like this. A young African-American male, age 22, is arrested for homicide. He is assigned a public defender who is grossly overworked, and [in] a few days, if the defendant is lucky, he consults with the attorney. They go into court; no criminologist is called; there is no dream team.

He is tried, convicted, and sent to San Quentin. He has a rap sheet from L.A. to the White House, but he is innocent. He is innocent. I was fascinated with the DNA evidence, and I was attending a board meeting—I'm on the board of trustees of the San Francisco Theological Seminary—and that was a good group to be with because these are good Christian people.

And they were glued to the television when it was announced that the verdict was about to be revealed. And when the clerk read the verdict, there was this deafening silence and look of profound astonishment and indeed disappointment. And as the television cameras roamed America, [I] saw the same astonishment and, indeed, disappointment on the faces of people who are white.

And when the camera scanned the faces of people who look like me, there was even cheering. I remember thinking, how utterly bizarre this is. How can it be that in the face of this mountain of evidence as it was described, they get a verdict like this and we get the reactions we get?

And it reflects the two societies in which we live. The DNA evidence and all the evidence notwithstanding, what it said to many people of color is that we do not trust the system. And we genuinely do not trust it. They genuinely did not believe the evidence. And the reason they didn't believe it is that many of them have witnessed it in some form or another.

And so they did not believe. Whites had not experienced it, found it inconceivable that the verdict could be anything else. It should have awakened us. The matter of who ends up in the criminal justice system of any country has always carried racial and ethnic implications.

While those who are confined in a country's jail or prisons are rough measure[s] of the types of criminal activity at a given time, they provide a sharper picture of who is at the bottom of the socioeconomic heap or on the political outs at that given time.

Visit Berlin's jails and count the Turks. Visit France's prisons and see the Algerians. Visit Canadian prisons and count the French-speaking and the Native populations. Visit American prisons and jails and see the Blacks and Hispanics. The patterns are far from new. They give validity to the discomfiting comment of California sociologist John Irving (phonetic) that the nation's jails exist less for programmed progress of crime control than as places of rabble management.

It's taken from Jerome Miller's *Search and Destroy*, a book that certainly is controversial in some circles, nonetheless I thought the quote to be appropriate. Drugs have virtually destroyed many American communities. They impacted the African-American community more than any other. And it is, even today, a problem that screams for solution.

I remember a woman said to me when I was city manager, "I don't care what you do, I want you to get these drug dealers from in front of my yard, I want to get them off of my front porch. You do what you have to do and get rid of them." And I think that is a sentiment of most communities. But race matters.

When you visit American jails you would be absolutely certain that the only people who sold drugs and used drugs were people of color. And we know that not to be true. When we go to rehabilitation centers, you would be absolutely certain that the majority of the people, by far, who use drugs were white.

There is a disconnect. All crimes should be punished, but the punishment should fit the crime. We all have a responsibility to make sure that there is true justice. Several years ago I had gone to a dinner party in a community which I was unfamiliar. And after the party, I was returning home and was driving at the speed limit and came into a curve and moved slightly into the opposite lane.

There was a police officer nearby and the lights went on and he stopped me and he said, "You know you crossed over into that other lane." I said, "Yes I am aware of that." And he said, "Where have you been?" And I said, "I was visiting some friends and I'm now going home." He said, "Where do you live?" I said, "I live in Oakland."

And he said, "What country are you from?" And I said, "Florida." I found the question curious. And he said, "You were born in Florida." I said, "Yes, and so was my father and my grandfather and my great-grandfather." He said, "Oh, but you sound like you're from somewhere else."

I do not, I do not sound like what he expected me to sound like. I do not sound like I'm from somewhere else. I was walking one evening in my neighborhood, fairly nice neighborhood. It was about 9 in the evening, and it was my custom to take those walks. And all of a sudden two police cars began to converge on me.

And I thought, what's going on? The police officers jumped out of the car and came up to me and said, "Keep your hands to your side." I thought, keep my hands to my side. [One] approached me, and he said, "Where are you going?" I said, "I'm walking in the neighborhood, I have left home, I'm going for a walk."

He said, "Where do you live?" And I said, "I live on Hillcrop Circle." And I thought, you know, I'd better stop this conversation and tell them that I am the city manager. And I did. And they were extremely embarrassed. I said, "What's happening?"—"Why did you stop me?"

And he said, "We got a call that there was a Black man wearing a black jacket, carrying an ice pick." Well the jacket I had on, and I am color blind, was not black; it was gray. And I did not have an ice pick. So they said, "Well you should be careful. How far do you live?" And I said, "Oh, just right up the street."

I went home and I thought about it and I mentioned [it] to the assistant city manager the next day, who happens to be white. And he thought of something that I did not. Now I was mad actually, not so much that I was stopped, the thought had really not struck me quite that way. After he told me that there was this lunatic out there with an ice pick, I thought, they let me walk home?

But Craig had another thought. Craig called the police chief [to] report the incident and asked him for a copy of the call. That was in 1986. It is 1999, and we still do not have a copy of the call; that was my department.

There was a break-in in one of our cars that was parked in the driveway a couple of weeks ago. And the person took my son's nanny's telephone and something else from the car. And the car was locked. That next morning we realized that the car had been broken into, and at the breakfast table I said somebody had broken into the car. When I came home that evening my 5½-year-old son had told his nanny that a Black man had broken into the car.

And I thought why would he say that? I never said anything about the color of the person breaking into that car. Why would he say [a] Black man had broken into the car? And so I asked him. I said, "Taylor, who broke into the car?" And he said, "A Black man." And I said, "Did you see him?" knowing full well he hadn't.

He said, "No." I said, "How did you know that the person was Black?" He said, "I don't know." And I thought here is a 5½-year-old child who sees something bad happening and his assumption is that a Black man did it. As troubling as that is, it is more troubling that we have 35-, 45-, 55-year-old men and women in American society who make the decision that it happened—it was bad, and a Black man must have done it.

Now I must admit that I bear some responsibility probably for this because, although I monitor what Taylor watches, I insist that he watches the news. And when he was 4 years old I told him that he had to watch the news. So he's been faithfully watching the news. One day I asked Taylor when he was about 4, what had he seen on the news?

And he said, "They said it's raining." I said, "It's raining. Where's it raining?" He said, "I don't know, but it's raining." Last week I came home and I asked Taylor if he had watched the news and he said, "Yes." And I said, "Tell me what happened." He said, "Well there were a lot of people and they were crying and they had a lot of children."

He said, "And they said something about these people had been run out of their homes somewhere." He said, "They say a bad man did it." He said, "I think he must be a monster." He was watching the news report on Kosovo. We do watch the news. On the local news [stories] about robberies, he has seen suspects arrested and he has seen largely people of color.

I do not want to leave with you any suggestion that the burden of justice rests only on us, those of us who are in the criminal justice system. There is a much larger, much more complex issue than that. Justice does rest also with the schools. And it rests with us a society in terms of how we value the schools and children who populate them.

It rests with quality education. I would ask you to survey the jails and prisons of this country and tell me what percentage of the inmates are high school graduates. Tell me what percentage of the inmates have set foot 1 day on any college campus, so justice is also in the quality of education.

We have to get children to school, keep them there, educate them well; the justice is in employment. I'm working on a project and just got survey results back, and I was really devastated to hear what some people were saying. They do not hire certain people who live in Oakland.

No, they do not hire any people who live in Oakland because their experience is that the people who come from Oakland have an attitude—have an attitude. Now this is one that I would leave with the Justice Department. I'm not sure how you would ferret this out, but there is something alarming about that.

Not hiring people from a certain community because of their attitude smacks of racism. The people who are not being hired because of their attitude are young Black males; these are the same ones who we're arresting—three out of four by the time they're 29 years old—they have an attitude.

You would have an attitude too. You would have a serious attitude. And speaking of employment, we all have choices when we hire people. So we want the brightest, those who are motivated, those who are respectful. And when we see jailed, convicted, arrested, we turn the page to the next applicant.

These are the uneducated and the unemployed. Justice requires work, that people be gainfully employed. The burden falls on the nonprofits and the churches and the mainstays of our community. It is not enough to talk about justice from the pulpit. The churches have a responsibility not just to be activists but to preach the value of respect for the law.

To raise money not just to build sanctuaries, but raise money to educate the members, to send them to college, to give them the one thing that can never be taken away from them, and that is knowledge. Justice requires that families do their jobs and that parents really parent. It is one thing to be poor; it is something else not to care.

I was invited to speak in Jacksonville several years ago. They invited me back to recognize my achievements, which I thought was interesting since I don't have very many of them. But I accepted the honor in any event, and I remember the mayor who introduced me. We met just before I was to give my speech.

And as we chatted we shared our backgrounds, and we discovered that we were born in the same year and that we had graduated from high school the same year. And both he and I had [been] president of our student councils and president of our senior classes. And so when he got up to introduce me he repeated this.

He said all of those things and he said, "So you see Henry and I have a lot in common." And I don't know what possessed me, as my mother would say, to do this. Because I don't know what possessed me to talk about the color of justice. But something told me to say it, and I stood up and facing an audience very much like this one.

I said, "Everything that the mayor said is true. But the mayor forgot to tell you that the reason that I attended the University of Illinois and not the University of Florida is that the University of Florida had not accepted a single Black student in its entire history." And as I said that I could see my mother kind of slip under the table.

And after the speech I apologized to her for embarrassing her and she said, "Oh no, no, no." She said, "You didn't see me slip under the table." She said, "You said what needed to be said; they needed to hear it." But what surprised me were the number of people who came up to me afterward, those under 40, who said, "But that cannot be."

Because their understanding of history is that it was in the 1800s that one could not attend the University of Florida and the University of Georgia and the University of Alabama, not in the 1950s and the early 1960s. It was in the late 1950s and early 1960s that not a single Black student had been on any of those campuses, and it wasn't because they were not interested.

I asked my brother to give me a tour of the neighborhood that we grew up in, and I wanted to go back particularly to the schools. And I did that before I gave that speech, and it's probably what prompted me to make that comment. We went back to the place where I had attended elementary school in Jacksonville, Florida.

The school was torn down, and it should have been. It should never have existed. It was an old, decrepit, dilapidated, neglected school when I was there. It was old and decrepit and dilapidated when they opened the doors. I studied from books where pages were missing and not because the Black children had torn them out.

I went to the junior high school; it too was torn down and it doggoned should have been torn down. I went to my high school, which is still standing. It is a place where James Weldon Johnson wrote, in 1900, "Lift Every Voice and Sing."

It is the college preparatory of Jacksonville, and it doggoned should be the college preparatory of Jacksonville because it was a college preparatory when I attended it and I remembered all of that. And I remember Alfred Lord Tennyson: "I am a part of all that I have met;... though much is taken, much abides; . . . That which we are, we are—One equal temper of heroic hearts, . . . strong in will to strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

I remember because I loved this opera so much, the final scene from Puccini's "Tosca." For those of you who know the opera you know that Tosca's lover has been imprisoned by the chief of police, and he is a real tyrant. He agrees to release Mario if Tosca will yield to him. She is grieved that she has to be so humiliated, but in order to serve her lover, she consents.

But before she does, she gets [the chief of police] to write a note giving her and Mario safe passage from the country. And as she grasps the note and he embraces her for his kiss, she slaps him. He has told her that there will be mock execution of Mario, that he really will not be executed, but this is to allow them now the time to escape.

So Tosca goes along with the (unint.) and she goes and she tells Mario that this will be [a] mock execution. Well true to his form, Scarpia the tyrant makes it a real execution, and she realizes that she has been tricked. She climbs to the top of the tower and just before she hurls herself from the tower, she says, "Scarpia before God we shall meet."

And it is for us who really believe in justice, who really believe in equality before the law, it is before God we shall meet. We need to dedicate ourselves and commit ourselves so that our pledge of allegiance rings true for all Americans.

That [these] two nations one Black, one white, separate and very unequal, one rich and one poor—one who can access the justice system knowing full well that they will be treated fairly, equally and that justice will be tempered with mercy, and the other knowing that they're poor and Black are at the mercy of justice.

We must pledge that we will truly become one nation under God, indivisible with liberty, and justice for all. Thank you.

END OF TAPE

Luncheon Keynote Address—Fox Butterfield Correspondent, *New York Times*

Thank you Nancy. Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. I've always wanted to stand here with the great seal of the Department of Justice behind me. I recently had the unusual experience of speaking to a class at Sing-Sing. There were 25 men in the room. All of them had been convicted of murder and were serving life sentences.

Oddly they had all read my book, *All God's Children*, as part of a class assignment, and they wanted to ask me questions about [it]. They were also all fathers who wanted to find some better way to connect with their children. I would like to share this story of one inmate with you because it represents what I have come to believe is a huge gap in our criminal justice system which we could do something about if we worked together.

Your theme this week. A 52-year-old inmate, named Bubba Eng sentenced for murder, said that he had been at Sing-Sing for 22 years. Recently he was in the shower room when a newly arrived inmate walked in, looked at him in the face, and then said, "Daddy."

It was his oldest son whom he had not seen since he was incarcerated. His son, he learned, had been convicted for armed robbery. At that moment Bubba Eng was devastated, he realized that not only he had wasted his life, but his son had wasted his life too, trying to imitate his father's criminal career.

This story in one form or another will be familiar to many of you, though not to the public or the politicians who pass our criminal laws. For reasons that are not well understood or researched, there is a strong intergenerational effect of incarceration on the children of men and women who are locked in our jails and prisons.

An intergenerational transmission. In some way, the violence, the criminal lifestyle is passed from father to son and increasingly from mother to daughter. And prison does not stop it. In fact prison may, unintentionally, be part of the mechanism by which crime and violence are perpetuated.

Let me offer you some statistics that illustrates this. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), on any given day there are now 1.96 million children who have a father or mother or other close relative who is incarcerated. [Of the] nearly 2 million children, 7 percent of these children have a mother who's incarcerated.

Ninety-three percent have a father who is locked up. The real totals though may be much higher. Denise Johnston (phonetic), at the Center for Children of Incarcerated Parents in Pasadena, believes we should also include those children whose parents are on probation or parole because they will have undergone many of the same problems in recent months.

That would add approximately another 5 million children for a total of 7 million, almost the population of New York City. Whichever figure you choose, the impact on children is enormous. Although the data [are] maddeningly imprecise, [they are] also appallingly consistent. Again according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 50 percent of all juveniles in locked facilities have a parent or other close relative who has been incarcerated.

That makes parental incarceration perhaps the single greatest risk factor in the making of delinquents. This 50-percent finding has been replicated in virtually every study that's been done. In Minneapolis, 50 percent of the children who were arrested under 10, had a parent who had been incarcerated.

In Sacramento County, California, 55 percent of the children between the ages of 9 and 12 who had been arrested had a parent who had been incarcerated. Leslie Icocca (phonetic), of the National Center for Crime and Delinquency, last year did a careful study of girls in detention in four counties in California: Los Angeles, San Diego, Alameda, and Marin.

Fifty-four percent of their mothers had been incarcerated and almost 50 percent of their fathers. She believes the estimate for the fathers is probably way too low because many of the girls didn't know much about their fathers. I want to stress that these findings have nothing, absolutely nothing, to do with race or ethnicity.

In the 1930s and 1940s, some of you may recall, Sheldon and Eleanor Gluck, at the Harvard Law School, did the first longitudinal study of the making of juvenile delinquents in the Boston area. They found that two-thirds of the boys who were in locked facilities in Massachusetts had fathers who had been incarcerated.

And of that group, half had grandfathers who had been incarcerated. But what was really significant in their study was that all of the boys in the sample were white. David Ferrington (phonetic) has come up with similar statistics, [in] the 50-percent range, for boys in white working-class London who have been locked up.

And if you look at adults in jails and prisons, you come up again with very similar figures. According to BJS about 40 percent of all the inmates, adult inmates in jails and prisons, have a parent who has been incarcerated. There isn't time today to explore all the possible reasons why incarceration of parents often leads to delinquency and to adult offending.

Suffice it to say there are probably a series of interlocking factors. First, children with parents who are incarcerated have many other problems in their lives, poverty, abuse, neglect, drug use, and so on—the factors you're all too familiar with.

Second, separation from a parent or loss of a parent is always a problem as with death or war. There is a rich literature on this. Third, there is the desensitizing effect. Our criminal justice system is built on deterrence and stigma.

But children who visit their parents in prison may come to think of it as normal. A judge in the juvenile court in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, told me about a case she had. The mother had been convicted of selling crack-cocaine and was also awaiting trial on charges of neglecting her four children.

A social worker, well intentioned, was taking the children to visit their mother in jail until the judge objected and ordered that the visits take place in her chambers and that the mother be dressed in civilian clothes.

She did not want the children to become accustomed to going to jail. The mother was puzzled when the judge made this order, and she wondered why jail visits were a problem. She said [that] she had been taking her kids to visit her own friends and relatives in prison for years.

Since that time, three of her four children have also been arrested and placed in juvenile prisons in Louisiana. The judge said to me sadly, "The kids have fond memories, and their only memories, of their mother behind bars."

If you have parents in jail, then it's part of your life and there is nothing offensive about it. There is a fourth factor at work too. Other research has shown that children who see their parent arrested by the police or have to be searched when they go to visit a parent in jail or prison can become angry at law enforcement or contemptuous of police and judges and jail guards.

They become particularly angry in visitors' room when they see their parents humiliated, such as when they see their parents denied permission to cross a yellow line on the floor to go to a vending machine. Only the visitors can cross those lines.

And finally, fifth, I believe simple imitation is also critical here. The incarcerated father often becomes a role model. We all know that if your father is a doctor or a lawyer, or a farmer or a policeman, there's a likelihood [that] you will go into the same line of work.

What doesn't occur to most of us because we don't have the experience, is that if your father is an incarcerated criminal, this may also be a powerful, if perverse, example. In my book, *All God's Children*, I studied the transmission of violence through four generations of a family, the Bosket family, which started out in rural South Carolina and ended up in Harlem.

The earliest member of the family to turn to a life of crime was named Pudd (phonetic) Bosket, the great-grandfather. He lived, he grew up in the 1890s in rural Edgefield County, South Carolina. When Pudd was a young sharecropper and worked on a white man's land raising cotton, he got tired of being whipped.

Whipping was still legal in South Carolina three decades after the end of the Civil War, a vestige of slavery. And so one day when the white man went to whip him, he turned and grabbed the whip out of the white man's hand and said, "Don't step on my reputation."

It was an amazing gesture at that time in South Carolina. And after that Pudd could not get hired by anybody else, so he turned to robbing stores, and he ended up on the chain gang. But instead of becoming viewed as an outlaw, he became something of a folk hero in his community.

His son and grandson and great-grandson would each seek in their own way to live up to Pudd's reputation. They would tell stories around their dinner table about the things that Pudd had done. They would draw paintings in school of Pudd. Or they would write stories in school about him.

When the youngest member of his family, Willie Bosket, was born in Harlem, his mother tried to hide the terrible truth from him that his own father had murdered two men and was in prison in Wisconsin. But whenever Willie did something bad like sneaking up behind a woman and slapping her on the rear end or stealing an old man's cane on the street, his mother would say to him, "Willie, you're real bad. You're just like your daddy, and when you grow up you're going to turn out just like him." Willie didn't know what that meant exactly, but one day when he was 6, he saw a photograph on his grandmother's dresser of a man dressed in prison fatigues.

He asked who it was, and his grandmother said, "That's your father. He's in prison in Wisconsin." And Willie said, "Why is he there?" And his grandmother said, "Because he murdered two men." That seemed pretty impressive to Willie and he began incorporating that into his own personality.

He began to tell his teachers and other boys in school, "Don't mess with me. My father is a murderer and when I grow up I'm going to be just like him." Willie was a problem from an early age. When he was 7 he snuck up to the third floor of his elementary school which was closed and he got into a storeroom and found a typewriter, went to a window, and threw the typewriter out a window, narrowly missing hitting a pregnant teacher walking outside below.

And, in fact, as Willie grew up he continued to commit crimes, 2,000 robberies by his own count. And at the age of 15 he was arrested for murdering two men. After he'd been arrested, he was examined by a panel of psychiatrists in New York. They asked him why he did what he did, and he said [that] he viewed murder as a form of competition.

He wanted to be as good at it as his father had been. So focusing on children with incarcerated parents may offer us an opportunity, a possible tool, for more effective intervention and prevention. The problem is, of course, there is no criminal justice agency responsible for implementing this.

At the most fundamental level, most jails and prisons are not required to ask newly arrived inmates whether they have children or what their names are. And even if they do ask, in some states they don't do anything with the information. Moreover there's no guarantee that the inmates will give correct answers.

Do the fathers know where their children are? Do the mothers want to risk providing a name and maybe losing custody of a child or losing government benefits? Another problem obviously is,

jails and prisons are in the security business, keeping inmates and guards safe is their primary mission.

Not surprisingly family visits are low on the priority list. They take up valuable manpower. And they can be an opportunity to smuggle in drugs or other contraband. At a more complex level, what should our policy be about fostering close relations between inmates and their children?

Are visits by children to jail to see their father and mother really good for family preservation as advocates say? Or do they tend to desensitize the child, making him or her too comfortable with the jail environment, causing the criminal justice system to lose its stigma, as the judge in Baton Rouge believes.

There is essentially now rigorous research on this issue. I would suggest what common sense tells us, to start paying more attention. Someone, some agency perhaps, should be responsible for collecting information on incarcerated parents and their children.

Someone should monitor them or at least share the information with schools, hospitals, juvenile court judges, social workers, law enforcement agencies, and so on. A few jails and prisons, on an individual basis, have begun such programs as some of you know.

The Osborne Association in New York has perhaps the best program in a prison at Sing-Sing, and has replicated [it] at Woodburn, of any place that I've seen in the country. It teaches inmates how to try to be better fathers from inside even when their children don't want to come and visit them or lie about where their fathers are.

Interestingly, only one-quarter of male inmates in state prisons are married or are able to remain married. And only about a third receive visits from family members, though at least two-thirds of male inmates have children. If you look at jails, the best example that I've seen is in San Antonio, in a county jail where there is an excellent program for fathers and mothers, begun by volunteers, that requires attendance at a parenting class 5 days a week in order to earn the right for a contact visit with your child on a Saturday.

Parents who don't participate in the class only get to visit by telephone through a glass partition. But we need much more, systematic state and national policies and partnerships. If we don't start paying attention to this issue, the cycle will continue.

Willie Bosket has no children. He's in prison for the rest of his life, three life sentences and 75 years in solitary. So he will never have children, but his favorite niece, a very bright girl, who used to go and visit him regularly, has now been adjudicated a delinquent herself.

She assaulted a man on the subway in New York and she's been placed in a state training school. So in conclusion I'd like to say the obvious, which you all know, that there is no free lunch in the prison business and that prison has more consequences than we think. Thank you very much.

I would be delighted to take some questions if people have any. I understand the microphones may be working or people could stand up and I'll try to hear them, if I can see.

Yes?

Q: You indicated [that] there's no rigorous research on the this issue. Having read the book about it and spent a lot of time with convicts, what's your hunch? Do you think exposing kids to detention facilities makes them comfortable or do you think maintaining that family linkage, or in some cases creating a family bond, is [a] preferable course for government to pursue?

A: The question was, there is no rigorous [research] on this issue, but what's my own hunch as whether it's better to try to preserve family bonds through visits or does this make the kids too comfortable with the prison environment? I guess I have to give [a] guarded, ambiguous answer because we don't have sufficient research.

My own hunch is that it's probably better to preserve the family bonds and do as much as we can but to monitor closely what's happening—to use the knowledge that these kids have an incarcerated parent to alert school authorities, social workers, whoever is working with them.

The parents themselves, to work with the parents themselves to watch for signs in the kids—this is a kind of marker that could be used effectively, I hope without stigmatizing the kids, but at least it's a way of looking at early warning signs.

So I would advocate more of these programs, but we should all be very aware of what the risks are. Sir, ma'am? Sorry I can't see.

Q: Fox, it's Ann Jacobs from the Women's Prison Association with a haircut. You know I haven't heard you focus on this desensitizing concern that you were talking about in terms of the possible result of visitation. And as a person who spent the last 10 years working with women in the criminal justice system and in seeing that in more instances than not, there isn't visitation.

I've spent a lot of my energy looking for ways of improving the conditions of visitation and the likelihood that parents will see their kids. I'm glad that you believe that there needs to be more research on this rather than you're suggesting that visitation is a bad thing, which is what I was afraid people would hear from what you were saying.

And it occurs to me that, in fact, there are a lot of other factors that are at work that have to do with this desensitizing phenomenon that you're talking about. And I wonder, even in the story of Willie Bosket, whether you might reflect a little bit about the reality for Willie of who his father was, versus the reality that we learned by reading the book.

You know the part of the story that I'm talking about. That, in fact, he had a story about who his dad was that he lived up to, then when he met his dad, [he] wasn't at all who his dad had

become, and I did wonder if he might not have turned out a little bit differently if he had more of an involving ongoing relationship with his father as he grew up.

A: Well here we have one of the leading experts on the subject, so I have to be very careful. This is a really difficult question and in the absence of research it's hard to be sure of your answer. We can only go with our instincts that visitations probably are a good thing.

But these kids do come up with ideas and Willie never met his father, never corresponded with his father, didn't know much about his father except sort of mythology until he was an adult. So he did develop his idealized portrait of his father in a vacuum because he had not been able to visit his father.

And it's possible that if he had known his father, if he had been able to go and see him in prison that he might have had a different sense. That's something that's inherently unknowable I suppose. So I guess I'll come back to the answer I gave before which is: In principle, I'm absolutely in favor of the visitation programs, and particularly teaching the parents how to be better parents while you've got them in jail or in prison, which is one of the things I didn't mention.

Of course, you've got the parents in jail or prison. If they get off the drugs, they can focus on being a better parent, they can learn some things that they haven't learned in the outside. And the hope is that, when they get back home, that they can put those things to use.

So certainly I'm in favor of this, but there is all this psychological evidence that the kids sometimes can be desensitized by the visits. Sir? I have a hard time seeing from here; the lights are bright.

Q: Jim Mustin with Family and Corrections Network. Really, appreciate your raising the issue as well. I think another theory that you might want to emphasize for examination is the basic validity and value of stigmatization as a way of preventing crime.

I think stigmatization itself is the boomerang. Then when we cast people out of the community, they have to have some type of response to that. And the response tends to be, okay, who needs you and to adopt a role of being an outlaw.

And I think your book demonstrates how this is also passed intergenerationally. But we're so dedicated in our culture to the belief [that] the stigmatization is great, that we've just got to do it, that we're pretty hesitant about examining that assumption.

And if we can take a step back, perhaps we could look at societies that don't practice, don't emphasize stigmatization but emphasize reintegration. You'll find that have emphasized strong [?], these are societies that generally have strong communal values, strong family values, and they tend to have lower crime rates, at least according to studies and work that's done by John Graithwave (phonetic) and others. And I'd like to consider that aspect as well.

A: Well you said it more eloquently than I can, so I agree that that's. . .

Q: Hi, I'm Kay Harris from Temple University in Philadelphia, and I guess I would like to follow up on your point [that] somebody should be in charge of dealing with this, tracking it, looking at the impact on families, on children of incarceration.

And it struck me that a good portion of the sessions at this conference is on community justice. And we're all involved, I think, in trying to define what does community justice mean and some of the work that's being done; I'm thinking of Todd Clear (phonetic) and David Karp's (phonetic) work on what are the characteristics of an egalitarian just community.

And they talk about one of the key characteristics being inclusion—that is, that in focusing on communities and building strong, just communities, everybody who's in the community has to be a focus and in cooperation with agents of the justice system.

So that inclusion means focusing on people who are identified as offenders, the families of offenders, as well as people who are identified as victims, the families of victims, and their supporters. And that I think, actually probably not by accident here, that the call that you're making is part of the real challenge of saying how serious are we about an emphasis on inclusion in our talking about how it is in the community and how does the community deal with all the people who are involved and affected by the justice system.

So if we're not now, as representatives of different parts of the justice system, paying attention to that, and I think a lot of the people in this are, I think a lot of [us] would embrace that as being part of our jobs, to care about exactly the kind of indirect effects, consequences, longer term effects that previously—and different kinds of models that—didn't focus on the community element of doing justice, didn't give as much attention to the consequences beyond the individual offender who's been so much of the focus traditionally.

A: It's a very good point, thank you. There's one more in the back.

Q: What if Pudd the first had not been caught or incarcerated but there had just been the story—that is, are you identifying children who are imitating the behavior of these parents so that the incarceration is sort of a proxy for the other.

How would your story have unfolded, do you think, if perhaps he killed someone and [had] gotten away with it and had been on the lam, but it was sort of a just killing element. Would the story have played out the same if it was just behavior? Are they trying to get into jail or are they trying to imitate the behavior that has been modeled for them?

A: It's an interesting question, since, unfortunately Pudd ended up in jail, ended up in the chain gang repeatedly, that experience started from the beginning and I don't know how quite to answer it. I think that the fact that he was in jail and then his son was in jail and the grandson and

the great-grandson, each one of them [was] fascinated, enamored in some strange way, not only by the criminal experience, but also by the jail experience.

They're so intertwined it's very hard to separate them. So it's an impossible question to answer, but I hope that everybody can take something from this and think about this issue of children and who have incarcerated parents because it's been really a back-burner issue that has not gotten much attention from anybody. Thank you.

END OF TAPE

Closing Keynote Address—Honorable Janet Reno, Attorney General of the United States

Thank you, Nancy, and thank you and your staff for all that you've done to make this conference possible.

And thank you for that warm welcome. But I'm the one who should be applauding you. Frankly, it's easy to come to Washington and try to remember what you learned in your community about how to get people to work together and talk about it. It's much harder to work in the community and bring people together and work through problems and get things done. I see people out there who I know have been doing that as partners in their community and as partners with us for some time. You are the people who make the difference, and I'm just very honored and privileged to be with you today.

We have come so far. We've realized that if we're going to succeed we have to work as partners. We've realized that if we are to succeed we must forget questions of turf and who gets the credit. Learning from what each of us does and where we can agree to share the load gives the whole system a greater chance to be fair, just, and effective.

I think a wonderful example of the partnership that we have talked about is the program that Nancy and BJA introduced back in 1994 called the Comprehensive Communities Program, or CCP. Last week Tom Windham, the Chief of Police of Fort Worth, and several of his colleagues presented a report called Six Safer Cities, which was published under a BJA grant to the National Crime Prevention Council. This report gets to the heart of what your partnerships can yield.

I have seen that partnership in action. I went to Fort Worth early on after I'd come to Washington, and I saw what Chief Windham and a partnership in his community could do. I have seen other examples, and now people don't look at me as if I'm crazy when I talk about prevention and intervention, because you have proved me right, all of you in this room, again and again.

Similar strategies are working in Denver, Hartford, Boston, and New York. In a column written by David Broder in the *Washington Post*, Broder quotes former Winston-Salem Police Chief George Sweatt, who said: "We can't go on locking people up. We've got to start looking at the front end of the problem. We're fast becoming the number one country for detention. We'd better start looking at kids. If you intervene at the earliest possible moment, you can reduce the number of people who wind up in the criminal justice system."

The day before yesterday I was in Winston-Salem. George Sweatt was not Police Chief; he was the director of the whole state juvenile justice system, and he was following through on what he said. It was working.

I attended a Conference of Mayors meeting last fall, and the mayors said, when you first came to talk to us in '93 and '94 we listened; we've put it into effect; and it's working. It's working because of you all who have made such an extraordinary difference in your community and have proved us right—that if we start at the front end we can make a difference.

We have done so much, but there is a tendency in this nation, once you succeed just a little bit, you become complacent and turn to other problems and focus on them. We have a golden opportunity in America right now.

Crime is down 6 years in a row. Juvenile crime is down. Let's not turn away and become complacent.

If we can keep after the goals we share, if we can develop prevention, intervention, enforcement, and aftercare programs the truly make a difference, we can continue to bring crime down in this nation, and we can have a substantial permanent impact on the culture of violence in this country. I'm convinced that we can do this.

But I would like to talk with you about how we look to the future and the pieces that I think need to be worked on and focused upon. First, I have felt that communities understand their needs and resources better than anyone and that decisions with respect to crime should be made in the community, with the Federal Government supporting you in every way that we can. But I think we have neglected the states and the counties in their relationship to communities and cities, and I would ask each of you to return to your state and figure [out] what can be done with state agencies to leverage greater resources, technical assistance, support to end fragmentation and to make sure we use the dollars as wisely as possible in every community.

I look at the dollars that are available from the Federal Government to the states: Violence Against Women moneys, Byrne grant moneys, victims' moneys. They're there, and let us make sure that they are used in the wisest way possible, by building strong partnerships between communities and state officials.

I go to a community and there probably is crime. It has spilled over from the city into the unincorporated area. What are you doing about it, I asked. And people kind of looked into space and shuffled their feet and said that they'd better start looking a little bit harder. Let us forge partnerships that don't break at any point along the line.

There's clear proof now that, to be successful, programs have to be comprehensive. If you develop the best Early Start program for [ages] 0 to 3 and then don't have good school systems or good afterschool programs, that foundation may come to naught. If you don't have programs after school, the great schooling that the child receives may go for naught.

So how do we improve on the comprehensive nature of the programs we have in our various communities? I think you all are doing a great job. But I would ask you to focus on the concept of aftercare. So much of what we do in enforcement is wasted because we send a child to a

detention facility or to a state training school for 9 months and then we return them to the apartment over the open-air drug market where they got into trouble in the first place, with no support, little concern, no adult to talk to, and they're going to be right back in our system.

I ask you to expand your thoughts beyond the juveniles to that category of people 18 to 35 who have prior records, who too often are running into closed doors across this nation because people won't hire them, won't give them a chance because of their prior record. They don't know anybody; they don't know where to go. If we can focus on aftercare and support of this category of offender, I think we can make a significant difference.

So much has been said about drug treatment in America, its lack thereof, or its development. When I first became a prosecutor in 1978, people looked at me as if I were crazy when I said drug treatment works. Now I don't think I can go anywhere in this country where somebody doesn't have a family member, friend, neighbor, fellow employee who has benefited from drug treatment.

But we've got to make it a coherent continuum. Why do we wait until somebody gets arrested when we see someone who has an obvious drug problem, who's not getting help because they can't afford it? Something is wrong with a nation that says that a man can have five stiff drinks tonight, drive up the Beltway at 90 miles an hour, crash into a car, kill two people, break his two arms, and have the two arms set tonight in a public hospital because he can't afford it, and yet we turn too often to that person pleading for help and say, you've got to be on a waiting list. They get back into trouble.

Let us make sure that we have in our communities across this nation a continuum of prevention programs, of intervention programs before arrest, of drug courts, of programs within prisons, of aftercare programs that can truly make a difference.

Let us refine what we've learned about case management so that we have one person, sensitive and thoughtful, managing that person who is a user, so that [she doesn't] get conned because we have had to shift the person from one program to another and he can con his way out of everything because nobody knows what he did in the prior program.

Let us focus on women and children, as we see crime rise among women and as we see more people with small children afraid to seek treatment because they're afraid they will lose their children. Let us figure out new and innovative ways to deal with them.

Let us institutionalize some concepts so that it doesn't have to be done based on a grant program or somebody's charity. Let me give you an example. There are so many wonderful conflict resolution, problem-solving programs afoot in this nation today teaching young people how to resolve conflicts without knives and guns and fists.

I have a dream for this nation, and that is that [all] teacher[s] will receive course work before they graduate from teachers college or with a degree in teaching in how to teach conflict resolution to their students, how to teach problem solving to their students, and that every police

officer in basic law enforcement training will receive similar training in how to work with young people on the streets to achieve the same goal.

We can do so much if we realize how effective these programs can be. At the same time, we can talk about programs and we can talk about partnership for a long time, but it won't matter one bit unless we look behind the partnerships, behind the programs, to the people involved.

Among the people in the community, we have got to build trust. Programs don't do it. It is the people in the programs, people who care and are dedicated, such as yourselves, who can build that trust. We've got to learn to listen to each other and, as my mother would say, listen with a listening ear, and we've got to hear what other people are saying.

We've got to hear through the anger of somebody who has reached the end of his or her rope the goodness that's there if only we can unlock the door and bring it out. We've got to learn to listen and talk to young people. The day before yesterday I was in Winston-Salem, where a basic law enforcement academy is in the school, a school for kids at risk. Five trainees sat with five students, and one young man said: "I didn't like police; I thought they were the bad guys. I ran the other way when I saw them coming. I was suspicious. Then these guys started talking to me, and I turned away, and I didn't want to listen to them. But suddenly I started hearing them and what they said made sense."

When you looked at those five trainees and those young people who have been through so much in their young lives, and when you listen to them talk and acknowledge each other, these were not strangers, these were not enemies; these were people [who] had formed confidence and trust in each other.

We can do so much if we return to our communities and make sure that we look at the people we are working with and develop that trust—trust that does not have to come from constant agreement, but trust that comes from respect and regard for each other.

One of the people we must look at as a person here and react to is the victim. We must do that, first of all, because of common humanity. The law has done a good deal about that. The law in state and federal systems now provides a large number of protections for victims. But too often we don't put substance behind the laws, either because the legislature won't fund the system properly or because the person doesn't know how to talk to the victim.

Again, we can do so much if we start thinking about, how would I want my mother to be treated if she were sitting across the table from me now? And if we put it in human terms, we can make the system more effective, people will be more willing to testify. There are a number of reasons why we should do it, leaving aside the most important, which is the humane reason.

But there is another reason we must focus on victims. Children who have been the witnesses or the victims of violence too often come to accept violence as a way of life and perpetuate violence as they grow older by their own conduct and their own actions. We should intervene in any

instance in which a child has been the victim of violence, in which the child has witnessed terrible violence, to provide counseling to let them know that violence does not have to be part of their life for the rest of their life.

One area that you'll be surprised to hear me mention, but it is a critical area, for the system will break down without it, is provision for indigent defense. There are too many cases continued because there are not adequate lawyers available. There are too many cases reversed because there was incompetent counsel. And unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, there are innocent people who have been convicted because they did not have appropriate counsel.

If we are to make *Gideon v. Wainwright*, the Supreme Court decision guaranteeing counsel to those who could not afford it, a reality, if we are to make the law in this country worth something more than the paper it's written on, we've got to make sure that everyone is properly represented in our courts.

But I have a challenge to defense lawyers. Most of them think that their job is to get the person off, get the motion to dismiss granted, and they think they've won the case. But too often their client walks out, back into violence, back into drug use, and I think it's time to rethink the traditional role of the public defender.

I just received from my old public defender at home, an adversary who I've said I've gotten more provoked at than probably anybody in the criminal justice system, a remarkable statement. It's the Public Defender Anti-Violence Initiative (AVI) of the 11th Judicial Circuit in Dade County, Florida: "It is the primary goal of the Anti-Violence Initiative to reduce the likelihood of our clients engaging in future criminal conduct."

Here are examples of ongoing AVI partnerships and projects in Dade County:

"The Public Defender is a partner of the University of Miami Child Service and Policy Research Program in evaluating the effectiveness of the Juvenile Justice Sentencing Project."

"Teamed with the University of Miami School of Medicine Center for Family Studies in a community partnership to prevent violence."

"Worked closely with the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice,"—and on and on, focusing on what they can do to make sure their client never returns to violence.

If we all thought in those terms about what each of us can do, we can all make a difference. This is a golden opportunity. We have a chance in this country to give our children strong and positive futures so that nobody is left by the wayside, so that nobody is written off, so that everyone has equal opportunity.

But we won't do it waiting until they grow up. We've got to start early, with the building blocks of life, with strong and healthy parents, with health care that can make a difference, with solid education, with good schooling, with supervision during afternoons and evenings, truancy

prevention, conflict resolution skills, school-to-work opportunities, but most of all giving our kids the spirit and the feeling that they can grow up to make a difference in this life.

You all are shining examples of what one person can do in your community to make a difference. Ladies and gentlemen, because of your work, if we keep at it, we are going to make a difference and we are going to end the culture of violence in this country for the lifetime of the people in this room and I'd say even on to your grandchildren.

God bless you all.

(Applause.)

We have some time for questions and I'd be happy to take your questions, but I have a question for you. If you don't want to ask me a question, you might answer this one: If you were the Attorney General of the United States, what would you do to address the concerns that I've talked about today or that are a matter of concern to you and or community?

Q: Ms. Attorney General—

A: This lady is one of the first people I met when I came to Washington. She told me about her program, and she's been there ever since.

Q: Ms. Attorney General, it's so good to see you. One of the things that I think that from your position would be very helpful to local communities is, as we look at the corrections system, people think it's the corrections system that has to fix itself. I would ask you and other Cabinet members to convene a session of agencies at the local level, such as United Ways, such as school districts, such as our local community resources, because together, as we begin to look at the full spectrum of care, if we literally sit at the local level and connect the dots and find our resources locally, what's happening in corrections is all of our problem, but it has always only been relegated to the criminal justice system to take care of itself.

I think we can work very, very well with our workforce development commissions, our United Ways, to be able to look at peer-run group recovery homes, our local funding entities that actually fund treatment where we can fund it properly and do some things. It would be very, very good if you could convene a meeting of some of those lead agencies and people to be able to get them involved in this whole situation.

A: Could you do me a favor and make sure I have your card?

Q: Yes, ma'am.

A: So I can follow up with you and get more of the details.

Q: I will. Thank you.

A: That's a wonderful idea.

(Applause.)

Q: Honorable AG, this is Roland Smallwood, Columbia, South Carolina.

In response to your question, I think the group assembled in this hall today happens to be the members of the church and choir, so the problem does not lie within the members who are assembled here. The problem lies with those persons in law enforcement, particularly those who are chiefs of police and sheriffs, who have not embraced the concept of community policing and community mobilization that you so diligently try to push through.

I think with the upcoming National Crime Prevention Council's conference in November that some effort needs to be made to make sure that persons in the upper echelon levels of law enforcement who have not embraced the concept of police, of community policing, be brought into this conference so that they can see communities that have accepted it and it is working.

In rural America you've got a lot of sheriffs and police officers who still do not believe, still want the nightsticks and believe that they can get people to submit by beating them across the head with a stick. I think unless those persons are brought to the forefront, part of America is going to move forward and part of America is going to stay in the back because of their beliefs.

A: I think your point is well taken, and you will be interested to know that I'm going from here to a conference on just that subject. I think the great issue that we have now is how we recognize that there are many, many police officers who are dedicated, doing an extraordinary job for their community. The great majority of police chiefs and sheriffs support community policing, support sensitive and professional policing, but there are some police officers, as there are some lawyers and some doctors, who abuse the confidence and the trust that we place in them.

I think those few have created a sense of concern among a significant part of the population. It is imperative that all of us, police and the community, work together to address this issue, in efforts such as I saw in Winston-Salem, where I had seen trust developed that was just extraordinary, or in High Point, North Carolina, where the faith community had been involved and the complaints against police officers had fallen dramatically because people had learned how to talk to each other. We are pursuing efforts within the Civil Rights Division.

But I think your point is very well taken, and I would continue to appreciate specific suggestions you have, such as you made with respect to the fall conference, on what we can do.

Q: Attorney General Janet Reno, I am deeply in admiration for all the work that you've done, and I have a request to make. I run halfway houses for offenders coming out of prison. I am seeing a trend coming out of Washington—I'm in the state of Nevada. I'm seeing a trend come out of Washington that says we need to become bean-counters when it comes to substance abuse treatment, how many people attended a process group, how many people received one-on-one counseling.

This is all in the substance abuse treatment field, and this is just one aspect of the work that we do. This level of bean-counting to me doesn't really address the problem of what are we actually producing. I would like to see a stronger emphasis coming out of the work we're doing as to what we are actually producing. In other words, how many people are not going back to prison, how many people are not using 3 months and 6 months later, and get away from this fee-for-service bean-counting, toward a more results-oriented objective throughout the whole field, get away from that managed care model and move more toward a results-oriented field for all of the social service agencies throughout the United States.

It's probably my Scotch nature, but this is what I want to see for my tax money, and I would appreciate your backing in this. Thank you.

A: I need to know who's requiring you to do that bean-counting.

(Laughter.)

Q: There goes my funding, Attorney General.

A: Here's what I would appreciate your doing.

Q: Okay.

A: Do you have a card?

Q: Yes.

A: If you can figure out who's asking you to do it, then I'll call you or have somebody call you in about a week and let's work through it and understand it.

You will not achieve, however, the results until we develop a better case management generally across the country, and I referred to that earlier, so that we know what the results are. And if we can develop information as to results, it can make a tremendous difference in terms of persuading Congress and the legislatures to fund programs that produce results.

We've got so much to do in showing results, whether it be in drug treatment or other efforts, and sometimes you can't show results overnight. You've got to invest in children before you have the proof of the pudding. But I think we can do a lot more, and I'm proud of what Nancy and others have done in terms of developing an ability to evaluate results, not the beans.

Q: I see that coming out of the Bureau of Justice. It's other agencies that I'm having problems with.

A: Let me find out who.

(Laughter.)

A: So make sure I get a card.

Q: Okay, you've got it. Thank you.

Q: Good morning, Attorney General. I thought I'd better chime in here because we're getting left out in the back of the room.

A: Let me just—please excuse me just for a moment. I can take you and two other people in the time that I've got, and I apologize. So I didn't want people to stand and think that I could get to everybody.

So forgive me, but we'll take you and two others.

Q: My name is Rod Gatula. I am a family physician and, looking over the list of participants, I suspect I'm the only physician here and certainly probably the only individual from a medical school.

One of my concerns and one of the things I've been working on for about 4 years is to get the issues that you're discussing regarding domestic violence, drug abuse, et cetera, into the health education field. When you ask about what sort of things can be done to have an impact, I think as I look at health education and have looked at it there is almost no curriculum in the medical schools, nursing schools, on how to identify and how to treat individuals who are involved in domestic violence, drug abuse, et cetera.

If you want to look at a longitudinal impact, if you train healthcare professionals before they get out of those institutions to look for issues around domestic violence, to ask families about whether members have been incarcerated, to look at drug abuse issues, they're one of the constants in the life of a child, besides the school system, where you know that that child will be seeing a healthcare professional for all those years, and that they may also be able to change the system.

So I would encourage the Bureau of Justice to get more involved in pushing health care institutions to teach those types of curriculums, so that practitioners who come out know how to deal with them.

A: Doctor, you've just become a great force for me.

But first of all, I can't see you that well from this distance, but you sound like Garrison Keillor.

(Laughter.)

First of all, when I first had some public hearings in Florida on substance abuse, I discovered that then, in about 1987, there was no curriculum on addictionology in any major medical school. I hope that's changing, and Donna Shalala and I have both written to deans of medical schools urging the change.

Now I've got to go back, prodded by you, to see what's being done.

I was very pleased to see that the American Pediatric Association—I'm not sure what its name is—had developed some protocols and some guidelines for pediatricians, because I think that pediatricians can be powerful forces for talking to children about violence, violence prevention, how to treat it, what to do, and that the combination of the public health discipline and the criminal justice law enforcement discipline can be very powerful.

I then asked, well, if the pediatricians are doing this, what are the family physicians doing about domestic violence? Someone recently had a conversation with a representative of the American Medical Association and I'm told some good progress is being made.

I'm going to go back and look at it all and see if I can't translate more effort into health education. I think your point is extremely well taken, and I'd appreciate any other suggestions you have, too.

Q: Ms. Reno, my name is Michael Smith. I'm a member of the National Youth Network. First I'd like to just thank you for your support to young people across this nation. You have truly been a great leader in making sure that young people are constantly at the table and that we're being heard in all sorts of areas.

A: Michael, you wouldn't let me do otherwise.

(Laughter.)

Q: Thank you.

I just wanted to say to you, if I were Attorney General for a day, one of the things that I would like to see is, any time a decision is going to be made that affects the life of young people, whether it's a sheriff making a decision for a curfew or whether it's a district attorney deciding to represent a different type of opinion, I think there should be a committee of young people, of diverse young people, not just the straight-A students, but the young people who have been through those experiences, who could be there to advise that person on that decision.

A: I think that's an excellent point.

(Applause.)

I will tell you, Michael, that, with the caseload a district attorney has or many public officials have, if you left it to advice by committee, we'd never get anything done that you and I wanted to get done.

What good persons will do in the community if they are sensitive to your recommendation is make sure that they listen to young people wherever they go and that they float an idea, that they try out something new, that they say, what do you think about this. I try, as I think you know, as I've said before, whenever I go to a new community to talk to young people who are in trouble or

who have been in trouble, to ask them what they think. I try to involve as many young people as possible in my thought processes.

So it may not be by committee all the time, but it's clear that young people have so much to say. When I go to schools, I explain to them that they ask better questions than anybody, including newspaper reporters. You can learn volumes from them.

Q: Thank you.

Q: (Speaks in Native-American tongue). I greeted you, Attorney General Janet Reno, in my language, acknowledging you also as a relative and thanking you for the work that you've done so far.

My name is Waunetta Lonewolf. I'm a member of the Oglala Lakota Nation from Pine Ridge, South Dakota. I live in Phoenix, Arizona. I have an organization called Dream Weavers, which consists of ex-Native gang members. One of my concerns is the funding that is starting to become more and more available to remote areas and tribal nations is really geared toward federal juvenile institutions.

I would just like to encourage you in your position to work more with the judges across the United States to look more at alternative forms of incarceration and look at other forms of creative sentencing, as opposed to putting our youth in the warehousing system, because that makes our job a lot more difficult when they come out.

Also, to take into consideration those youth who are locked up. Taking a look at the curriculum—I do believe that institutions can rehabilitate. We look at them as not being able to. The issues that you are concerned with in terms of the drugs, the alcohol, the violence, also exists within the juvenile prisons, and we have a lot of crimes that are being committed inside the prisons. So if you would take a look at some of the programs that are being instituted, the curriculum that has been developed for youth while they are locked up, I think that would make, those of us who really have a passion in working with our youth, our jobs a lot easier.

A: I've assigned somebody to do that and to work on both curriculum alternatives, sentencing circles, learning from Native-Americans as to what can be more effective in giving young people a chance for a strong and positive future, and I would appreciate any specific suggestions that you can provide me.

Thank you all so very, very much.

(Applause.)

SPEAKER BIOGRAPHIES

GARY L. ACEVEDO has been a member of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes' judiciary since November 1998. He is active in general jurisdiction work as well as being the tribal court's designated juvenile court judge. Judge Acevedo is a member of the Montana Juvenile Justice Council. He is a member of the Montana Court Improvement Program's Advisory Committee, served 6 years on the Montana Children's Trust Fund Board, served 2 years on the Montana Governor's Council on Families, and is a member of the Montana Bar Association's Judicial Relations Committee.

MARIE ALMONTE has been working since February 1998 as an outreach counselor for the Street Outreach (SOS) project of the Midtown Community Court in New York City. Ms. Almonte is a certified HIV counselor who works closely with the New York City Police Department's community policing units to offer immediate assistance to those on the streets who have fallen between the cracks of traditional law enforcement and social service systems. Prior to joining the SOS program, Ms. Almonte was the bilingual educator at the Midtown Community Court for the Foundation for Research on Sexually Transmitted Diseases, running health education groups for misdemeanor offenders.

S. CAMILLE ANTHONY serves as the executive director of the Utah Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice, a position to which she was appointed in November 1992 by Gov. Michael O. Leavitt. The commission, made up of 19 criminal and juvenile justice professionals and a citizen chair, is charged with promoting broad philosophical agreement concerning the objectives of the criminal and juvenile justice system in Utah, as well as providing a mechanism for coordinating the functions of the various branches and levels of government involved. In addition, Ms. Anthony is on Gov. Leavitt's Senior Staff and Cabinet Council. Previously, she worked as an intern for U.S. Sen. Jake Garn (R-Utah), and participated in a study abroad program in London, England, with Brigham Young University (Utah). In 1992, she was selected by Rotary International to participate in its Group Study Exchange to Sweden. Ms. Anthony received a Juris Doctor from the University of Utah College of Law.

CARLA M. ARRANAGA is deputy-in-charge of the Hate Crime Suppression Unit for the Los Angeles County (Calif.) District Attorney's Office and is responsible for the prosecution of all adult hate crimes in Los Angeles County. Ms. Arranaga has helped establish a hate crimes response in every police department and sheriff station in Los Angeles County. Ms. Arranaga has been a prosecutor for the office for more than 14 years. She assists a variety of federal, state, and local agencies responsible for the prosecution and abatement of hate crimes. In 1997, Ms. Arranaga served as a panelist for the White House Hate Crime Summit. Ms. Arranaga received a bachelor of arts degree in political science and Chicano studies and a Juris Doctor from the University of California at Berkeley.

NICK ATHAS is a film producer with Olmos Productions, Inc. His work includes producing *It Ain't Love* and serving as marketing director for *Dominick and Eugene*, *The Ballad of Gregorio Cortez*, *Triumph of the Spirit*, and *American Me*. He served as producer and director of outreach of the Lives in Hazard Film and Educational Campaign and has 4 years' experience working on violence and abuse issues. He attended the University of California at Los Angeles Film School.

CLEMENTINE BARFIELD-DYE is president of Save Our Sons and Daughters (SOSAD), which she founded in 1987 after the shooting death of one of her teenage sons. SOSAD provides a support network for victims of homicide and creates positive, peaceful alternatives to violence. Ms. Barfield-Dye has been a guest lecturer at numerous colleges and served on the board of directors of the National Victim Center, the Black Community Crusade of the Children's Defense Fund, the Community Violence Prevention Project, the International Convening Committee of the Citizens' Assembly for a Weapons Free World, and the National Organization of Victim Assistance. She has a degree in interdisciplinary studies from Wayne State University (Mich.) and honorary doctoral degrees from Marygrove College (Mich.) and Siena Heights University (Mich.).

GENE BARNES is the district administrator for the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control's San Diego district office. He has been employed with the department since 1974. Mr. Barnes conducts L.E.A.D. (License Education on Alcohol and Drugs) training, is a presenter for police seminars regarding ABC disorderly premises investigations, has served on committees concerning conditional use permits, and is an adviser to Youth Access to Alcohol Panels. He has a master's degree in education administration from San Bernardino State University (Calif.), a community college teaching credential for police science, and a Management Peace Officer Standards Training certificate.

JOSEPH BEARD has been responsible for the Snohomish County (Wash.) Police Department's Sex Offender Unit since 1992. His responsibilities include preparing sex offender community notification bulletins, conducting all sex offender community education meetings, tracking the registered sex offenders residing within the county, and preparing failure-to-register cases for prosecution. He conducts sex offender community notification training with local school districts, child protection services, the state Department of Corrections, and other police agencies within the county. He was appointed a voting member of the Department of Corrections End of Sentence Review Committee and is a member of the End of Sentence Review Subcommittee that determines the distribution of the "Notice of Release" on sex offenders within the state of Washington.

JAMES BELL has been a staff attorney at the Youth Law Center in San Francisco, California, for 17 years, representing children confined in adult jails, juvenile detention centers, and training schools. He is currently involved in litigation in San Francisco, New Orleans, and Kentucky. He has written articles analyzing death penalty sentences for children and testified before Congress on federal legislation that impacts adolescents. He continues to assist the African National Congress in the administration of the juvenile justice system in South Africa. Similarly, he worked with Palestinians and Israelis on alternatives to juvenile incarceration. He has recently returned from Cambodia, where he trained lawyers.

SHAY BILCHIK has served as administrator of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention since October 1994. He previously served as associate deputy attorney general in the Office of the Deputy Attorney General. Mr. Bilchik began his career in 1977 as an assistant state's attorney for the 11th Judicial Circuit of Florida in

Miami. In 1979, he was promoted to juvenile division chief and later to deputy chief assistant for administration. Mr. Bilchik became chief assistant for administration in 1985 and had supervisory authority over the juvenile prosecution program. He established and oversaw the Child Advocacy Center, which is a multidisciplinary intake unit for cases involving victims of child abuse. He has lectured extensively on juvenile justice issues and served on the faculty of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. Mr. Bilchik received a bachelor's degree and a Juris Doctor from the University of Florida.

BETHANY BLAKEY is management/program analyst with the U.S. Department of Justice Drug Enforcement Administration, and is currently detailed to the Crime Mapping Research Center of the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice (NIJ). Her primary responsibility at NIJ is staffing the Joint National Partnership for Reinventing Government/Department of Justice Crime Mapping & Data-Driven Management Task Force. She has worked in a variety of nonprofit human services organizations and in all three levels of government, including the mayor's office of Pittsburgh, the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections Community Correctional Centers, and now the Justice Department. She earned two master's degrees from the University of Pittsburgh, including a master of public administration with a specialty in management of nonprofit organizations and a master of social work with a concentration in community organization and planning.

ROBERT J. BODISCH, SR., is the director of the Texas Narcotics Control Program, in the office of the governor. The Texas Narcotics Control Program directs the activities of 47 Narcotics Task Forces spread throughout Texas. Mr. Bodisch is also the state coordinator for the Texas Military Surplus Property and Procurement Program. Prior to accepting his current position, Mr. Bodisch was a Harris County (Tex.) deputy sheriff, a lieutenant investigator with the Harris County District Attorney's Office, chief investigator with the Texas Prosecutors Council, senior criminal investigator with the Texas Attorney General's Office, and reserve captain with the Taylor (Tex.) Police Department. Mr. Bodisch serves as an advisory board member of the U.S. Department of Justice's Border Research and Technology Center; a member of the Joint Command Group, Operation Alliance; a member of the Organizational Command Group, Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System; a member of the Drug Policy Task Force, Council of State Governments; and chairman of the Organizational Command Group for the Texas Narcotics Control Program.

ROBERT C. BORUCHOWITZ has been the executive director of the Seattle-King County (Wash.) Public Defenders Association since 1978. He is the author of numerous articles and frequently serves as a trainer at continuing legal education seminars. He is a member of the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association Board of Directors and the Washington Minority and Justice Commission. He received a bachelor of arts degree in political science from Kenyon College (Ohio) and a Juris Doctor from Northwestern University School of Law (Ill.). Other activities include: panelist, "What Defenders Can Learn from Racial Bias in the Courts Studies," NLADA, December 8, 1994; participant, forum on "Post-Sentence Detention of High-Risk Offenders," Ministry of Justice, Ottawa, Canada, May 12-13, 1995; recipient of Reginald Heber Smith Award, National Legal Aid and Defenders Association, 1987, and William O. Douglas Award, Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, 1993; member, National Legal

Aid and Defenders Association Board of Directors, Defender Council; and technical support member, Washington State Minority and Justice Commission.

JOSEPH E. BRANN has served as director of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services since 1994. Mr. Brann began his law enforcement career in Santa Ana, California. In 1990, he became chief of police in Hayward, California. He has written and lectured extensively on community policing. Mr. Brann has a bachelor's degree in criminal justice from California State University at Fullerton and a master's degree in public administration from the University of Southern California. He is a graduate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy.

BARBARA BRODERICK has been the state director for adult probation for the Arizona Supreme Court for the past 4 years. In her current position, Ms. Broderick has responsibility for strategic planning, budgeting, and program oversight of the 15 probation departments within the superior court. Prior to joining the Arizona judicial system, she was the New York state director of probation and correctional alternatives and the director of policy analysis and information for the New York state parole division. Ms. Broderick is the southwest regional representative on the American Probation and Parole Association's Board of Directors. She holds a master of arts degree from the University at Albany School of Criminal Justice (N.Y.).

THOMAS C. BROWN is the owner of Summit Quest Consulting and a national speaker, workshop facilitator, and executive retreat leader in the areas of organizational and personal empowerment and leadership development. He has a doctor of philosophy degree in lifestyle management and organizational change.

GARLAND BRUNOE is vice chairman of the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Indian Reservation of the Dog River Band of Wascoe's. He is also the director for compensation and benefits and managed care branch for the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs.

HEZEKIAH BUNCH, JR., is the chief of police for the Housing Authority of Baltimore City (Md.) Police Force. Prior to accepting this position in March 1993, Mr. Bunch retired from the Baltimore City Police Department with 22 years of active duty. During his career, he performed duties in the Patrol Division; Foot Patrol Unit; Special Operations Unit; Tactical Operations Unit; Tactical Public Housing Drug Enforcement Unit; District Community Relations Unit; Criminal Investigations Division Narcotics Unit Drug Enforcement Administration Task Force; State's Attorney's Office Investigative Unit; and the Executive Protection Unit. Mr. Bunch recently became an assessor for the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. He has an associate in arts degree in law enforcement from Baltimore Community College (Md.) and a bachelor of science degree in criminal justice from Cooper State College (Md.). He is a graduate of the National Academy of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

KEVIN S. BURKE is a district court judge in Hennepin County (Minn.). He presently presides in the Hennepin County Drug Court and is the assistant chief judge of the district. He is former chief judge of the district. He was appointed to the bench in 1984 and was elected in 1986 and

re-elected in 1992 and 1998. Before becoming a trial court judge, he was an assistant public defender and in private practice. He is a member of the board of directors of the National Center for State Courts and serves as an adjunct professor of law at the University of Minnesota. For a number of years, Judge Burke chaired the Minnesota State Board of Board Defense. He graduated from the University of Minnesota Law School.

DOTTIE BURKETT is an elder service officer with the Seminole County (Fla.) Sheriff's Office and has been an active TRIAD participant/presenter at the local, regional, and national levels for the past 6 years. Ms. Burkett has been a presenter/consultant at numerous academy and agency training locations in Florida and other states.

DONNA BURNS serves as director of the Special Projects Division of the Georgia Emergency Management Agency (GEMA). This division includes Public Information Training, the Consequence Management Program, the Excess Property Program, and Information Management. Prior to joining GEMA in 1991, Ms. Burns was the executive assistant to the chief of staff for the State Olympic Law Enforcement Command during the 1996 Centennial Olympic Games in Atlanta, Georgia; a criminal justice consultant with the Georgia Department of Community Affairs; the director of training for the Georgia Sheriffs' Association; and deputy sheriff with the Cobb County (Ga.) Sheriff's Office. Ms. Burns is a certified peace officer and peace officer instructor. She has a bachelor of arts degree in criminal justice from West Georgia College and a master of government administration degree from Georgia State University.

FOX BUTTERFIELD is a national correspondent for the *New York Times*, reporting on crime and criminal justice policy. He has worked as a *Times* correspondent for 30 years, serving as bureau chief in Saigon, Tokyo, Hong Kong, Beijing, and Boston and as a correspondent in Washington and New York. During that time, he was awarded the Pulitzer Prize as a member of the *New York Times* team that published the Pentagon Papers, the Pentagon's secret history of the Vietnam War, in 1971. He is also the author of several books; has published articles in numerous publications other than the *Times*; has appeared frequently as a guest on television news programs; and has lectured to a wide variety of groups. He received a bachelor's degree, master's degree, and doctor of philosophy in Chinese history from Harvard University (Mass.).

SEAN M. BYRNE is executive director of the New York Prosecutors Training Institute, which provides capital prosecution training and technical assistance to members of the New York State District Attorneys Association. Previously, Mr. Byrne served as deputy commissioner of the New York Division of Criminal Justice Services; counsel to the director of criminal justice in the executive chamber of former New York Gov. Mario M. Cuomo; and law clerk for Judge W. Bellacosa of New York's Court of Appeals. He also served in the New York Division of Parole and in the counsel's office of the New York Department of Correctional Services.

JOHN A. CALHOUN is executive director of the National Crime Prevention Council, a nonprofit organization whose work includes public service advertising, training and technical assistance, work with the 122-member Crime Prevention Coalition of America, substance abuse prevention, municipal strategies, youth initiatives, publications, policy development, and fundraising. He created and launched the Youth as Resources program, an initiative that asks

youth to identify social issues that concern them and then design and run service projects to address those issues. Former Massachusetts commissioner of the Department of Youth Services, Mr. Calhoun served as a presidential appointee under President Carter as commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth and Families. A graduate of Brown University (R.I.), Mr. Calhoun also holds a master's degree in theology from Episcopal Divinity School (Mass.) and a master's degree with honors in public administration from Harvard University (Mass.).

WILLIAM H. CARBONE is executive director of the Court Support Services Division in the state of Connecticut's Judicial Branch. He was formerly director of the state's Office of Alternative Sanctions; undersecretary of the Management and Justice Planning Division, Connecticut Office of Policy and Management; and chairman of the state's Prison and Jail Overcrowding Commission. Mr. Carbone holds a practitioner-in-residence appointment at the School of Public Safety and Professional Studies of the University of New Haven (Conn.). He teaches courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels in various aspects of the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems.

THOMAS H. CARR serves as the director of the Washington/Baltimore High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program, a project sponsored by the Office of National Drug Control Policy. Mr. Carr retired from the Maryland State Police after 23 years of service. He was assigned to the Attorney General's Office, where he worked as a white-collar crime investigator and supervisor. He also served as an associate instructor with the Maryland Police and Correctional Training Commission. Prior to that, he was commander of the Criminal Investigation Division and the Narcotics Division and was chief of the Bureau of Drug Enforcement. Mr. Carr has been a faculty member of the University of Maryland, Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology since 1993. He also serves as director of the University of Maryland Law Enforcement/Criminal Justice Technology Research Program. Actively involved in the development of new criminal justice policy within the state of Maryland, he was the vice chairman of the Maryland Governor's Prescription Drug Commission, a vice chairman of the Governor's Drug and Alcohol Abuse Commission, and executive director of the state Office of Strategic Drug Enforcement Coordination, a forum that coordinated state antidrug initiatives. Mr. Carr has a bachelor of arts degree in history from Towson University (Md.) and attended the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy and the Federal Executive Institute.

JAMES D. CAYCE is presiding judge for the King County (Wash.) District Court. Prior to his appointment to the bench in 1989 he spent 9 years in private practice. Judge Cayce chaired a task force that led to the creation of a mental health court in King County. He also created a speaker's bureau, which provides court outreach to immigrant and ethnic communities. The bureau focuses on opening communication between the courts and the community, providing education about the services available in the courts and giving people an opportunity to meet elected officials in an informal atmosphere. Judge Cayce serves on numerous committees.

JAN M. CHAIKEN, PH.D., has been director of the U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics since September 1994. Previously he served as an assistant professor in the Mathematics Department of Cornell University (N.Y.), a research associate at the Massachusetts

Institute of Technology, a senior mathematician at the RAND Corporation, an adjunct associate professor at the University of California at Los Angeles System Sciences Department, and a principal scientist in law and justice at Abt Associates Inc. Dr. Chaiken has a doctor of philosophy degree in mathematics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

MARCIA CHAIKEN is director of research for LINC, where she has developed and carried out research and produced research-application reports and presentations for many of the federal research agencies included in the U.S. Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services and the U.S. Congress. Private foundations for whom she has developed research, reports, and presentations include the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. She has also carried out a number of evaluations for national youth organizations, including Girl Scouts of the USA and Girls Clubs of America. Dr. Chaiken is taking the lead in a partnership of senior research analysts, eight municipal and county law enforcement departments, and three tribal governments, including tribal police, for a U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice-sponsored project involving locally initiated research in support of community policing. The project is concentrating on reducing violence against women and girls. As principal investigator, Dr. Chaiken recently completed a project funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and NIJ with the goal of providing safer environments for youth during nonschool hours. In 1995, Dr. Chaiken was cochair of the American Society of Criminology Task Force on Prevention, Research, Policy and Practice, which convened at the request of U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno.

MARCIA CHOO is the assistant director of museum programs at the Simon Wiesenthal Center Museum of Tolerance where she is responsible for the coordination and integration of museum education programs such as the Arts & Lectures Series, Special Exhibitions, the Tools for Tolerance for Professionals Program, and Special Events. As the past executive director of the Asian-Pacific-American Dispute Resolution Center, Ms. Choo has an extensive background in mediation and race relations and conflict resolution. She designed and team-taught a course on race relations and community conflict resolution at California State University, Dominguez Hills, and continues to be a part-time faculty member with the Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution at the Pepperdine University School of Law (Calif.). Ms. Choo is a member of the Community Advisory Council to the Los Angeles (Calif.) chief of police and was appointed to serve as an adviser to the Los Angeles City Human Relations Commission. She does extensive volunteer work with the International Visitors Council of Los Angeles. She has a bachelor of science degree in social psychology from the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), and earned a certificate in management development for entrepreneurs from the Anderson School at UCLA. She is also a graduate of the City Focus Public Affairs Programs of the Coro Foundation.

KEITH G. CHVAL is an assistant attorney general for the state of Illinois. He serves as the supervisor of Illinois Attorney General Jim Ryan's Internet Criminal Activity Unit, which targets Internet-based exploitation of children. Mr. Chval also serves as the attorney general's legal liaison to the National Association of Attorneys General for computer crime. He previously served as an assistant state's attorney in the Criminal Division of the DuPage County (Ill.) State's Attorney's office where he served as a prosecutor in misdemeanor, juvenile, and felony

courtrooms. He is a graduate of the Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago-Kent School of Law.

ROCH O. CLAPP is the director of the Boise County (Idaho) Community Justice Department. He previously served the county as a juvenile probation officer. Prior to his employment in Boise County, he served in Nez Perce County (Idaho) as assistant to the tribal court administrator, misdemeanor probation officer, jury commissioner, and court administrative officer. He has a bachelor of arts degree in political science from the University of Idaho.

PETER CLAVELLE has served as mayor of Burlington, Vermont, since 1989. He previously served in numerous city management and public service positions in Vermont, including town manager of Castleton, city manager of Winooski, and personnel director of Burlington, and as Burlington's first director of community and economic development. In 1993, he founded Burlington Associates, a consulting firm specializing in community development and planning for municipal and state governments and nonprofit organizations. His consulting work has taken him to Brazil, the Gaza Strip, and Grenada, where he worked and lived for one year. His experience led to his appointment to the board of directors of the Vermont-based Institute for Sustainable Communities, which promotes environmental protection and participatory decisionmaking in Central and Eastern Europe. Mayor Clavelle received a bachelor's degree in urban studies from St. Anselm College (N.H.) and a master's degree in public administration from Syracuse University (N.Y.).

SAM COCHRAN is a 24-year, career law enforcement officer with the Memphis (Tenn.) Police Department, where he is the coordinator of the Critical Incident Services Hostage Negotiation Team and Crisis Intervention Team. He serves on numerous boards of directors and committees that focus on community issues pertaining to mental health, jail diversion, and homelessness. He has a bachelor of science degree in criminal justice and a master of science degree in political science, with a minor in criminal justice, from the University of Southern Mississippi.

LEE COLWELL, PH.D., is a professor of criminal justice, and the director of the Criminal Justice Institute and the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement, which are divisions of the University of Arkansas. He retired from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, where he served as associate director. He also served as a senior policy adviser on criminal justice to the governor of Arkansas. He serves as an adjunct professor at the University of Virginia and the University of Southern California. Dr. Colwell is chairman of the National Youth Gang Center Advisory Board and serves on the Executive Panel of the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice Technology and Policy Assessment Committee. He has a bachelor of science degree from Little Rock University (Ark.), a master of public administration degree, and a doctor of philosophy degree in public administration from the University of Southern California.

FOSTER COOK is an assistant professor and the director of the substance abuse programs in the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB). He is currently principal investigator for the Office of National Drug Control Policy/U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice (NIJ) Breaking the Cycle project, the NIJ Arrestee Drug

Abuse Monitoring project, and the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs Drug Court initiative, as well as other projects. He is immediate past president of the Alabama Association of Community Corrections, director of Birmingham Treatment Alternatives to Street Crimes (TASC) and its past president, and serves on the board of directors of National TASC and the Office of National Association Drug Control Professionals. Mr. Cook received his bachelor of arts degree and master of arts degree from UAB. He is a certified alcohol and drug abuse counselor.

GREGORY M. COOPER serves as chief of police of the Provo (Utah) Police Department and as chairman of the Utah Criminal Tracking and Analysis Project (UTAP). Prior to this position, Mr. Cooper was employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, serving in various investigative and supervisory positions. Before joining the FBI, he served as chief of police in Delta (Utah) and as a police officer in Provo. He coauthored the *Crime Classification Manual*, a landmark book on homicide, arson, and sexual assault. Mr. Cooper has consulted internationally with law enforcement agencies on more than 1,000 cases. He is an expert witness in crime scene analysis. He has provided expert testimony that linked multiple homicides in separate jurisdictions by behavioral traits, contributing to the conviction of a serial killer. Mr. Cooper also instructs at the Utah Police Academy and Utah Valley State College and was an adjunct faculty member at Salt Lake Community College (Utah) and the University of Virginia. He serves as chairman of the board for the Utah County Major Crimes Task Force and is a board member on the Utah Council on Victims and the Massachusetts State Police Behavioral Science Unit. Additionally, he is the president of Shield International, Inc., an international training, consultation, and research company for law enforcement, public safety, and private industry organizations.

JAMES E. COPPLE is the executive deputy director for the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC). In this position Mr. Copple oversees units represented by the Justice Programs and Community Action Team and serves as one of the spokespersons for the organization. Prior to his position with NCPC, Mr. Copple was the founding president and CEO of the Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America, a privately funded, nonpartisan membership organization of 4,300 antidrug and violence-prevention coalitions. Mr. Copple served as special assistant to the superintendent of schools in Wichita (Kans.), where he also was the founding director of Project Freedom, a local comprehensive coalition addressing drug abuse and violence; the founding principal of the Downtown Law, Public and Social Service Magnet High School; and served on the Governor's Advisory Committee on Juvenile Crime. Mr. Copple formerly served on the Advisory Committee for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention and the National Advisory Committee for the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Currently, he is secretary of the board of directors of the Treatment Advisory Center. Mr. Copple has a bachelor of arts degree in history from Eastern Nazarene College (Mass.) and a master of divinity degree from Nazarene Theological Seminary (Mo.) and has done further graduate work at Boston College (Mass.) and Johns Hopkins University (Md.). Mr. Copple is currently on leave from the doctor of philosophy program in the history and philosophy of education at the University of Kansas.

RONALD P. CORBETT is second deputy commissioner of the Massachusetts Probation Department. He has worked in corrections for 25 years as a probation officer, an assistant chief, a regional director, and a director of training and development. He is past president of the National Association of Probation Executives.

FERNANDO CUBILLAS has been general manager for Olmos Productions, Inc., since 1989. He previously worked for the Entertainment Department of Universal Studios Tours and in production for the Universal Studios Television Department. He received a bachelor of science degree in business from California State University at Fullerton.

CRAIG CUSSIMANIO is manager of Web site development for the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA). In this role, Mr. Cussimanio manages the content and development of the association's Web site (www.jrsa.org). His latest project involves managing the development of the new BJA evaluation Web site (www.bja.evaluationwebsite.org), designed to provide state administrative agency staff, criminal justice planners, researchers, and evaluators, as well as local practitioners, with a variety of resources for evaluating criminal justice programs.

LINDA DAHLBERG, PH.D., is a senior behavioral scientist at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence Prevention in Atlanta, Georgia. Before joining the CDC in 1990, she held a faculty appointment at Emory University (Ala.). Dr. Dahlberg has worked in the past several years in the area of adolescent health, addressing such problems as interpersonal violence among youth and sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV/AIDS. Currently, Dr. Dahlberg conducts research on interpersonal violence among youth and is a technical consultant on a number of youth violence prevention projects across the United States. Dr. Dahlberg received a master of arts degree and a doctor of philosophy degree in sociology from Indiana University-Bloomington.

JAMES L. DANFORTH has served as the chief of police on the Oneida Reservation in Wisconsin for 13 years. In addition to overseeing police personnel, he is responsible for gaming security and observation personnel. Previously he served as a sheriff's deputy for Outagamie County for 11 years. Chief Danforth sits on numerous committees and organizations, including the Great Lakes Native American Law Enforcement, Wisconsin Chiefs of Police Association, National Sheriff's Association-Indian Affairs, and Wisconsin Attorney General's Children In-need Task Force. Chief Danforth is a graduate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy, and is actively pursuing a degree in criminal justice administration while attending numerous conferences and seminars.

MARI ANN DANIELS is the director of the Baltimore City (Md.) Department of Juvenile Justice. Ms. Daniel is responsible for the overall administration of delinquency programs in the city. Ms. Daniel has previous experience as an assistant area director, a program director in two of Maryland's institutions, and a probation officer. She is the current chair of the Maryland Female Population Task Force and vice-chair of the National Girls' Caucus. Ms. Daniel received

a bachelor of science degree from Coppin State College (Md.) and a master of science degree from the University of Baltimore (Md.).

PRESTON A. DANIELS is mayor of Des Moines (Iowa). He also works for Employee and Family Resources, Inc. (EFR), where he is the director of community and court services for the National Council on Alcoholism/The Iowa Plan. He also served as a central assessment counselor, a family counselor, director of a Treatment Alternatives to Street Crimes program, a correctional officer/counselor, a probation officer, and a youth shelter counselor. Mayor Daniels received his bachelor of arts degree in psychology and a master of science degree in health science and counseling from Drake University (Iowa).

BEVERLY WATTS-DAVIS is a national trainer in community mobilization, resource development, and forming effective partnerships and collaboratives to address systemic problems. Ms. Davis is the current executive director of San Antonio (Tex.) Fighting Back and past statewide coordinator for Texans' War on Drugs. San Antonio Fighting Back is a comprehensive prevention and relapse prevention intervention, treatment, community empowerment, and community improvement program that addresses substance abuse, crime, and violence. Ms. Davis also provided community mobilization services to rural, high-risk, and ethnic minority communities.

M. BETH DAVIS is executive director of the Mississippi Public Defender's Commission. She served as the public defender for the city of Jackson (Miss.) for 13 years and as deputy chief public defender for Hinds County (Miss.) for 6½ years. She is a past president of the Mississippi Public Defender Association and currently serves on its board of directors. She has been chosen to participate in the National Defender Leadership Project by the Vera Institute of Justice in New York as a trainer for public defenders throughout the nation. She recently attended the National Judicial College and the National Chief Defender Roundtable and has been selected to participate in the Executive Session on Indigent Defense Systems at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government (Mass.). She is a graduate of Mississippi State University and the University of Mississippi School of Law.

RAYMOND DAW serves as executive director of two rural programs—Northwest New Mexico Fighting, whose mission is to reduce the demands for alcohol and drugs through community mobilization, public information, and technical assistance, and Na'nizhoozhi Center, Inc. (NCI), whose mission is to reduce public intoxication and related problems. NCI is a model, 150-bed program with protective custody, social detoxication, Native-American treatment, and shelter components. Both programs have contributed significantly toward a 48-percent drop in public intoxication and the formation of youth programs.

ALICE W. DERY became assistant chief in the U.S. Department of Justice Criminal Division Asset Forfeiture Office, now the Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section, in 1994. Since joining the Department of Justice in 1986, she has worked as a special assistant U.S. attorney and as the Law Enforcement Coordinating Committee/Victim-Witness Coordinator for the Middle District of Georgia, an attorney-advisor in the Financial Litigation Unit in the Executive Office

for U.S. Attorneys, and a special counsel in the Asset Forfeiture Office. She graduated from Mercer University (Ga.) in 1983 and was a 1986 graduate of the Mercer University Law School.

DREW DIAMOND is a senior associate at the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), where he has directed several community policing projects. During 1995, he carried out a 9-month assignment as director of the Community Policing Consortium project funded by the U.S. Department of Justice, which provides community policing training and technical assistance nationwide. He worked in Bosnia during summer 1996, providing technical assistance to the International Police Task Force. Prior to joining PERF, he served in the Tulsa (Okla.) Police Department for 22 years. He was chief of the department from October 1987 to November 1991. He also was an agent in the U.S. Army Criminal Investigations Command and an employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). He is a graduate of Northeastern Oklahoma State University and the FBI's National Academy and National Executive Institute.

WALTER DICKEY has been a member of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison Law School since 1976 and is currently the Evjue-Bascom Professor of Law. He is the faculty director of the Remington Center for Research, Education and Service in Criminal Justice, which gives law students the opportunity to provide service, perform research, and gain experience in criminal justice. He was the secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections from 1983 to 1987 and, in an earlier leave of absence from the law school, drafted the administrative rules for the department. He chaired the Wisconsin Judicial Council when it modernized the law pertaining to homicide and is the author of two books and numerous articles on criminal justice issues and professional responsibility. He has been a member of the American Law Institute since 1989 and chaired the Wisconsin Governor's Task Force on Sentencing and Corrections. He has worked extensively with the Campaign for an Effective Crime Policy in Washington.

MARY D. DORMAN started her private law practice in New York City in 1975. Her first-amendment advocacy has resulted in her work on behalf of various artists, galleries, alternative art venues, and collectors. Much of her practice consists of age, gender, and race discrimination cases, reflecting her commitment to equality in the workplace. Ms. Dorman holds an appointment as a special master of the Supreme Court of New York. She currently serves on the advisory board of the Midtown Community Court in New York City.

JEREL A. EAGLIN is director of youth crime prevention for the National Crime Prevention Council and program director for the National Youth Network, an organization dedicated to strengthening the voice of young people. He is the author of numerous publications.

GEORGE EPP is serving his third term as sheriff of Boulder County (Colo.). Sheriff Epp has worked in the Boulder County sheriff's office in numerous capacities since 1972. He is chairman of the Colorado Drug Control and System Improvement Board, president of the board of directors of the Boulder Shelter for the Homeless, and a member of the board of directors of the County Sheriffs of Colorado, the Boulder County Community Corrections Board, and the National Criminal Justice Association. Sheriff Epp has a bachelor's degree in sociology from the University of Colorado in Boulder.

JOSEPH R. FARMER is the program manager of the Drug Control & System Improvement component of the Byrne Formula Grant program administered by the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission. He has held this position since his retirement following 32 years of service as a police captain with the city of Phoenix (Ariz.) Police Department. Capt. Farmer commanded the Phoenix Police Drug Enforcement Bureau and the Communications Bureau during its transition to the 911 emergency call system, and administered the department's police academy and advanced training sections. He also served as a patrol supervisor, homicide investigator, and field officer.

MICHAEL J. FARRELL is deputy commissioner for policy and planning for the New York City Police Department, where he is in charge of the department's crime statistics, grant programs, system of orders and directives, crime strategies, resource allocation plans, and performance measurement indicators. He has also served the department as director of special projects, assistant commissioner in the Office of the First Deputy Commissioner, and deputy commissioner for policy development. Mr. Farrell also served on the director's staff of the U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice and as a presidential management intern. He has a bachelor of arts degree and a master's degree in public administration from New York University. He attended the program for senior executives in state and local government at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government (Mass.).

RAYMOND C. FISHER has served as associate attorney general of the United States since November 1997. As the third-ranking official of the U.S. Department of Justice, he oversees the work of the Civil, Civil Rights, Antitrust, Tax, and Environment & Natural Resources Divisions, the Office of Justice Programs, and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Mr. Fisher, a business trial lawyer, was the founding partner of the Los Angeles office of Heller, Ehrman, White & McAuliffe. He served as a law clerk to Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., at the U.S. Supreme Court and, the year prior, to Judge J. Skelly Wright of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Prior to joining Heller Ehrman in March 1988, he practiced with the firm of Tuttle & Taylor. Mr. Fisher is a fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers and the American Bar Foundation. He is the past chair of the Lawyer Representative Coordinating Committee of the Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference and was a member of the Executive Board of the Federal Bar Association for the Central District of California. He served as president of the five-member Los Angeles (Calif.) Police Commission and was deputy general counsel for the Independent Commission on the Los Angeles Police Department ("Christopher Commission") in 1991. He has also been a member and is a past president of the board of directors of the Constitutional Rights Foundation and served on the board of directors of the Brennan Center for Justice and the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles. He was a member of the Los Angeles City Civil Service Commission, and served as commission president from 1987 to 1988. In 1975 he was special assistant to the governor of California. He received a bachelor of arts degree from the University of California at Santa Barbara and a bachelor of law degree from Stanford Law School (Calif.).

GLENN M. FLOTHE, a lifelong Alaskan, retired from the Alaska Troopers in July 1998 after 24 years. During the 10 years he worked throughout Alaska as a homicide and violent crimes investigator, Mr. Flothe was responsible for solving the first bombing of the Trans-Alaska

Pipeline and for bringing to justice a serial murderer responsible for kidnaping and murdering 19 Alaskan women. While serving as commander of the Alaska State Troopers Criminal Investigation Bureau, Mr. Flothe brought online Alaska's Violent Criminal Apprehension Program and National Center for Missing and Exploited Children's programs and assisted in writing legislation establishing Alaska's mandatory statewide Uniform Homicide Reporting System. Mr. Flothe currently is employed as the director of security for Doyon Universal and volunteers his time teaching at the Alaska Department of Public Safety Training Academy and assisting the Native American Rights Fund. He has a bachelor of arts degree in organizational management from Alaska Pacific University and is a graduate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy.

EDWARD A. FLYNN is chief of police of Arlington County (Va.). He began his career in 1971 with the Jersey City (N.J.) Police Department, where he served as a patrol officer, sergeant, lieutenant, captain, and inspector. He also has served as chief of police in Braintree, Massachusetts, and reform chief in Chelsea, Massachusetts. He is a member of the National Community Oriented Policing Resource Board, a peer review consultant at the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice (NIJ), and a consultant and instructor for the International Association of Chiefs of Police. He has a bachelor of arts degree from LaSalle University (Pa.) and a master of arts degree in criminal justice from John Jay College of Criminal Justice (N.Y.). He is a graduate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy and was an NIJ Pickett Fellow at Harvard University Kennedy School of Government's program for local government executives.

RITA ALIESE FRYE was reappointed to a second 6-year term as the Cook County (Ill.) public defender in June 1998. In this capacity, she is the chief executive of the Office of the Cook County Public Defender. Her duties and responsibilities include designating liaisons to all county and court agencies involved in the administration and funding of the office; serving as ex-officio member of all office committees and as director of all internal office operations; and monitoring all activities of the office, including all requests for expenditures, budgets, and allocation of resources. She has an associate of arts degree from Prairie State College (Ill.), a bachelor of arts degree from Loyola University (Ill.), and a Juris Doctor from Northwestern University College of Law (Ill.).

DENNIS GABRIEL is a substance abuse counselor for Tulane University's (La.) Project Return, which he joined after 15 years of incarceration. He also has worked as a stevedore, a supervisor with marine and offshore catering companies, and a recreational supervisor for the New Orleans (La.) Recreation Department and served in the U.S. Air Force, where he specialized in aircraft mechanics.

FRANCES GALLEGOS is a Santa Fe, New Mexico, municipal court judge, having been elected to a 4-year term in 1996. In this capacity, she adjudicates DWI/criminal cases, domestic violence and shoplifting cases, as well as traffic/parking offenses. In her short tenure, she has initiated and implemented a number of innovative programs at the court that promote alternative sentencing. Prior to her election, Judge Gallegos served as ombudsman for the New Mexico Lt.

Governor's Office, urban initiative coordinator for the Santa Fe Community Partnership for Substance Abuse Prevention, and National Guard broadcast journalist on the "War on Drugs" project. She also served as a U.S. Air Force staff sergeant during the Vietnam War, and was a member of the National Guard in the Persian Gulf War. In 1993, Judge Gallegos was appointed to the Santa Fe DWI Task Force and to the New Mexico Legislative DWI Oversight Task Force.

FRED W. GARCIA is the chief programs officer for Washington state's alcohol and drug authority. In this position, he leads a large staff in developing, implementing, and evaluating policies and programs concerning the prevention and treatment of alcohol and other drug problems. Prior to arriving in Washington state, Mr. Garcia was a senior presidential appointee with the Clinton administration. From 1993 to 1996 he was the deputy director for demand reduction within the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy. Accomplishments during this tenure included building a partnership between the national pharmaceutical industry and Federal Government to fight drugs and to establish a National Prevention League—a coalition of drug prevention organizations. After leaving the White House in 1996, Mr. Garcia joined the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, where he served as a senior advisor to the assistant attorney general. His responsibilities included leading community-based initiative efforts, coordinating the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program, and building bridges between the national criminal justice system and the nation's substance abuse systems.

LUIS GARCIA, PH.D., is a professor of sociology at Suffolk University (Mass.) and chief criminologist for the Boston Police Department's Office of Research and Evaluation. He has designed and managed extensive research projects on criminal justice and social issues, including community policing, hate crimes, Boston's citizen police academy, fear of crime, violence against police officers, and prostitution. He has conducted collaborative projects with various universities, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, the National Institute of Justice, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He is one of the leading practitioner-researchers in the criminal justice field, and has developed the Boston Police Department's capacity for conducting empirical research on over a dozen topics during the past 4 years. He is currently developing further research on community policing, restorative justice, and race and class issues in crime and justice.

HENRY L. GARDNER is managing partner of Gardner, Underwood, and Bacon, a municipal management consulting firm he established in 1995. He previously served as senior vice president of Donaldson, Luftkin & Jennette Securities Corporation and city manager of Oakland, California, where he began his career as an assistant personnel analyst in 1971. He serves on numerous boards of directors and is past president of the National Forum for Black Public Administrations. He has a bachelor of arts degree in political science and speech from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and a master of arts degree in government from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

BRADLEY GEHRING has been a member of the Outagamie County (Wis.) Sheriff's Department since 1983, serving as both a patrol officer and an investigator. Since his election in 1991, Sheriff Gehring has been involved in many statewide criminal justice issues. He served as president of the Badger State Sheriffs Association in 1996. He currently serves on the Wisconsin

Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and Crime and was recently appointed to the Criminal Penalties Study Committee. He has served on several boards of directors and committees in Outgamie County. He is currently the chair of the Outgamie County Drinking Diversion Program. Sheriff Gehring received a degree in criminal justice from Mount Senario College (Wis.).

MARTHA GILLAND has served as director of the Georgia Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) since 1996. The state agency is responsible for administering many of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs grants within the state. Prior to her appointment to the CJCC, she was special assistant for 15 years providing law enforcement liaison during Zell Miller's tenure as Georgia's lieutenant governor and governor. Ms. Gilland serves as a board member on the state's Commission on Family Violence and the Georgia D.A.R.E.[®] Board. She attended Georgia State University.

NANCY E. GIST is the director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). Ms. Gist is the first presidentially appointed director of BJA, and she is responsible for administering the Justice Department's only grant agency authorized to support all components of the criminal justice system. Formerly, Ms. Gist served for 10 years as deputy chief counsel of the Massachusetts Committee for Public Counsel Services. Prior to that, Ms. Gist was the director of Midwest Legal Services and assistant director of the United Auto Workers Legal Services Plan. In 1992, Ms. Gist participated as foreign expert at a conference in Johannesburg, South Africa, on the establishment of a constitutional right to counsel in the new South Africa. Ms. Gist received a bachelor of arts degree in economics from Wellesley College (Mass.) and a Juris Doctor from Yale Law School (Conn.).

JOHN S. GOLDKAMP is a professor of criminal justice at Temple University (Pa.) and the president of the Crime and Justice Research Institute. Dr. Goldkamp's research has focused generally on criminal courts and more recently on criminal justice and treatment. He helped develop, implement, and evaluate pretrial release guidelines in the Philadelphia (Pa.) courts in response to jail crowding and completed a study examining pretrial release supervision in a series of full experiments. Dr. Goldkamp published an evaluation of the Miami, Florida, Drug Court funded by the State Justice Institute and the U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and recently completed an NIJ-funded experimental evaluation of Miami's Domestic Violence Court as it focused on the role of substance abuse in domestic violence. He has written about the drug court movement, served as a faculty member in drug court training programs, and is the evaluator member of the drug court planning team in Philadelphia. Dr. Goldkamp is principal investigator of NIJ's Drug Court Evaluation I and leads an evaluation of the Philadelphia Commission on Crime and Delinquency. He also serves as the evaluator of Philadelphia's criminal justice treatment network for female offenders.

JAMES GREEN is the deputy director of program and staff development for the Court Support Services Division of the Connecticut Judicial Branch. He previously served as a consultant to the Office of Alternative Sanctions of the Connecticut Judicial Branch and director of programming

for the Connecticut Prison Association. He also has served as a consultant to several states in the area of community-based strategies to overcome prison crowding.

SAUL A. GREEN is the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan. He is a fellow of the Michigan State Bar Foundation and the American Bar Association Foundation and a member of the Attorney General's Advisory Committee and chair of its Violent/Organized Crime Subcommittee. He has a bachelor of arts degree in prelegal studies and a Juris Doctor from the University of Michigan.

REUBEN M. GREENBERG has served as chief of police of the Charleston (S.C.) Police Department since April 1982. He previously served as the undersheriff of the San Francisco County (Calif.) Sheriff's Department, a major with the Savannah (Ga.) Police Department, chief of police with the Opa-Locka (Fla.) Police Department, chief deputy sheriff of Orange County (Fla.) Sheriff's Department, director of public safety of Mobile (Ala.), and a deputy director of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement. He also was an assistant professor at California State University at Hayward, taught political science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and taught criminal justice at Florida International University. He is the immediate past president of the South Carolina Law Enforcement Officers' Association and a board member of the South Carolina Commission on Racial Relations, the South Carolina Crime Victims Compensation Board, and the South Carolina Sentencing Commission. He received a bachelor of arts degree from San Francisco State University (Calif.) and master's degrees in public administration and city planning from the University of California, Berkeley. He is a graduate of the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy.

ELLEN HALBERT is the director of the Victim Witness Division at the District Attorney's Office in Travis County, Texas. In addition, she is the editor of *Crime Victims Report*, a national publication. In 1991, she was appointed as the first victim to serve on the Texas Board of Criminal Justice, the board that oversees the adult criminal justice system in Texas: prisons, probation, parole supervision, and the new state jail division. This 6-year appointment ended in March 1997. Ms. Halbert has testified as an authority on victims' needs and services before Congress, appeared on national television, and participated in national forums and conferences on the rights and roles of victims in the criminal justice system.

GUY J. HARGREAVES is a supervisory special agent with the U.S. Department of Justice U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and is currently assigned to DEA headquarters as the staff coordinator for the methamphetamine program—Operation Velocity. Special Agent Hargreaves also served as the program manager for the DEA Clandestine Laboratory Training Facility. Special Agent Hargreaves has executed numerous raids on drug laboratories in the United States. He conducted law enforcement training in more than 20 foreign countries while assigned to the DEA Office of International Training. Prior to joining DEA, he served as a Dallas, Texas, police officer and Central Intelligence Agency special agent.

TRENTON HARGROVE has been chief deputy attorney general of the Civil Rights Enforcement Section of the Pennsylvania Office of the Attorney General since July 1992. In addition to prosecuting violations of Pennsylvania's civil rights laws, the Civil Rights

Enforcement Section participates in various education and training programs with municipal governments and community groups. Mr. Hargrove chaired the Pennsylvania Attorney General's Youth Violence Task Force, and served as an instructor for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center's program for the investigation and prosecution of hate crimes. Mr. Hargrove is one of the original members of the Affirmative Civil Rights Litigation Working Group of the National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG), and has served as an adviser to the Pennsylvania Governor's Alliance for Law Enforcement and Community Relations to develop recommendations on the law enforcement response to community tension. He is the current chair of the Pennsylvania Attorney General's Arson Task Force and the Internet Civil Rights Subcommittee of NAAG. Mr. Hargrove is also a member of the attorney general's Hate Crimes Working Group on state and local law enforcement training. Mr. Hargrove is a graduate of Bucknell University (Pa.) and the Dickinson School of Law (Pa.).

DANIEL A. HARO is director of community relations for Olmos Productions, Inc., and producer of *It Ain't Love*. He received a bachelor of arts degree in history/Latin American studies from Boston University (Mass.) and a Juris Doctor from Antioch School of Law (D.C.).

M. KAY HARRIS is an associate professor and chair of the Department of Criminal Justice, as well as an affiliated professor of women's studies at Temple University (Pa.). She currently is working on two major projects. One is a policy review of BJA's formula grant program under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Program. The other involves assisting in implementation of the city of Philadelphia's comprehensive alternatives-to-incarceration plan. Before joining the Temple faculty in 1981, Professor Harris served as director of the Washington office of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Earlier she held positions with the American Bar Association, the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, and, within the U.S. Department of Justice, the Office of the Attorney General, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, and the Bureau of Prisons. She also served as assistant director of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

D. ALAN HENRY is the executive director of the Pretrial Service Resource Center (PSRC), a position he has held since 1984. PSRC is the national clearinghouse for information about pretrial issues—programs, research, and legislation—established with Justice Department funding in 1976. Mr. Henry is a nationally known expert on pretrial and jail-related issues and has testified on these issues before numerous state legislative bodies and congressional committees and the Standards Committee of the American Bar Association. Mr. Henry has written extensively about pretrial issues and has provided technical assistance to state, local, and federal officials involved in pretrial release, supervision, diversion, and drug testing court procedures in the criminal and juvenile justice systems.

SUSAN HERMAN is executive director of the National Center for Victims of Crime, which works with more than 10,000 grassroots organizations forging a national commitment to help victims of crime rebuild their lives. Ms. Herman previously served as director of community services at the Enterprise Foundation, which provides technical assistance to cities, nonprofit organizations, and community development corporations in community planning, supportive

housing, workforce development, and community safety; director of New York City's Domestic Violence Division of Victim Services; special counsel to the New York City police commissioner; director of mediation services at the Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution; an attorney for the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund; and an instructor at New York University's School of Law and Wagner Graduate School of Public Service. She has an undergraduate degree from Bryn Mawr University (Pa.) and a Juris Doctor from Antioch School of Law (D.C.).

STEPHEN L. HILL, JR., became U.S. attorney for the Western District of Missouri in December 1993. His office has targeted illegal drug dealing, particularly methamphetamine. Mr. Hill has made public awareness a key part of the antimethamphetamine effort and has held over 175 public meetings on the subject.

TOM HINZ is serving his second term as sheriff of Brown County (Wis.). He previously served in the Green Bay (Wis.) Police Department as a patrol officer, detective sergeant, detective lieutenant, detective captain, chief deputy of detectives, and assistant chief. He is president of the board of directors of the Family Violence Center in Brown County and an executive board member of the Brown County Drug Alliance. He is an original member of the committee that puts together the annual Multi-Jurisdictional Conference in northeastern Wisconsin. The purpose of the conference is to improve the relationships between tribal law enforcement and other law enforcement agencies in the area.

GARY HINZMAN is director of the Sixth Judicial District's community correctional agency in Cedar Rapids, Minnesota. He previously served as director of a police academy and as a police chief, served on and chaired several statewide task forces and boards of directors, and taught at local colleges. In 1992, he founded the Community Corrections Improvement Association. He has a master's degree in public administration.

ERIC M. HOLDER has served as deputy attorney general since July 1997. In this capacity, he is responsible for the day-to-day operation of the U.S. Department of Justice and is the highest ranking African-American in law enforcement in the history of the United States. He previously served as U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, as an associate judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, and in the Public Integrity Section of the Justice Department. He has a bachelor of arts degree in American History and a Juris Doctor from Columbia University (N.Y.).

JERIJEAN HOUCHINS is a gubernatorial appointee to the Texas Planning Council for Developmental Disabilities. She has more than 30 years of experience in human services, disability issues, criminal justice, mental health/mental retardation, rehabilitation law, public relations, training/education, governmental affairs, leadership/administration, counseling, and public service. Ms. Houchins has a bachelor of arts degree in psychology from the University of Texas at Tyler and a master of education degree in counseling/rehabilitation from Stephen F. Austin State University (Tex.). She is a licensed professional counselor.

M. PATRICIA HOVEN is vice president of social responsibility for Honeywell, Inc. She also served at Honeywell as vice president of community and local government affairs. In that position she was responsible for the Honeywell Foundation, of which she remains president. She first joined Honeywell as a manager of policy and program development for the company's Corporate and Community Responsibility Department. Ms. Hoven has been a board member of the University of Minnesota YMCA, the Metro YWCA, Minnesota Early Learning Design, Courage Center, Cricket Theater, Minneapolis Downtown Council, Minneapolis Initiative Against Racism Leadership Board, and the National Retiree Volunteer Coalition and has chaired the Minneapolis Chamber Business Action Resource Council. She currently serves on the Minnesota Meeting Steering Committee and the Minnesota Women's Economic Roundtable and is a member of the Conference Board Contributions Council, the United Way of America's Corporate Associates Committee, and the Center for Corporate Community Relations at Boston College (Mass.)

HENRY IZUMIZAKI is the executive director of Eureka Bay Area, a part of the national Eureka Communities organization, which develops nonprofit leaders through a 2-year fellowship program. Building on his early experiences as a migrant farm worker, streetworker, and community organizer, Mr. Izumizaki served as a program executive of the San Francisco Foundation; trustee and chief financial officer of the California Consumer Protection Foundation; chief strategist of the Urban Strategies Council of Oakland, California, one of four chief technical advisors for HOPE VI—a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development initiative; assistant superintendent of the Oakland Unified School District; and the highest ranking staff civilian in the San Francisco (Calif.) Police Department. He directed the Oakland Metropolitan Forum, which links the University of California at Berkeley resources with community needs. He is a member of the National Funders Collaboration on Empowerment Zones and the National Advisory Board for the Pew Civic Entrepreneur Initiative and served as part-time director of special initiatives for the East Bay Community Foundation.

KEVIN M. JACKSON is a senior program manager and corrections leader for the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, Office of Science and Technology. He served earlier as acting director of NIJ's Technology Assessment Division, which is responsible for NIJ's National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Centers. Prior to coming to NIJ, he spent 5 years at the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections (NIC); at the Training Academy in Colorado; and later at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's as technology project director in Washington, D.C. He served in both adult and juvenile corrections in New Mexico and held various positions, including deputy secretary of the Youth Authority and state director of probation and parole. Currently, he is serving as chairman of the American Probation and Parole Association's Technology Committee and serves on the national "Drug Detection Working Group." He is a graduate of West Point (N.Y.) and the Army Command and General Staff College.

TRUDY JACKSON is a member of Healthy Families Idaho and was asked to be part of the group's Steering Committee for Community Justice. She owns and operates Trudy's Kitchen, a

family-style restaurant that is a large employer in the Idaho City (Idaho) area. She is a current member of the Idaho City Community Club and Historical Foundation.

ANN L. JACOBS is the executive director of the Women's Prison Association, which focuses on programs for both incarcerated women and ex-offenders with an emphasis on providing clients with a graduated structure, a continuum of care, opportunities to participate in the design and delivery of their own service plans, and opportunities to contribute to the community. Ms. Jacobs previously served in former New York Mayors Koch's and Dinkins' administrations as deputy director of the Office of Program Planning for the deputy mayor for public safety and assistant director of the Mayor's Office of Operations; as project director for the National Institute for Dispute Resolution; as training director of the National Pretrial Services Resource Center; and as director of research and evaluation at the national office of Cities in Schools. Ms. Jacobs has a degree from the University of Maryland.

WERIS JAMA is a program specialist for Project Outreach to New Americans at the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC). The project was established in 1993 by NCPC in partnership with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Refugee Resettlement and BJA. The purpose of the project is to assist U.S. communities in building collaborative relationships between law enforcement and refugees to prevent and reduce crime and victimization. Ms. Jama, a refugee from Somalia, fluently speaks three languages; she has lived in Somalia, Egypt, Turkey, Kenya, and the United Arab Emirates. Besides working on her bachelor's degree, she has been volunteering with agencies, such as Lutheran Social Services, Community Refugee Ecumenical Outreach, and Virginia Family Services, and providing outreach and assistance to the Somali communities in Northern Virginia.

SUZANNE H. JAMES is the court administrator for Maryland's Seventh Judicial Circuit. She previously has held positions with the District of Columbia Courts and the U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. She is president of the National Association for Court Management and was founding president of the Mid-Atlantic Association for Court Management. She received a master of arts degree in criminal justice administration from the State University of New York at Albany and is a graduate fellow of the Institute for Court Management.

VICTOR JAMMERS is head of the Crime Prevention Group of the Dutch Department of Justice. He is secretary of the Dutch Platform on Crime Control and from 1993 to 1996 was a member of the Commercial Robbery Task Force.

JANIE L. JEFFERS serves as deputy executive director of the White House-DC Interagency Task Force. The Task Force was created to serve the dual purpose of advising the president on the District's affairs and to coordinate delivery of technical and other forms of assistance to the District of Columbia. She previously served as senior policy adviser to Vice President Al Gore at the President's Crime Prevention Council and was responsible for developing strategies and policy options for program integration of prevention programs created by the 1994 Crime Act. Ms. Jeffers has worked for the U.S. Department of Justice Federal Bureau of Prisons, Community Corrections and Detention Division, serving as branch chief for the National Office of Citizen

Participation and deputy commissioner in the New York City Department of Corrections. During her tenure with New York City, she worked at the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections (NIC) in Colorado through an intergovernmental loan. While working at the Jail Center in Boulder (Colo.), she provided technical assistance to more than 300 counties in 10 states in the areas of management, policy, and planning and training. Ms. Jeffers has been a consultant to the United Nations World Health Organization on the management of HIV/AIDS in jails and prisons in Europe and Africa. She has authored numerous articles and has numerous media credits. She served as a field instructor at the Columbia University School of Social Work (N.Y.) and as adjunct professor at Baruch College (N.Y.), taught at the NIC Academy in Colorado, and is currently a field instructor at the Howard University School of Social Work (D.C.). Ms. Jeffers was chair of the D.C. Reclaim Our Youth Initiative and served on the board of the National Reclaim Our Youth Initiative. She received graduate and undergraduate degrees from Howard University.

PATRICIA COATS JESSAMY is the first woman to serve as Baltimore City (Md.) state's attorney, a position she has held since February 1995. Ms. Jessamy began her legal career in Maryland as an assistant state's attorney in the Office of the State's Attorney for Baltimore City. She served as chief of the Economic Crimes Unit and deputy state's attorney for administration. Ms. Jessamy is the secretary of the board of the National District Attorneys Association, treasurer of the Maryland State's Attorneys Association, and a member of the board of the American Prosecutor's Research Institute. She is on the executive committee of the Baltimore-Washington High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area and the Vehicle Theft Prevention Council.

CLAIRE JOHNSON is the special adviser to the director for the D.C. Initiative at the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice (NIJ). NIJ's D.C. Initiative is an effort by the Federal Government to assist the nation's capital as it undergoes major justice reform and significant functions and operations are transferred to the Federal Government. Prior to joining NIJ, she was director of governmental relations and senior researcher at the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD). While at NCCD, Ms. Johnson directed projects to validate the D.C. youth risk assessment instrument, the national boot camp evaluation, the national correctional options program, Weed and Seed case studies, a study of minority overrepresentation in the (D.C.) juvenile justice system, and an assessment of the District's Youth Services Administration. From 1987 to 1993, and again in 1996 and 1997, she served as project director for the Study of Crime and Justice Trends in the District of Columbia for the Washington, D.C., government. She also served as project director for two studies of homicide in the District of Columbia and as codirector for the Drug Abuse Research Program for the District.

MICHAEL P. JUDGE is the chief public defender for the County of Los Angeles, California, with responsibility for 40 offices with more than 600 lawyers. He is a trustee of the Los Angeles County Bar Association, is a member of the Los Angeles Superior Court Bench/Bar Coalition, has served on the Executive Board of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, is on the Executive Board of the Criminal Courts Professionals, is the vice chairperson of the Los Angeles Drug Court Oversight Committee, and is an officer of the California Public Defender Association.

CANDICE M. KANE, Ph.D., has served as the acting director of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority since December 1996. She is also the associate director of the Authority's Federal and State Grants Unit. In that role Dr. Kane is responsible for 10 federal- and state-supported grant programs in the areas of law enforcement, corrections, victim services, violence against women, and motor vehicle theft prevention. Dr. Kane is also the coprincipal investigator of a national evaluation of a model gang prevention, intervention, and supervision project funded by the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and of a second evaluation of the Cook County (Ill.) state's attorney's Victim-Witness Program funded by the U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice. Dr. Kane's previous work includes positions with public and private agencies at the local and state levels. She holds a doctor of philosophy degree from Northwestern University (Ill.) and a Juris Doctor from Northern Illinois University.

JOHN KAYE has been the Monmouth County (N.J.) prosecutor since 1983. Mr. Kaye is a member of the U.S. Department of Justice Executive Working Committee and a member of the board of directors of the National College of District Attorneys, the American Prosecutors Research Institute, and the International Association of Prosecutors. He was president of the National District Attorneys Association (NDAA) in 1996 and chairman of NDAA's board of directors in 1997. Mr. Kaye holds a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Scranton (Pa.) and a Juris Doctor from the Dickinson School of Law (Pa.).

JAMES CRAIG KEENER is a program manager for the Criminal Justice Planning Agency of the American Samoa Government. Mr. Keener previously served as a law enforcement officer in California. He has a bachelor's degree in sociology and criminal justice from California State University and is currently doing his graduate work at Oregon State University in anthropology.

GEORGE KEISER has been chief of the Community Corrections Division at the U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Corrections (NIC) for the past 16 years. For 15 years prior to joining NIC, Mr. Keiser worked in a variety of assignments for the Iowa Department of Corrections ranging from correctional officer to institution superintendent. Mr. Keiser is one of the authors of the Iowa Community Corrections Act.

MICHAEL E. KELLY is assistant to Phoenix (Ariz.) Mayor Skip Rimsza, specializing in economic development and community organization and development. Mr. Kelly is an expert in behavioral health services with more than 20 years of experience in training and education, community organization, and development and productivity. Mr. Kelly holds a master of arts in teaching and a bachelor of arts in sociology from the University of Pittsburgh (Pa.).

THERESA KELLY is the director of special projects for the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC), a nonprofit organization dedicated to enabling people to act individually and together to build safer, more caring communities. She manages planning support and other technical assistance for nearly 30 municipalities, including large cities, metropolitan areas, and smaller communities. Specifically, Ms. Kelly works closely with the 16-site BJA-funded Comprehensive Communities Program (CCP) in Freeport, Illinois, and Dubuque, Iowa, among others. Recently, Ms. Kelly developed a BJA technical assistance program to support

development of communitywide crime prevention strategies in seven small cities. Through workshops, onsite consultation, and conferences, she currently presents and coordinates municipal assistance on comprehensive crime prevention and control planning and training of local government and community leaders; develops best practices documents in local and community crime prevention; develops crime prevention resource centers for localities; and produces newsletters chronicling local innovation. In addition, she serves as a liaison for the development of partnerships with national membership organizations that represent municipal and community crime prevention interests. She has contributed to numerous NCPC publications. Formerly a consultant to NCPC on youth violence prevention, she was a lobbyist for a state environmental regulatory agency and the coordinator of international exchange programs for a nonprofit organization. Ms. Kelly has a bachelor of arts degree in political science and history from Drew University (N.J.), where she was a Drew Scholar, and a master of arts degree from Rutgers University (N.J.), where she was a fellow of the Eagleton Institute of Politics.

CATHY KENDALL is the grants planning bureau chief for the Montana Board of Crime Control, where she oversees a bureau staff responsible for monitoring and oversight of 13 block grants programs. She is responsible for planning and development of the multiyear drug strategy submitted to BJA and has been involved in that process since 1989. Ms. Kendall began her tenure with the state of Montana in 1972 serving with the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services initially as a social services worker and advancing in 1978 to administrative positions within the public assistance and medical assistance divisions. She transferred to the Montana Board of Crime Control in 1985, a move that initiated extensive involvement in state and local public safety issues. Ms. Kendall is a graduate of the University of Montana.

MIKE KING is the director of the Criminal Justice Support Unit of the Utah Attorney General's Office. A 20-year police veteran, Lt. King started his career with the Pleasant View (Utah) Police Department in 1979. Lt. King also worked for the Ogden City (Utah) Police Department, where he served in patrol, motors, SWAT, and detective capacities, and the Weber County (Utah) District Attorney's Office, where he was the administrative officer and investigator. While at Weber County, Lt. King was the lead agent in the Zion Society Ritual Child Sex Abuse case. In 1993, Lt. King was hired by the Utah attorney general to conduct an indepth study on ritual crime in Utah. Lt. King has a bachelor of arts degree in criminal justice from Weber State University (Utah).

ROBERT A. KIRCHNER is the senior adviser for evaluation at BJA, where he has served since January 1989. Dr. Kirchner also held positions with the Executive Office of the President, the U.S. Departments of the Interior and Transportation, and the General Accounting Office. He served as a director of research and taught at various universities and colleges prior to government service.

LARI K. KOGA is the administrator of the Crime Prevention and Justice Assistance Division of the Hawaii Department of the Attorney General. She has been with the division since 1989. She previously worked as a social worker with delinquent girls, research director on juvenile justice,

and juvenile justice specialist. Ms. Koga has master's degrees in social work and public administration.

YVONNE KORN is director of National Crime Prevention (formerly known as the National Campaign Against Violence and Crime) for the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department, Australia. National Crime Prevention is in the process of implementing a high-profile strategic program to reduce crime and violence across Australia in cooperation with state and territory colleagues. Ms. Korn held a senior position for 6 years with Crime Concern UK. In the late 1980s, she worked for the London, England, Borough of Southwark, developing and implementing its groundbreaking community safety strategy.

EDWARD J. KRUEGER is chair of the Fox Valley Technical College's (Wis.) Criminal Justice Department. Mr. Krueger serves as a special consultant to the Wisconsin Department of Justice's Training and Standards Bureau regarding civil disturbance issues, crime prevention, and recruit officer training. He also serves as a consultant to the Wisconsin Department of Licensing and Regulation pertaining to the regulation of private security agencies. As president of E.J. Krueger and Associates, Inc., he provides security and crime reduction consulting services. Mr. Krueger received a master of arts degree in education administration from Loras College (Iowa) and a bachelor of science degree in business administration and economics from the University of Wisconsin, Platteville.

DAPHNE KWOK has served as executive director of the Organization of Chinese Americans (OCA) since September 1990. She has been an active member of OCA since 1985, serving as president of the Northern Virginia chapter for 2 years and as an officer and board member for 5 years. She is currently an executive board member of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus Institute and has served as a board member of the Organization of Pan Asian American Women and an alumni-elected trustee of Wesleyan University (Conn.). Ms. Kwok received a bachelor of arts degree in East Asian studies and music from Wesleyan University and a master's degree in public administration from Baruch City College of New York.

JULIUS LANG has been the Coordinator of the Midtown Community Court, an experimental branch of the New York criminal court in Manhattan's Times Square neighborhood, since October 1996. The court handles misdemeanor arrests in Manhattan's Times Square, Chelsea, and Clinton neighborhoods, and its mission is to respond constructively to "quality-of-life" crime and work to prevent crime before it occurs. As Midtown's coordinator, he worked with the New York City Police Department to launch Street Outreach Services, its joint homeless outreach program, and also recently launched Times Square Ink, the court's job training program. Prior to joining the court, he was chief of staff to New York City's Commissioner of Housing Preservation and Development. A graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and the Villanova University of Law, Mr. Lang also spent several years as an associate at the law firm of Shearman & Sterling.

KATHERINE N. LAPP serves as New York state's director of criminal justice and commissioner of the Division of Criminal Justice Services. In these capacities, Ms. Lapp is the governor's chief adviser and policymaker on criminal justice matters and is responsible for

developing and promoting the state's criminal justice agenda. Ms. Lapp is also responsible for coordinating all of the state's executive criminal justice agencies. She previously served as the criminal justice coordinator for the city of New York, as chief of staff and counsel to the New York City deputy mayor for public safety, and in the Appellate Division of the New York state Supreme Court for the presiding justice. Ms. Lapp received a bachelor of arts degree in history from Fairfield University (Conn.) and a Juris Doctor from Hofstra University (N.Y.).

ALTA LASH is the executive director of United Connecticut Action for Neighborhoods, a position she has held since 1978. Recently she was named the director of the Trinity Center for Neighborhoods at Trinity College (Conn.). She teaches courses in community organizing at both the University of Connecticut School of Social Work and Trinity College. Ms. Lash was one of the principal designers of the Comprehensive Communities Partnership program in Hartford (Conn.).

MICHAEL LAWLOR is serving his seventh term as a member of the Connecticut House of Representatives. He represents the 99th district, which comprises East Haven and the Short Beach area of Branford. Rep. Lawlor has been recognized for his work in reforming Connecticut's criminal justice system, including alternative forms of punishment, drug policy, juvenile justice reform, victims' rights, sexual offender registration, and reducing racial disparities in the corrections system. In 1998, 1994, and 1993, Rep. Lawlor led successful attempts to increase gun control in Connecticut.

ERIC LEE is deputy director for the Center for Court Innovation—a public/private partnership that develops national models for adjudicating quality-of-life, domestic violence, and drug crimes. Mr. Lee directs the center's national technical assistance programs and oversees technology development. Prior to joining the Center, Mr. Lee served as the director of operations at the Midtown Community Court in New York City. He led the development of the award-winning computer system at the Midtown Community Court and, most recently, of the innovative systems at the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Treatment Court and Domestic Violence Court. Mr. Lee has also held positions in community and economic development in New York and Los Angeles, California. He is a graduate of Vassar College (N.Y.) and the Graduate School of Public Policy and Social Research at the University of California, Los Angeles.

PATRICK A. LEE is chief judge of the Oglala Sioux Tribal Court in Pine Ridge, South Dakota. He previously served as vice president of instruction at Oglala Lakota College (S.D.) and has taught both college and high school students. He received a bachelor of science degree in education from Black Hills State University (S.D.) and a Juris Doctor from Arizona State University.

SUNNY LEE is the program coordinator for the Tools for Tolerance for Law Enforcement Professionals Program at the Simon Wiesenthal Center Museum of Tolerance. Ms. Lee is responsible for coordinating programs for more than 20,000 members of law enforcement from the recruit- to command-level staff. Her responsibilities include organizing workshops on hate crimes, valuing diversity, and ethical decisionmaking. She has been conducting workshops on

ethical decisionmaking for hundreds of police officers from more than 25 agencies throughout California. She also works closely with the National Conference on Community and Justice to present a facilitator training program for law enforcement personnel. Ms. Lee has a bachelor of arts degree in history from the University of San Diego and has been trained as a facilitator by the National Conference through the “Facilitating In A Diverse Environment” program.

GINGER LERNER-WREN is the presiding criminal court and administrative judge for the Broward County (Fla.) Mental Health Court, which was established to better address the complex needs of the mentally ill in the criminal justice system. She previously directed the county’s Office of the Public Guardian. She oversaw, on behalf of the Advocacy Center for Persons with Disabilities, implementation by the state of Florida of a stipulated settlement agreement affecting the South Florida State Hospital. Also on behalf of the center, she investigated and drafted a legislative report on a fire at a Broward County assisted living facility, which killed six people. Judge Lerner-Wren has a bachelor of arts degree in politics and public affairs from the University of Miami (Fla.) and a Juris Doctor from Nova Southeastern University in Fort Lauderdale (Fla.).

WILMA A. LEWIS has served as U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia since 1998. Ms. Lewis began her legal career with the Washington, D.C., law firm of Steptoe & Johnson in 1981. In 1986, she joined the Civil Division of the U.S. attorney’s office in Washington, D.C., as an assistant U.S. attorney. During her tenure with that office she attained the position of deputy chief of the Civil Division. In 1993, Ms. Lewis joined the Office of the Solicitor of the U.S. Department of the Interior as the associate solicitor for the Division of General Law. She served as associate solicitor until her confirmation as inspector general for the Department of the Interior in 1995. Ms. Lewis has a bachelor of arts degree with distinction from Swarthmore College (Pa.) and a Juris Doctor from Harvard Law School (Mass.).

TOM (T.J.) LEYDEN, a former neo-Nazi skinhead, is with the Simon Wiesenthal Center’s National Task Force Against Hate. As a leading recruiter, organizer, and propagandist for the white supremacist and neo-Nazi movements, Leyden spent more than half of his 30 years promoting hate, bigotry, and racism. He now speaks for the Wiesenthal Center to thousands of students, teachers, at-risk teens, youth groups, universities and colleges, military professionals, and law enforcement officials throughout the United States. He has spoken to U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Pentagon officials of his experiences in the movement and the methods of recruiting youth people into hate groups. Leyden was also a featured speaker at the White House Conference on Hate Crimes in Washington, D.C.

WAUNETTA LONEWOLF is an Oglala-Lakota from the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation who has been working with all types of street gangs, including Native-American gangs, since 1989. She believes the foundation for encouraging youth to trade their street “family” for traditional family is spirituality, reclaiming a sense of identity, and self-pride. She is currently working on a book about Native-American youth gangs, their lives, and poetry and a film documentary, with proceeds going to a youth camp in South Dakota for Indian gang members.

MARY LOPEZ is the director of SafeFutures, a consortium of collaborative groups in the Omaha (Nebr.), metropolitan area. SafeFutures’ mission is to create an environment for youth

that is free of violence and negative influence. Ms. Lopez has coordinated the planning of communitywide initiatives related to drug prevention, truancy reduction, and school safety. She has held leadership positions in public housing and welfare reform at the local, state, and national levels. Her professional background also includes work in education and mental health. Ms. Lopez is a staff member in the Department of Public Administration at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. She has a bachelor's degree in education and a master's degree in special education and public administration.

SCOTT LYONS is the chief of police of Duluth, Minnesota. Chief Lyons serves in a variety of capacities in both public and private partnerships within his community and is also involved in several state organizations. He is a board member of the Minnesota Chiefs of Police Association; vice chair of the Minnesota Gang Strike Force; and chair of the Narcotics Enforcement Coordinating Committee, which is responsible for all the Edward Byrne Grant Drug Task Force funds in Minnesota. Chief Lyons is involved in many community activities and serves as an assistant high school football coach.

DENNIS MALONEY is the director of the Deschutes County (Ore.) Department of Community Justice. There he initiated a variety of juvenile and adult corrections programs that have gained national attention. Mr. Maloney has written numerous books and articles. The book he wrote on juvenile probation is the most widely distributed textbook in the history of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

GEORGE P. MARCH is the chief county detective of the Chester County (Pa.) District Attorney's office. He recently retired as deputy commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Police. He continues to serve as the chairman of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Justice Network (JNET) Steering Committee, the governance body directing implementation of Pennsylvania's criminal justice-integration effort, and previously served as a member of the Pennsylvania Governor's Office of Information Technology Leadership Group and the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency Technology Automation Advisory Committee.

JIMENA MARTINEZ is the coordinator of technical assistance for the Center for Court Innovation, where she spearheads the center's efforts to promote dialogue about court-community collaborations and support jurisdictions that are planning community courts. Ms. Martinez is currently working with 20 cities that are actively planning community courts. Ms. Martinez has 15 years of experience with education and business organizations that provide technical assistance and consulting. She has a bachelor of arts degree in economics from Barnard College, Columbia University (N.Y.).

MARC MAUER, assistant director of the Sentencing Project, has directed programs on criminal justice reform for 25 years. He has written and lectured widely both in the United States and abroad on issues of sentencing policy, racial disparity, and international comparisons in the use of incarceration.

JUDITH WHITE McBRIDE is senior adviser to the assistant attorney general for the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, where she currently focuses on issues related to mental health, school violence, aftercare, and community building. Prior to coming to the department, Ms. McBride served as deputy director for administration at the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law in its national office in Washington, D.C., directing its Criminal Justice Standards Project from 1995 to 1997, its Evaluation of Judicial Performance Project, and a number of other projects over a 12-year period. Ms. McBride has worked as a consultant to the National Center for State Courts on judicial evaluation and to the University of Massachusetts at Amherst on alternative dispute resolution. Ms. McBride has also served as a legislative assistant at the (D.C.) City Council, as an assistant for congressional and intergovernmental relations at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and with the House Select Committee on Aging. Ms. McBride holds a bachelor of arts degree from Wellesley College (Mass.), a master's degree in developmental psychology from George Washington University (D.C.), and a Juris Doctor from Georgetown University (D.C.).

MICHAEL S. McCAMPBELL currently directs Circle Solutions, Inc.'s, Clandestine Laboratory Model Enforcement Program, which is funded by BJA. This multiyear project involves developing guidelines and training programs for states and localities that wish to implement coordinated multiagency approaches to clandestine laboratory cleanup and law enforcement. Mr. McCampbell also directed two other BJA-funded clandestine laboratory cleanup and enforcement projects and is the associate director for two training projects funded by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. He has more than 30 years of experience as a criminal justice expert, including a 23-year career with the Arlington County (Va.) Police Department and 1 year as a visiting fellow at the U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice.

ANNE McDIARMID is a criminal justice consultant and manager of program services for Dakota County (Minn.) Community Corrections. For 4 years, she was employed under contract to the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections (NIC), in Washington, D.C. She has 27 years of experience in the correctional field as a probation officer, lawyer, manager of a residential program for women offenders, planner, correctional specialist, manager, and consultant. In her capacity as a consultant, Ms. McDiarmid provides technical assistance and training to other state, county, and private agencies on developing intermediate sanctions for women offenders, a project she managed at NIC. In her position with Dakota County, she assists in designing, developing, and implementing restorative justice policies and practices for adult and juvenile offenders. She received a bachelor's degree in psychology from the University of Minnesota, a master's degree from St. Thomas College (Minn.), and a Juris Doctor from William Mitchell College of Law (Minn.)

JAMES J. MCGIVNEY is deputy director for government relations at D.A.R.E.[®] America. Prior to joining D.A.R.E.[®] America, he spent 28 years as a special agent of the U.S. Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA). In addition to his investigative and undercover assignments, Mr. McGivney was active in the DEA's demand reduction efforts and community programs. During his last 4 years at DEA, he served as chief of public affairs. Mr. McGivney has been a contributor to several prominent law enforcement journals and, in 1997,

was the guest editor of *The Police Chief*, the national magazine of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Mr. McGivney has had extensive experience in training law enforcement officers throughout the country and has been a guest instructor at the U.S. Attorney General's Advocacy Institute and the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education. Mr. McGivney is a veteran of the U.S. Army. He has a bachelor of science degree in marketing from Northern Illinois University and a master's degree in education from the University of Virginia.

STAN M. MCKINNEY has been director of the Emergency Preparedness Division of the South Carolina office of the Adjutant General since February 1993. Previously, Mr. McKinney served for 6 years as the director of the Division of Public Safety Programs in the South Carolina governor's office, where he provided advice and support to the governor and his executive staff on public safety issues and developed program and legislative initiatives to improve various areas of the justice system as well as highway safety and statewide emergency/disaster response and recovery. He served as the 1997–1998 president of the National Emergency Management Association (NEMA). Mr. McKinney holds a bachelor of arts degree in political science/public administration and a master of criminal justice degree from the University of South Carolina.

GARRY A. MENDEZ, JR., PH.D., is currently the president of the National Trust for the Development of African-American Men. He founded the National Trust in response to the litany of problems faced by African-Americans, especially males. The organization concentrates on solving problems through the use of African and African-American values. Prior to founding the trust, Dr. Mendez was a visiting fellow at the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, where he worked on developing and evaluating a program that he designed titled, "Crime Is Not a Part of Our Black Heritage." For 12 years he was director for the administration of justice for the National Urban League. He also worked as a drug counselor and a street worker in New York (N.Y.). Dr. Mendez earned his doctorate at the University of Michigan.

ANDY MITCHELL is the deputy director of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs' Office for State and Local Domestic Preparedness Support, which is responsible for developing training programs for state and local first responders; administering a grant program to provide specialized equipment to enhance the capacity of state and local agencies to respond to nuclear, biological, explosive, and chemical incidents; and providing specialized technical assistance to state and local public safety agencies. He has held numerous positions at BJA, including chief of the National Initiatives Branch, chief of the South Branch in BJA's State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Division, and senior policy analyst in the Policy Development and Management Division. Prior to joining BJA, Mr. Mitchell served as business unit manager for public safety and technology in the Government Services Division of Aspen Systems Corporation, director of special projects for the National Criminal Justice Association, and director of financial and grants administration for the Georgia State Crime Commission. He received a bachelor's degree in business administration from Georgia Southern College.

CRANSTON J. MITCHELL has served as the chairman of the Missouri Board of Probation and Parole since April 1986. Prior to Mr. Mitchell's appointment to the board, he was regional supervisor of jobs for Missouri Graduates, Inc. He has served at the management level in

government for several years, including while at the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and while a police officer for the St. Louis (Mo.) Metropolitan Police Department. He also worked in the private sector for the Mitchem-Thayer Corporation as a marketing representative. Mr. Mitchell currently serves as a consultant for the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs and the National Institute of Corrections. He is past president of the Association of Paroling Authorities International and serves as board member for the Missouri Victim Assistance Network. Mr. Mitchell serves as a member of the Missouri Sentencing Commission. He served on the City of Jefferson Housing Authority and previously served as a member of the Board of Regents of St. Mary's Medical Center for 8 years, 4 years as its vice-chair. Mr. Mitchell earned a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Missouri. As a Danforth fellow, he participated in the State and Local Government for Senior Executives program at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University (Mass.).

RICHARD MOORE has served as the administrator of the Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning since 1988. In this capacity, he oversees research and evaluation projects, planning efforts, and grant programs to support state agencies, the courts, the legislature, and local officials as they develop and implement criminal justice and juvenile justice system policies and initiatives. Mr. Moore has more than 25 years of experience collecting, analyzing, and reporting crime and other justice system data.

CHARLES A. MOOSE is chief of the Portland (Ore.) Bureau of Police, where he has served in various capacities since 1975. He is a member of the adjunct faculty of Portland State University (Ore.) and a major in the Oregon Air National Guard. He serves on numerous boards of directors. Chief Moose has a bachelor of arts degree in U.S. history from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, a master of public administration degree, and a Ph.D. in urban studies/criminology from Portland State University. He is a graduate of the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy and National Executive Institute.

DENNIS MURPHY has practiced law in Washington, D.C. (where he worked for the U.S. Department of Justice, the U.S. Attorney's Office, and D.C. Law Students in Court); Tucson, Arizona (where he was a private criminal defense attorney and public defender); and New York City (where he was attorney-in-charge of the Legal Aid Society's Criminal Defense Division and now handles death penalty trial litigation for the statewide Capital Defender Office). He has taught, lectured, and testified on mental health and law and other legal subjects in schools (high schools, community colleges, universities, law schools, medical schools, and business schools) and before legal groups and legislatures. He has been a consultant to public defenders, organizations, and communities experiencing difficulties in the funding and delivery of quality legal representation to indigents.

JAMES MUSTIN is president and founder of Family and Corrections Network, a national, volunteer information clearinghouse that upholds the value of families of offenders. He is the editor of the *Directory of Programs Serving Families of Adult Offenders* and the chief editor and publisher of *FCN REPORT*, the only national publication on families of offenders. He recently organized the Fifth North American Conference on the Family and Corrections in Bethesda

(Md.). As Virginia coordinator for Real Justice family group conferencing, he is helping four Virginia communities bring together victims, offenders, and their families to discuss harm and agree on ways to make amends. He is retired from the Virginia Department of Corrections, where he worked as a family counselor in the Virginia Beach Juvenile Court and a training supervisor for offender treatment programs at the Academy for Staff Development.

DAVID F. MUSTO is professor of child psychiatry and the history of medicine at the Yale University School of Medicine (Conn.), where he has been on the faculty since 1969. He began his study of the history of drugs in 1967 while a member of the U.S. Public Health Service. He is the author of *The American Disease: Origins of Narcotic Control* (third edition). Dr. Musto serves on the national advisory committee of the Fighting Back program of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and is a charter fellow of the College on the Problems of Drug Dependence. Dr. Musto is a graduate of the University of Washington School of Medicine and completed his graduate work in history and residency in psychiatry at Yale.

SCOTT C. NEWMAN has served as prosecuting attorney for Marion County (Ind.) since January 1995. He has initiated new services for crime victims, including the Center of Hope facilities at four area hospitals, which address the emotional, medical, and legal needs of sexual assault victims outside the hospital emergency room. He also created the Street-Level Advocacy Program, which places full-time deputy prosecutors and paralegals in neighborhood offices located in police district stations. Prior to taking office, Mr. Newman served as an assistant U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Indiana and as a deputy prosecutor in the Marion County Prosecuting Attorney's office. He has an undergraduate degree from Princeton University (N.J.) and a Juris Doctor from the University of Michigan.

LEONARD NOISETTE is the director of the Neighborhood Defender Service, a community-based public defender's office located in Harlem (N.Y.), which has sought to broaden the role of public defenders. Mr. Noisette has been a public defender of indigents for 15 years. He serves on the board of directors of the New York State Defenders Association, the New York State Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, and the National Legal Aid and Defender Association. He is involved in a number of volunteer activities with youth. Among them are serving as a mentor for Legal Outreach, an educational and college preparatory program for inner-city teens; a basketball coach and workshop instructor for B.A.K.E. (Brothers Against Killing Each Other), a youth program in the low-income neighborhood in which he grew up; and a counselor/mentor with the Rites of Passage program sponsored by Allen A.M.E. Church for seventh- and eighth-grade young men attending the church's school.

ROSE OCHI has served as director of the U.S. Department of Justice's Community Relations Service since June 1996. In this position, she has served on the President's Initiative on Race Task Force, played a major role in the Hate Crime Initiative, and mobilized a Church Burning Crisis Response Team. Previously, she was the associate director of the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy and served as the Los Angeles City (Calif.) director of criminal justice planning.

NANCY ODIERNO has served as the drug elimination coordinator for the Menominee Tribal Housing Department for 2 years.

JEAN F. O'NEIL serves as the director of research and policy analysis and editor-in-chief for the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC). Among her primary responsibilities is overseeing the design and implementation of program evaluations of the agency's efforts. She served for 15 years on the staff of a member of the U.S. House of Representative in a variety of policy and constituent-service positions. Prior to her present position with NCPC, she developed the world's first computerized database of crime prevention programs for the agency. Ms. O'Neil has authored and coauthored more than a dozen books and monographs on topics ranging from community organizing to program evaluation, including major national policy statements on crime prevention. She has helped design evaluations for the National Citizens' Crime Prevention Campaign; the Teens, Crime, and the Community curriculum; Community Responses to Drug Abuse; Youth as Resources; two major annual national conferences; and numerous other programs. A graduate of Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service (D.C.), Ms. O'Neil earned a master of public administration degree from Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government (Mass.). She has earned more than half the credits needed for an associate of arts degree in computer science.

FRANK A. ORLANDO is the director of the Center for the Study of Youth Policy at Nova Southeastern University, Shepard Broad Law Center (Fla.). Judge Orlando provides technical assistance for the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative, which assists states in reforming their juvenile justice agencies and programs. Judge Orlando coordinated the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Broward County (Fla.) Detention Initiative from 1988 to 1991. He directed the Florida Detention Initiative from 1994 to 1998. Prior to assuming his present position in 1988, he served as a Florida circuit court judge for 21 years. Judge Orlando holds a bachelor of science degree in education and a Juris Doctor from the University of Florida.

RAE ANN PALMER is coordinator of special projects and community programs in the Hartford (Conn.) city manager's office. In this position, Ms. Palmer manages federal criminal justice grant funds; serves as the project leader for the design and implementation of the city's community court; coordinates the city's efforts to make city government have more of a "community-oriented" focus; and manages the City Action Line, a nonemergency citizen request/complaint telephone system.

MARIO PAPAROZZI is an assistant professor in the Law and Justice Department at the College of New Jersey. He retired from the New Jersey Department of Corrections in 1998 after a 26-year career. His highest rank at the department was assistant commissioner. Dr. Paparozzi also served as the deputy compact administrator for interstate inmate and parole matters. He is president of the American Probation and Parole Association. From 1992 to 1994, Dr. Paparozzi served as an elected county legislator in Union County (N.J.). Dr. Paparozzi has conducted numerous training seminars on corrections and public administration, published numerous articles in scholarly and practitioner journals and magazines, and appeared on many television and radio programs.

TYRONE C. PARKER serves on the staff of the court-appointed receiver for the Washington, D.C. Housing Authority. He also is the president of the Alliance of Concerned Men, of which he is a founding member. He previously served as the assistant administrator for the D.C. Institution of Behavior for Youth and an intake specialist with the D.C. Department of Corrections. He is best known for his intervention in negotiating a truce between the Avenue and Circle crew members at the Benning Terrace Housing Development in Washington, D.C. He frequently speaks at forums to eradicate violence, drugs, and gangs and makes media appearances.

ELIZABETH A. PEARSON is a senior staff associate at the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA), where she is charged with monitoring legislation and federal agency activities that impact state and local systems of justice. In addition, she has served as primary author on several NCJA publications. Prior to working at NCJA, Ms. Pearson worked at the National Conference of State Legislatures in its Criminal Justice Program. Ms. Pearson holds a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a master of public administration degree from the University of Colorado.

SHEILA D. PETERS, PH.D., is a licensed clinical psychologist specializing in working with the vulnerable child and adolescent population. She is an assistant professor of psychology at Fisk University (Tenn.) and is a faculty collaborator with the National Consortium on Violence Research (NCOVR). She is a partner at Green, Peters and Associates, P.C., a clinical and consulting psychology firm in Nashville, Tennessee. Dr. Peters serves as senior program manager for the Gender-specific Programming for Girls Training and Technical Assistance Initiative funded through the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. She has served as a staff psychologist in a secure juvenile justice facility. She is a past member and vice-chair of the Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth and the Tennessee State Advisory Group (SAG). She is chair of the Metropolitan Nashville/Davidson County Human Relations Commission and a member of the board of directors of United Way of Middle Tennessee, Tennessee Voices for Children, Murci Homes, and the Alcohol and Drug Council. Dr. Peters has a bachelor of arts degree with honors in psychology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and a master of science degree and doctor of clinical psychology degree from Vanderbilt University (Tenn.).

JUDITH N. PHELAN has served as staff assistant to Portland (Ore.) District Attorney Michael D. Schrunk since 1984. In addition to providing management consulting and training, her prior experience includes serving as manager of programs and community services for Multnomah County's (Ore.) Department of Corrections, director of Portland's Comprehensive Employment and Training Act program, and coordinator of Portland's youth service centers. She has authored several reviews and articles. Ms. Phelan received a master's degree in social work from Portland State University.

RICK PHILLIPS is the executive director of Community Matters, a nonprofit organization that provides training, materials, and technical assistance to schools and communities in the areas of strengthening and sustaining community partnerships; involving youth in service through service learning, peer help, and mediation; providing violence and substance abuse prevention education; and increasing organizational effectiveness. He is the past president and a current board member of Youth Service California and the California Association of Peer Programs.

CARMEN PEÑA RIVERA is the executive director of the Puerto Rico Correctional Administration's Bureau of Evaluation and Assessment. She has worked on the development of treatment and rehabilitation programs for inmates convicted of violent crimes, including the establishment of the Learning to Live Without Violence program and the first treatment program in Puerto Rico for incarcerated sex offenders. She has conducted a number of investigations, served as a psychologist and adjunct professor at the Correctional Officers Academy, been an adviser on mental health issues for the correctional system, participated in the Multi-Agency Negotiation for Inmates Mental Health Plans and the Inmates Classification Plan Task Force, and served as a consultant on the boards of directors of several universities and government agencies. She received her doctoral degree in clinical psychology with a subspecialization in forensic psychology.

DAVID J. ROBERTS has served as deputy executive director of SEARCH since 1987. Mr. Roberts provides technical assistance to justice agencies throughout the nation, addressing such issues as automation planning and integration of information systems. He directed SEARCH's 1999 Symposium on Integrated Justice Information Systems, 1997 Conference on Justice Agencies and the Internet, 1996 Symposium on Integrated Criminal Justice Information Systems, and 1994 International Symposium on Criminal Justice Information Systems and Technology. In addition, Mr. Roberts presently serves as the director of a project to assist the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs in developing a comprehensive funding plan to support integrated justice information systems at the local, state, and national levels and as director of a project on National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) implementation among law enforcement agencies. Mr. Roberts holds a bachelor of science degree in law enforcement and criminology from Metropolitan State College (Colo.); a master of arts degree from the School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York at Albany; and a master of criminal justice administration degree from Oklahoma City University.

ROBERT E. ROBERTS is the executive director of Tulane University's (La.) Project Return, a prison aftercare program that offers community-building workshops; vocational counseling and job placement; addiction treatment; training in conflict resolution, relationship skills, and communication; and family and individual counseling. He also is a clinical assistant professor at Tulane University's School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine. In 1989, he was awarded a 3-year grant to conduct literacy and community-building research at the Dixon Correctional Institute, a medium-security state prison in Louisiana. He makes frequent media appearances.

LAURIE O. ROBINSON has served as assistant attorney general since September 1994. She heads the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, and oversees implementation of crime bill grant programs on Violence Against Women, Corrections, and Drug Courts. Prior to joining the Justice Department, Ms. Robinson served for 14 years as director of the American Bar Association's (ABA's) Criminal Justice Section, where she founded the ABA Juvenile Justice Center and was instrumental in the decade-long effort to implement the ABA Criminal Justice Standards. For 7 years, she also headed the ABA's Professional Services Division in Washington, D.C. Ms. Robinson has served on a number of national boards, including those for the National College of District Attorneys, VALOR (the Victim Assistance Legal Organization), the National Forum on Criminal Justice (of which she was chair from 1991–1993), and the *Federal Sentencing Reporter*. Ms. Robinson is a graduate of Brown University (R.I.).

JEANNE ROBISON is a senior assistant city prosecutor for Salt Lake City, Utah, and has served as the city's Weed and Seed and Comprehensive Communities Program coordinator. Ms. Robison is on the board of trustees for the Multi-Cultural Legal Center and chairs its Mediation Committee. Ms. Robison has a Juris Doctor from the University of Utah College of Law.

MAUDE S. SAUNDERS serves as assistant director for resident services for the Richmond (Va.) Redevelopment and Housing Authority. Her responsibilities include delivery of case management, employment, job training, and substance abuse intervention services to public housing residents, management of all drug elimination grants applications, and monitoring of contractual services.

MICHAEL SCAGNELLI is an assistant chief of police for the New York (N.Y.) Police Department. He is currently the executive officer of the Manhattan South patrol borough, which oversees 10 police precincts in Manhattan. Since joining the department in 1970, Mr. Scagnelli has performed patrol duties, was an undercover narcotics officer, was a detective for 10 years, and commanded the 66th Precinct, the Motor Transport Division, the 12th Division, the Traffic Control Division (which includes Highway Patrol and the Mounted Unit), and the Transit Division. He is currently president of the Honor Legion of the Fraternal Organization of Police Heroes.

MICHAEL D. SCHRUNK has been the elected district attorney in Multnomah County, Oregon, since 1981. Multnomah County encompasses the largest metropolitan area in the state of Oregon and has a population of 636,000. The Multnomah County District Attorney's office has over 200 staff members, including 82 attorneys. Approximately 30,000 cases are reviewed annually, and close to 9,000 felonies and over 10,000 misdemeanor cases are issued each year. Mr. Schrunk is a graduate of the University of Oregon Law School. He has extensive experience in prosecution of criminal cases and, while in private practice, represented plaintiffs and defendants in civil litigation and defended criminal cases. He served as a Captain in the U.S. Marine Corps in Vietnam and is past president of the Multnomah County Bar Association and the Oregon District Attorney's Association. Mr. Schrunk currently chairs the Regional Organized Crime Narcotics Task Force and is a member of the Governor's Commission on Organized Crime and Multnomah County's Public Safety Coordinating Council. Mr. Schrunk has served as a lecturer for the National College of District Attorneys and the Drug Enforcement Administration and has provided articles and reviews for the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the National Institute of Justice. Mr. Schrunk is the recipient of several national awards, including the U.S. Department of Justice's Public Service Award for Community Leadership.

DOUGLAS F. SMITH is the director of the Arizona High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Center. He previously served as deputy chief of the Tucson (Ariz.) and Ann Arbor (Mich.) Police Departments and as deputy chief of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Police Department. In all three cities, he was responsible for community-based law enforcement programs.

PATRICIA SMITH is the assistant director of the Comprehensive Communities Program and the Baltimore City (Md.) Hotspot Initiative Program administered by the Mayor's Coordinating Council on Criminal Justice. Both programs are community-based crime prevention initiatives that involve partnerships with the community, government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and

institutions. Ms. Smith has also worked with the Maryland Department of Juvenile Justice, Youth and Adults, and nonprofit organizations to develop and implement a youth tribunal in southwest Baltimore. The youth tribunal incorporates the restorative justice models of a youth court and the community conferencing model. Ms. Smith also works with issues involving addiction through community support for recovering addicts.

RODNEY A. SPRAUVE is the project director for the Harlem (N.Y.) Community Justice Center. Mr. Sprauve worked previously in the Metal Fabricating Division of General Motors as a governmental affairs liaison to the U.S. Department of Defense. He has extensive experience in the public policy sector, including working as regional campaign coordinator for former New York Governor Mario Cuomo and State Comptroller H. Carl McCall's 1994 campaigns. Mr. Sprauve also headed the legal defense fund for former U.S. Rep. Floyd H. Flake. Mr. Sprauve is a graduate of Hampton University (Va.) and received his Juris Doctor from the City University of New York School of Law.

RICHARD L. STALDER has served as secretary of the Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections since January 1992. He began his career with the department in 1971 as a correctional officer and has served as superintendent and warden of major juvenile and adult facilities. In 1994, he was elected to a 6-year term on the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections. Selected by the membership of the American Correctional Association to serve as president, he began a 2-year term in August 1998. He has a bachelor of arts degree and a master's degree from Louisiana State University.

HENRY J. STEADMAN is president of Policy Research Associates, Inc. Previously, Dr. Steadman ran a nationally known research bureau for 17 years for the New York State Office of Mental Health. His work has resulted in 6 books, more than 100 journal articles in a wide range of professional journals, 18 book chapters, and numerous reports. Among Dr. Steadman's major current projects are: (1) the National GAINS Center for Persons with Co-occurring Disorders in the Justice System; (2) the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Violence Risk Assessment Study; (3) the National Resource Center on Homelessness and Mental Illness under contract to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), Center for Mental Health Services; and (4) the Women and Violence Coordinating Center funded by SAMHSA.

MARK C. THOMPSON is the director of administration for the New Hampshire Department of Justice, where he is responsible for both the fiscal and administrative management of the agency. He serves as the state official responsible for U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs funding to the state. He also is the director of the Statistical Analysis Center and the administrator for both the state's drug forfeiture program and the multijurisdictional drug task force. Mr. Thompson worked for the New Hampshire State Police before assuming his current position in 1982. He has served on the National Criminal Justice Association's Board of Directors and is the current first vice president. He has a bachelor of arts degree in government and a master's degree in public administration from Golden Gate University (Calif.).

JEREMY TRAVIS has served as director of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the research arm of the U.S. Department of Justice, since 1994. Before joining NIJ, Mr. Travis was the deputy

commissioner for legal matters of the New York (N.Y.) Police Department. Mr. Travis has also served as chief counsel to the Subcommittee of Criminal Justice of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary; a law clerk to Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg; a special adviser to former New York City Mayor Edward Koch; the executive director of the New York City Criminal Justice Agency; and the executive director of the Victim/Witness Assistance Project for the Vera Institute of Justice. Mr. Travis has lectured and taught courses about law, criminal justice, public policy, and history at numerous institutions. Mr. Travis received a bachelor's degree, with honors, in American Studies from Yale University (Conn.), a master's degree in public administration from the New York University Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, and a law degree, cum laude, from the New York University School of Law.

R. LEWIS VASS currently serves as the criminal justice information services officer for the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Virginia Department of State Police. He is a representative on the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Crime Information Center (NCIC) Southern Region Working Group, the Virginia representative and a member of the board of directors for SEARCH, and the agency representative for the Agency Advisory Committee to the Virginia Council on Information Management. He currently serves as a member of the Brady Act Task Group on Functional Requirements for the National Instant Check System for firearms purchases. He also serves as a coordinator of legislative liaisons to the Virginia General Assembly for the Department of State Police. Capt. Vass graduated from the Virginia State Police Academy in 1967. He is a graduate of Northwestern University Traffic Institute and received a bachelor's degree in the administration of criminal justice from Virginia State University.

MARIA THERESA VIRAMONTES has been executive director of the East Bay Public Safety Corridor Partnership in Oakland, California, since April 1986. Prior to this she served as chief of staff for a former California state assembly member. For 5 years she was a partner and senior consultant in a private consulting business doing grant research, writing, educational program development, service contract negotiation, and fundraising. Her community involvement spans 30 years and includes local, regional, and national work providing technical assistance, fundraising, and development for community groups and nonprofits working in low-income areas to build sustainable communities. She has served on numerous nonprofit boards of directors serving the needs of high-risk children and families and for the protection of regional parks and open spaces. As a former state-appointed official, she served terms on the Economic Development Commission of Zoning and Adjustment, the Port/Waterfront Committee Board of Zoning and Adjustment, and the Planning Commission in the city of Richmond, California.

JOANN WALLACE has been director of the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia since 1994. Before becoming the director, she was the deputy chief of the Appellate Division. She previously served the agency as the coordinator of the Juvenile Services Program, which provides advocacy for children incarcerated in the District of Columbia detention facilities, and as a staff attorney. Ms. Wallace currently serves on the board of directors of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association (NLADA) and is the chair of the Defender Council. In 1995, she chaired NLADA's Blue Ribbon Advisory Panel on Defender Services. She has been a member of the American Bar Association's Criminal Justice Standards Committee. In 1994, Ms. Wallace founded the District of Columbia Appellate Practice Institute. She previously

served as chair and continues to serve as a lecturer for the District of Columbia Criminal Trial Practice Institute. She is a member of the visiting faculty for the Trial Advocacy Workshop at Harvard Law School (Mass.). She received a Juris Doctor from New York University Law School.

IRWIN WALLER, PH.D., is director general of the International Centre for Prevention of Crime, which was created in 1994 to assist cities and governments in reducing delinquency, violence, and insecurity by harnessing experience and know-how internationally to solve local problems. Dr. Waller is on leave from his post as professor of criminology at the University of Ottawa (Canada) and is the immediate past president of the World Society of Victimology and cochair of the society's Symposium Victimology 2000, which is scheduled to take place in Montreal, Canada, in August 2000. In the 1970s, he held the position of director general in the Canadian Ministry responsible for policing and prisons. He received a doctor of philosophy degree in law (criminology) from the University of Cambridge (England).

NANCY M. WARE is the director of technical assistance and training for the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Executive Office for Weed and Seed. She previously served as the director of national programs for BJA; the executive director of the Rainbow Push Coalition and the Citizenship Education Fund; a cabinet member of former Mayor Sharon Pratt Kelly's administration in Washington, D.C., and the executive director of the Mayor's Youth Initiatives Office; the chief of emergency mental health services and outreach for children in the District of Columbia; the director of the Paul Robeson Psychoeducational School for emotionally disturbed children; and a clinical psychologist for the (D.C.) Public Schools Special Education Department. She received her graduate training in educational psychology at Howard University (D.C.) and clinical psychology at American University (D.C.).

RANDY A. WEAVER is the manager of the National and Regional Threat Assessment Program at the National Drug Intelligence Center in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. In his current position, Mr. Weaver supervises process development and publication of National and Regional Threat Assessments, incorporating information from hundreds of agencies and organizations at the federal, regional, state, and local levels. An authority on methamphetamine and Mexican drug-trafficking organizations, Mr. Weaver has spoken to diverse audiences at international, national, regional, and state conferences and has authored and supervised publication of intelligence studies on a wide variety of drug and crime topics. He is a retired U.S. Army Intelligence officer, having served in intelligence positions in the United States and abroad specializing in intelligence support to unconventional operations. Mr. Weaver has a bachelor of science degree in political science from the State University at Albany and a master of science degree in strategic intelligence from the Defense Intelligence College (Washington, D.C.). He is a graduate of the Defense Language Institute, the Foreign Language Training Center-Europe, and the National Interagency Counternarcotics Institute.

DAVID M. WERTHEIMER is services and systems integrations administrator for the King County (Wash.) Department of Community and Human Services. In this capacity, he is working to develop an integrated human services continuum for King County, which crosses the traditional boundaries of systems, including the mental health, substance abuse, and criminal justice systems. Mr. Wertheimer is a member of the adjunct faculty in the graduate program in

psychology at Antioch University (Wash.). He also maintains a small private clinical practice. He is a graduate of Haverford College (Pa.), Yale University Divinity School (Conn.), and the University of Connecticut School of Social Work.

STEPHEN L. WESSLER is an assistant attorney general in the Maine Department of the Attorney General, where he has served since 1976, except for a 3-year period in private practice. In spring 1992, Mr. Wessler was asked to design an enforcement program under the Maine Civil Rights Act, a civil injunction type of hate crime law. The Civil Rights Unit, established in summer 1992, has two key design features: first, it is staffed by volunteer assistant attorneys general and, second, the department asks every police department in the state to designate an officer to be trained and certified by the department as a designated civil rights officer. The Civil Rights Unit receives approximately 250 complaints each year, most of which are forwarded by local civil rights officers, and brings 25 to 30 enforcement cases, which are handled by volunteer assistant attorneys general, in state court. In fall 1996, Mr. Wessler began a school harassment prevention program known as the Civil Rights Team Program. This coming fall, the program will involve approximately 100 schools, each of which will establish a Civil Rights Team consisting of students and faculty advisers. The teams strive to address issues of bias-motivated harassment in their schools. The teams are trained and supported by the department. Mr. Wessler graduated from Harvard University (Mass.) with a bachelor of arts degree and received a Juris Doctor from Boston University School of Law (Mass.).

NIGEL WHISKIN has been chief executive of Crime Concern since its inception in 1988. He represents Crime Concern on the Board of the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime and the Association of Chief Police Officers' Sub-Committee for Crime Prevention. He is a fellow of Loughborough University (Leicestershire, UK). He previously worked with the National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders from 1972 to 1988, and helped set up the first victim support scheme in the United Kingdom. Mr. Whiskin was a probation officer from 1965 to 1972.

JANET K. WIIG is the associate director of the Institute on Criminal Justice at the University of Minnesota Law School. From 1992 to 1998, Ms. Wiig was an assistant Hennepin County (Minn.) attorney working on special assignment to develop policies and programs in the areas of child welfare and juvenile justice. There she directed a crime prevention initiative based upon her research involving children under the age of 10 who have committed delinquent acts. From 1987 to 1992, she was assistant commissioner and director of children's services with the Minnesota Department of Human Services. From 1979 to 1987, she held positions with the Los Angeles (Calif.) Superior Court overseeing policy and program development; developing training workshops for judges, lawyers, and social workers; and as founding director of the Child Advocate's Office. In addition, she has been a consultant and has presented at educational programs for several national and state organizations on the subjects of child advocacy, juvenile justice, and child welfare. Ms. Wiig has a master's degree in social work from the University of Minnesota School of Social Work and a Juris Doctor from Loyola Law School (Calif.).

B. DIANE WILLIAMS is president of the Safer Foundation, the nation's largest private nonprofit provider of social services, education, and employment training and placement services exclusively targeting offenders and ex-offenders. She serves as an adjunct professor of marketing

at Aurora College (Ill.). Ms. Williams' association with Safer began in the 1970s when she volunteered at the agency. She was elected to the board of directors and in April 1995 she joined the agency's staff as an "on-loan executive" from corporate America serving as vice president for development and strategic initiatives. Prior to joining the Safer Foundation, Ms. Williams had a 23-year career in telecommunications, which began in 1972 at Ohio Bell Telephone Company; she then moved to AT&T in 1981. In 1986, she joined Rockwell International where she was director of sales support in its Communications Division. In 1991, she became director of marketing in Ameritech's Enhanced Business Services Unit. Ms. Williams earned a master's degree in business administration from Northwestern University's Kellogg School of Business (Ill.).

NEIL R. WOODCOCK is the director of law enforcement support services for the North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety. He retired from the Air National Guard in 1994. During his military career he served in various positions in the U.S. Air Force and National Guard, including national guard liaison to BJA, deputy director of plans and support in the office of the secretary of defense; reserve component adviser to the U.S. Air Force chief of security police and director of staff support in the Air Force Office of Security Police headquarters; director of resource management for the 123d Tactical Reconnaissance Wing; and base commander, Kentucky Air National Guard. He has a degree from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and a graduate degree from Webster University (Mo.).

SPEAKER CONTACT LIST

Hon. Gary L. Acevedo
Judge
Confederated Salishand Kootenai
Tribal Court
P.O. Box 278
Pablo, MT 59855
(406) 675-2700
(406) 675-4704 (fax)
veritas44@yahoo.com

Mr. Jeff Allison
Acting Director
State and Local Assistance Division
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-3661
(202) 307-3373 (fax)

Ms. Maria Almonte
Outreach Program
Center for Court Innovation
314 West 54th Street
New York, NY 10019
(212) 373-8088
(212) 586-1144 (fax)

Ms. S. Camille Anthony
Executive Director
Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice
State Capitol, Room 101
Salt Lake City, UT 84114
(801) 538-1031
(801) 538-1024 (fax)
canthony@gov.state.ut.us

Ms. Carla Arranaga
Deputy in Charge
Hate Crimes Suppression Unit
Los Angeles County District
Attorney's Office
320 West Temple, Room 780-40
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-3798
(213) 626-2758 (fax)

Mr. Nick Athas
Producer
Olmos Productions, Inc.
30 Sand Street
Mill Wood, NY 10546
(914) 923-4772

Mr. Charles P. Austin, Sr.
Chief
Columbia Police Department
1409 Lincoln Street
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 733-8409
(803) 988-8004 (fax)

Ms. Clementine Barfield-Dye
President
Save Our Sons and Daughters
2441 West Grand Boulevard
Detroit, MI 48208
(313) 361-5200
(313) 361-0055 (fax)
SOSADB@aol.com

Mr. Gene Barnes
District Administrator
Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control
1350 Front Street, Room 5053
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 525-4603
(619) 231-1171 (fax)

Joseph M. Beard
Detective
Sheriff's Office
Snohomish County
M/S 606
3000 Rockefeller Avenue
Everett, WA 98201
(425) 388-3324
(425) 388-3033 (fax)
joe.beard@co.snohomish.wa.us

Mr. Paul Belkin
Grant Program Specialist
State and Local Assistance Division
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 305-2102
(202) 305-2542 (fax)
belkinp@ojp.usdoj.gov

Mr. James R. Bell
Youth Law Center
114 Sansome Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94101
(415) 543-3379
(415) 956-9022 (fax)

Mr. Eric J. Bergstrom
Assistant District Attorney
Multnomah County
600 County Courthouse
1021 Southwest Fourth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 823-5784
(503) 823-5840 (fax)
Eric.J.Bergstrom@co.multnomah.or.us

Hon. Shay Bilchik
Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency
Prevention
800 K Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 307-5911
(202) 307-2093 (fax)
bilchik@ojp.usdoj.gov

Ms. Bethany Blakey
Crime Mapping Research Center
National Institute of Justice
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 606-4531

Mr. Robert Bodisch, Sr.
Director
Texas Narcotics Control Program
Criminal Justice Division
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, TX 78711
(512) 463-1806
(512) 463-1705 (fax)
rbodisch@governor.state.tx.us

Mr. Robert Boruchowitz
Director
Public Defender Association
810 Third Avenue, Eighth Floor
Central Building
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 447-3900 x 602
(206) 447-2349 (fax)

Mr. Joseph Brann
Director
Office of Community Oriented
Policing Services
1100 Vermont Avenue NW., Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 616-2888
(202) 616-2914 (fax)

Ms. Barbara Broderick
State Director of Adult Probation
Supreme Court of Arizona
1501 West Washington, Suite 244
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 542-9468
(602) 542-9673 (fax)
bbroderick@supreme.sp.state.az.us

Mr. Robert Brown
Senior Advisor on Prevention
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-3297
(202) 305-1367 (fax)
bobb@ojp.usdoj.gov

Mr. Simon Brown
Lieutenant
Alaska State Troopers
4600 50th Street
Anchorage, AK 99502
(907) 248-1410
(907) 248-9834 (fax)

Mr. Thomas C. Brown
President
Summit Quest Consulting
Cinnaminson, NJ
(609) 303-0604

Mr. Garland Brunoe
Vice Chair of the Tribal Council
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs
P.O. Box 1299
1233 Veterans Street
Warm Springs, OR 97761
(541) 553-3411
(541) 553-3263 (fax)
gbrunoe@wstribes.org

Mr. Hezekiah Bunch, Jr.
Chief
Housing Authority Baltimore City
Police Department
417 East Fayette Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
(410) 396-4068
(410) 783-1867 (fax)

Mr. Michael Burdeen
Grant Program Specialist
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 305-2104
(202) 305-2542 (fax)
burdeenm@ojp.usdoj.gov

Ms. Sonia L. Burgos
Director
Community Safety and Conservation Division
U.S. Department of Housing and
Urban Development
451 Seventh Street SW.
Washington, DC 20410
(202) 708-1197 x 4069
(202) 401-7965 (fax)

Hon. Kevin S. Burke
Judge
Hennepin County Court
1051-C Government Center
Minneapolis, MN 55487
(612) 348-4389
(612) 348-5374 (fax)
Kevin.Burke@co.hennepin.mn.us

Ms. Dottie Burkette
TRIAD
100 Bush Boulevard
Stanford, FL 32773
(407) 330-6600
(407) 330-6654 (fax)

Ms. Donna H. Burns
Director of Special Projects
Office of the Governor
Georgia Emergency Management Agency
935 East Confederate Avenue
Atlanta, GA 30316
(404) 635-7021
(404) 635-7005 (fax)
dburns@gema.state.ga.us

Mr. Fox Butterfield
Correspondent
New York Times
8 Fulling Mill Lane
Hingham, MA 02043
(781) 740-8940
(781) 740-4733 (fax)
foxG@NYTimes.com

Ms. Mary V. Leftridge Byrd
Superintendent
State Correctional Institution
500 East Fourth Street
Chester, PA 19013
(610) 490-5412
(610) 447-3042 (fax)

Mr. Sean M. Byrne
Prosecutor Coordinator
New York Prosecutors Training Institute
150 State Street, Fifth Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 432-1100
(518) 432-1180 (fax)

Mr. John A. Calhoun
Executive Director
National Crime Prevention Council
1700 K Street NW., Second Floor
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 466-6272
(202) 296-1595 (fax)
jack@ncpc.org

Mr. William H. Carbone
Director
Office of Alternative Sanctions
2275 Silas Deane Highway
Rocky Hill, CT 06067
(860) 563-1332
(860) 721-9474 (fax)

Mr. Luis Cardona
Director
DC Barrios Unidos
P.O. Box 21098
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 487-0159
luiscardo@hotmail.com

Mr. Thomas H. Carr
Director
Washington/Baltimore HIDTA
Office of National Drug Control Policy
Executive Office of the President
7500 Greenway Center Drive, Suite 900
Greenbelt, MD 20770
(301) 489-1700
(301) 489-1660 (fax)
Tcarr@wb.HIDPA.org

Mr. Mike Cashman
Special Agent
Office of Training
Drug Enforcement Administration
Quantico, VA 22135
(703) 640-7538
(703) 640-7039 (fax)

Hon. James D. Cayce
Presiding Judge
King County District Court
1034 King County Courthouse
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 296-3594
(206) 296-0596 (fax)

Mr. Jan M. Chaiken
Director
Bureau of Justice Statistics
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 307-0765
(202) 307-5846 (fax)
chaiken@ojp.usdoj.gov

Ms. Marcia R. Chaiken
Director of Research
LINC
P.O. Box 924
Alexandria, VA 22313
(703) 549-8222
(703) 836-5941 (fax)
linc@radix.net

Ms. Marcia Choo
Assistant Director
Museum Programs
Simon Wiesenthal Center
Simon Wiesenthal Plaza
9760 West Pico Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90035-4792
(310) 553-9036

Mr. Keith Chval
Supervisor
Internet Criminal Activity Unit
Office of the Attorney General of Illinois
100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 814-3505
(312) 814-5024 (fax)
kchval@pop.state.il.us

Mr. Roch O. Clapp
Director
Boise County Office of Community Justice
P.O. Box 126
Idaho City, ID 83631
(208) 392-6767
(208) 392-6712 (fax)

Mr. Peter Clavelle
Mayor
City of Burlington
City Hall
149 Church Street, Room 34
Burlington, VT 05401
(802) 865-7272
(802) 865-7024 (fax)
clavelle@vbimail.champlain.edu

Mr. Sam Cochran
Lieutenant
Memphis Police Department
201 Poplar
Memphis, TN 38103
(901) 545-5735
(901) 545-3877 (fax)

Dr. Lee Colwell
Director
National Center for Rural Law Enforcement
Criminal Justice Institute
University of Arkansas
7723 Asher Avenue, Suite B
Little Rock, AR 72204
(501) 570-8000
(501) 565-3081 (fax)
lcolwell@cji.net

Mr. Foster Cook
Director
Breaking the Cycle
401 Beacon Parkway West, Suite 270
Birmingham, AL 35209-3105
(205) 917-3784
(205) 917-3721 (fax)
fcook@beapsyl.his.uab.edu

Mr. Gregory M. Cooper
Chief
Provo City Police Department
P.O. Box 1894
Provo, UT 84603
(801) 698-2750

Mr. James E. Copple
Director
Coalition, State, and Field Services
National Crime Prevention Council
1700 K Street NW.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 261-4115
jcopple@ncpc.org

Mr. Ronald P. Corbett
Deputy Commissioner
Office of Commissioner of Probation
One Ashburton Place, Room 405
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 727-5348
(617) 727-2199 (fax)

Ms. Cheryl Crawford
Acting Director
Program Development Division
National Institute of Justice
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 514-6210
cheryl@ojp.usdoj.gov

Mr. Fernando Cubillas
Production Manager
Olmos Productions, Inc.
2020 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 500
Century City, CA 90061
(310) 557-7010
(310) 557-6276 (fax)

Mr. Gerald Cunningham
Senior Associate
Church Action for Safe and Just Communities
Homeland Ministries
130 East Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204-3634
(317) 635-3113 x 373
(317) 635-4426 (fax)

Mr. Craig Cussimano
Manager of Web Site Development
Justice Research and Statistics Association
777 North Capitol Street NE., Suite 801
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 842-9330
(202) 842-9329 (fax)
ccussima@jrja.org

Dr. Linda Dahlberg
Senior Behavioral Scientist
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
4770 Bufford Highway NE.
MS-K60
Atlanta, GA 30341
(770) 488-4646
(770) 488-4349 (fax)
lld@cdc.gov

Mr. James L. Danforth
Chief
Oneida Tribal Police Department
2783 Freedom Road
Oneida Nation, WI 54155
(920) 869-2239
(920) 869-1864 (fax)

Ms. Mari Ann Daniels
Director
Baltimore Department of Juvenile Justice
321 Falls Way
Baltimore, MD 21202
(410) 333-6751
(410) 333-2888 (fax)

Mr. Preston Daniels
Mayor
City Hall
400 East First Street
Des Moines, IA 50309
(515) 283-4944
(515) 237-1645 (fax)

M. Beth Davis
Executive Director-State Defender
Mississippi Public Defender's Commission
State Defender's Office
P.O. Box 22485
Jackson, MS 39225-2485
(601) 354-7450
(601) 354-7459 (fax)
msstdef.@mssc.state.ms.us

Mr. Raymond Daw
Executive Director
Na'nizhoozhi Center, Inc.
2205 East Boyd Drive
Gallup, NM 87301
(505) 722-2177
(505) 722-5961 (fax)
raydaw@aol.com

Ms. Alice W. Dery
Assistant Chief
Asset Forfeiture Division
U.S. Department of Justice
1400 New York Avenue NW., Room 10100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 514-1263
(202) 616-1344 (fax)
Alice.Dery@doj.gov

Mr. Drew Diamond
Consultant
Police Executive Research Forum
11815 East 28th Street
Tulsa, OK 74129
(918) 627-5700
(918) 627-5700 (fax)
ddiem49@aol.com

Mr. Walter Dickey
University of Wisconsin Law School
975 Bascom Mall
Madison, WI 53706
(608) 262-1542
(608) 262-1232 (fax)

Ms. Mary D. Dorman
Attorney
Advisory Board
Midtown Community Court
584 Broadway, Suite 1006
New York, NY 10012
(212) 941-1202
(212) 941-1299 (fax)
mdd2@juno.com

Mr. Jerel Eaglin
Director
Youth Services
National Crime Prevention Council
1700 K Street NW., Second Floor
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 466-6272
(202) 296-1356 (fax)

Hon. Ronald Earle
District Attorney
Travis County
314 West 11th Street, Suite 200
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 473-9401
(512) 473-9695 (fax)

Mr. George Epp
Sheriff
Boulder County
1777 Sixth Street
P.O. Box 471
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 441-4609
(303) 441-4739
geesh@co.boulder.co.us

Mr. Joseph R. Farmer
Program Manager, Byrne Grant
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission
3737 North Seventh Street
Room 260
Phoenix, AZ 85014
(602) 230-0252 x 213
(602) 728-0752 (fax)
acjc@goodnet.com

Mr. Michael J. Farrell
Deputy Commissioner
Policy and Planning Division
New York City Police Department
One Police Plaza
New York, NY 10038
(212) 374-5390
(212) 374-0233 (fax)

Mr. John Feinblatt
Director
Center for Court Innovation
351 West 54th Street
New York, NY 10019
(212) 373-8080
(212) 397-0985 (fax)
feinblattj@communitycourts.org

Hon. Raymond C. Fisher
Associate Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
10th Street and Constitution Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 514-9500
(202) 514-4371 (fax)

Mr. Edward A. Flynn
Chief
Arlington Police Department
1425 North Court House Road
Arlington, VA 22201-2686
(703) 358-4040

Ms. Margo L. Frasier
Sheriff
Travis County
1010 Lavaca Street
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 473-9788
(512) 708-4675 (fax)
sheriff.frasier@co.travis.tx.us

Mr. Stephen Friedman
Vice President, Public Affairs
MTV
1515 Broadway
New York, NY 10036-5797
(212) 258-6000

Ms. Rita Aliese Frye
Public Defender
Cook County
69 West Washington, 16th Floor
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 603-0600
(312) 603-9860 (fax)

Mr. Dennis Gabriel
Substance Abuse Counselor
Project Return
3425 Magnolia Street
New Orleans, LA 70115
(504) 895-8616

Mr. Luke G. Galant
Senior Program Advisor for Enforcement
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-3211
(202) 616-2421 (fax)
luke@ojp.usdoj.gov

Hon. Frances Gallegos
Judge
Santa Fe Municipal Court
P.O. Box 909
Santa Fe, NM 87504-0909
(505) 438-5110
(505) 438-5159 (fax)

Mr. Fred W. Garcia
Director
Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse
Programs
P.O. Box 45330
Olympia, WA 98504-5330
(360) 438-8228
(360) 438-8078 (fax)
MARIPOSAS@prodigy.com

Dr. Luis Garcia
Chief Criminologist
Boston Police Department
5 Thompson Street
Boston, MA 02136
(617) 343-5985
(617) 343-5011 (fax)
garcial.bpd@ci.boston.ma.us

Mr. Henry L. Gardner
Managing Partner
Gardner, Underwood and Bacon
924 Hillcroft Circle
Oakland, CA 94610
(510) 444-8343
(510) 444-8210 (fax)

Mr. Bradley Gehring
Sheriff
Outagamie County
320 South Walnut Street
Appleton, WI 54911
(920) 832-5620
(920) 832-5263 (fax)

Ms. Martha Gilland
Director
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
503 Oak Place, Suite 540
Atlanta, GA 30349
(404) 559-4949
(404) 559-4960 (fax)
mgilland@cjcc.state.ga.us

Hon. Nancy E. Gist
Director
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-6500
(202) 305-1367 (fax)
gistn@ojp.usdoj.gov

Mr. John S. Goldkamp
Professor
Temple University
Department of Criminal Justice
520 North Columbus Boulevard, Suite 600
Philadelphia, PA 19123
(215) 627-3766
(215) 627-7810 (fax)
cjri@ix.netcom.com

Mr. John F. Gorczyk
Director
Vermont Department of Corrections
103 South Main Street
Waterbury, VT 05671-1001
(802) 241-2263
(802) 241-2565 (fax)

Michael R. Gottfredson
Vice President
Undergraduate Education
University of Arizona
Administration Building, Room 501
Tucson, AZ 85721
(520) 621-8257
(520) 621-5707
gottfred@u.arizona.edu

Mr. Shaking Graham
Youth Organizer
Bronx Youth Force
320 Jackson Avenue
Bronx, NY 10454
(718) 665-4268
(718) 665-4279 (fax)

Mr. James Green
Deputy Director
Community Service Programs
Office of Alternative Sanctions
1155 Silas Deane Highway
Wethersfield, CT 06109
(860) 257-1904
(860) 257-1976 (fax)

Hon. Saul A. Green
U.S. Attorney
Eastern District of Michigan
211 West Fort Street, Suite 200
Detroit, MI 48226
(313) 226-9501
(313) 226-4609 (fax)
AMIE01.sgreen

Mr. Reuben Greenberg
Chief
Charleston Police Department
180 Lockwood Boulevard
Charleston, SC 20403
(843) 720-2497

Mr. Carl R. Greene
Executive Director
Philadelphia Housing Authority
12 South 23rd Street, 6th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 684-4174
(215) 684-4163 (fax)

Ms. Ellen Halbert
Director
Victim Witness Program
District Attorney's Office
Travis County
5105 Scenic View
Austin, TX 78746
(512) 327-1316
(512) 329-8747 (fax)
halbert@ONR.COM

Mr. Guy J. Hargreaves
Staff Coordinator
Drug Enforcement Administration
700 Army-Navy Drive
Arlington, VA 22202
(202) 307-4327
(202) 307-4502 (fax)

Mr. Trenton Hargrove
Chief Deputy Attorney General
Civil Rights Division
Office of the Attorney General
14 Strawberry Square
Harrisburg, PA 17110
(717) 787-0822
(717) 787-1190 (fax)
thargrove@attorneygeneral.gov

Mr. Daniel Haro
Producer
Olmos Productions, Inc.
2020 Avenue of the Stars, Fifth Floor
Century City, CA 90067
(310) 557-6811
(310) 557-6276 (fax)

Ms. M. Kay Harris
Principal Investigator
Crime and Justice Research Institute
520 North Columbus Boulevard, Suite 600
Philadelphia, PA 19123
(215) 627-3766
(215) 627-7810 (fax)
cjri@ix.netcom.com

Mr. D. Alan Henry
Executive Director
Pretrial Services Resource Center
400 F Street NW., Suite 310
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 727-2911
dah@pretrial.org

Ms. Noreena Henry
Director
Native American Program Office
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-3205
henry@ojp.usdoj.gov

Ms. Susan Herman
Executive Director
National Center for Victims of Crime
2111 Wilson Boulevard, Room 300
Arlington, VA 22201
(703) 276-2880

Hon. Stephen L. Hill, Jr.
U.S. Attorney
Western District of Missouri
400 East Ninth Street, Fifth Floor
Kansas City, MO 64106
(816) 426-4212
(816) 426-4210 (fax)
stephen.hill@usdoj.gov

Mr. Tom Hinz
Sheriff
Brown County
300 East Walnut Street
Green Bay, WI 54301
(920) 448-4222
(920) 448-4206 (fax)
hinz_tj@co.brown.wi.us

Mr. Gary Hinzman
Director
Sixth Judicial District
951 29th Avenue SW.
Cedar Rapids, IA 52404
(319) 398-3672
(319) 398-3684 (fax)
ghinzman@doc.state.ia.us

Hon. Eric M. Holder
Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
10th Street and Constitution Avenue NW.
Room 41
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 514-2101
(202) 514-0467 (fax)

Mr. Charles M. (Bud) Hollis
Senior Program Advisor for Adjudication
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-3218
(202) 616-2421 (fax)

Ms. Jeri Jean Houchins
Texas Planning Council
1300 Bluff Drive
Round Rock, TX 78681
(512) 255-1465
(512) 255-1746 (fax)
btl@inetport.com

Ms. M. Patricia Hoven
Vice President, Social Responsibility
Honeywell, Inc.
P.O. Box 524
Minneapolis, MN 55440-0524
(612) 951-0430
(612) 951-0433 (fax)
pat.hoven@corp.honeywell.com

Mr. Henry Izumizaki
Executive Director
Eureka Bay Area
425 Market Street, 16th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 546-3996
(415) 546-9238 (fax)
eurekasf@aol.com

Mr. Kevin Jackson
Program Manager
Research and Technology Division
National Institute of Justice
810 Seventh Street NW.
Room 7241
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 307-2956
(202) 307-9907 (fax)

Ms. Trudy Jackson
Steering Committee for Community Justice
Boise County
P.O. Box 31
Idaho City, ID 83631
(208) 392-4151
(208) 392-9662 (fax)

Ms. Valera Jackson
Executive Vice President
The Village
3180 Biscayne Boulevard
Miami, FL 33137
(305) 571-5526
(305) 571-1900 (fax)
valerajg@aol.com

Ms. Ann L. Jacobs
Executive Director
Women's Prison Association
110 Second Avenue
New York, NY 10003
(212) 674-1163
(212) 677-1981 (fax)
ann.jacobs@postoffice.worldnet.att.net

Ms. Weris Jama
Program Specialist
Outreach to New Americans
National Crime Prevention Council
1700 K Street NW., Second Floor
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 466-6272
(202) 296-1356 (fax)

Ms. Suzanne James
Administrator
Prince George's County Court
14735 Main Street
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772
(301) 952-3708
(301) 952-3708 (fax)
sjames@co.pg.md.us

Mr. Victor Jammers
Ministry of Justice
Department of Crime
P.O. Box 20301
2500 EH
The Netherlands
(31) 70-3707632
(31) 70-3707250 (fax)
Vjamemers@best-dep.minus.nl

Ms. Janie L. Jeffers
Deputy Executive Director
White House-DC Interagency Task Force
Old Executive Office Building
17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW.,
Room 264
Washington, DC 20503
(202) 395-6965

Ms. Patricia Coats Jessamy
State's Attorney
City of Baltimore
Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr., Courthouse
110 North Calvert Street, Room 208
Baltimore, MD 21202
(410) 396-4986
(410) 539-5215 (fax)

Ms. Claire Johnson
Special Advisor to the Director
D.C. Initiative
National Institute of Justice
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 307-2942

Mr. Michael P. Judge
Chief Public Defender
Los Angeles County
Criminal Courts Building
210 West Temple Street, 19th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-2811
(213) 617-0614 (fax)

Dr. Candice M. Kane
Acting Executive Director
Illinois Criminal Justice Information
Authority
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 1016
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 793-8550
(312) 793-8422 (fax)
ckane@icjia.state.il.us

Mr. John Kaye
Prosecuting Attorney
Monmouth County
71 Monument Park
Freehold, NJ 07728
(732) 431-7160
(732) 409-3673 (fax)
jkaye@monmouth.com

Mr. James C. Keener
Byrne Program Coordinator
Criminal Justice Planning Agency
P.O. Box 6642
Pago Pago, AS 96799
(684) 633-5221
(684) 633-7552 (fax)
keener@samoatelco.com

Mr. George Keiser
Chief
Community Corrections Division
National Institute of Corrections
500 First Street NW.
Room 720
Washington, DC 20534
(202) 307-3995
(202) 307-3361 (fax)
gKeiser@BOP.GOV

Mr. Michael E. Kelly
Assistant to the Mayor
City of Phoenix
200 West Washington Street, 11th Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1161
(602) 262-7111
(602) 495-5583 (fax)
mkelly@ci.phoenix.us.az

Ms. Theresa Kelly
Director of Special Projects
National Crime Prevention Council
1700 K Street NW., Second Floor
Washington, DC 20006-3817
(202) 261-4125
(202) 296-1356 (fax)
kelly@ncpc.org

Ms. Cathy Kendall
Grants Planning Bureau Chief
Montana Board of Crime Control
303 North Roberts
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-2947
(406) 444-4722 (fax)
ckendall@mt.gov

Mr. Paul F. Kendall
General Counsel
Office of Justice Programs
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 02531
(202) 307-6235
(202) 307-1419 (fax)
Kendall@ojp.usdoj.gov

Mr. Spurgeon Kennedy
Program Manager
National Institute of Justice
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 307-2942

Mr. Gil Kerlikowske
Deputy Director of Support Services
Office of Community Oriented
Policing Services
1100 Vermont Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 633-1382
(202) 633-1386 (fax)
gil.kerlikowske@usdoj.gov

Mr. Mike King
Lieutenant
Utah Attorney General's Office
160 East 300 South, 5th Floor
Salt Lake City, UT 84114
(801) 366-0512
(801) 366-0242 (fax)
atkey01.mking@state.ut.us

Mr. Robert A. Kirchner
Senior Program Advisor
Program Development Division
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-3455
(202) 616-2421 (fax)
kirchner@ojp.usdoj.gov

Ms. Lari K. Koga
Administrator
Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice
Division
Department of the Attorney General
425 Queen Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 586-1151
(808) 586-1373 (fax)
lkoga@lava.net

Ms. Yvonne Korn
Director
National Crime Prevention
Commonwealth Attorney General's
Department
Robert Garran Office
National Circuit
Canberra, Australia 2600
(61) 2-62506735
(61) 2-62730913 (fax)
yvonne.korn@ag.gov.au

Mr. Edward J. Krueger
Chair
Criminal Justice Department
Fox Valley Technical College
1875 North Bluemound Drive
Appleton, WI 54914
(920) 735-4858
(920) 831-4331 (fax)
kruegere@foxvalley.tec.wi.us

Ms. Daphne Kwok
Executive Director
Organization of Chinese Americans
1001 Connecticut Avenue NW.
Room 707
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 223-5500
(202) 296-0540 (fax)

Mr. Julius Lang
Coordinator
Midtown Community Court
314 West 54th Street
New York, NY 10019
(212) 484-2703
(212) 586-1144 (fax)
jlang@courts.state.ny.us

Ms. Katherine N. Lapp
Director of Criminal Justice and
Commissioner
New York State Division of Criminal Justice
Services
Executive Park Tower
Stuyvesant Plaza
Albany, NY 12203-3764
(518) 457-1260
(518) 457-3089 (fax)

Ms. Alta Lash
Executive Director
United Connecticut Action for Neighborhoods
190 New Britain Avenue
Hartford, CT 06103
(860) 297-5178
(860) 287-5190 (fax)

Mr. Michael Lawlor
Representative
Connecticut House of Representatives
LOB, Judiciary Committee, Room 2500
Hartford, CT 06106
(860) 240-0530
(860) 240-0021 (fax)
MLawlor99@juno.com

Hon. Bill Lann Lee
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice
10th Street and Constitution Avenue NW.
Room 5643
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 514-2151
(202) 202-1379 (fax)

Mr. Eric Lee
Deputy Director
Center for Court Innovation
351 West 54th Street
New York, NY 10019
(212) 373-8088
(212) 397-0985 (fax)
lee@communitycourts.org

Hon. Patrick A. Lee
Chief Judge
Oglala Sioux Tribe
P.O. Box 280
Pine Ridge, SD 57770
(605) 867-5151
(605) 867-1549 (fax)

Ms. Sunny Lee
Program Coordinator
Tools for Tolerance for Law Enforcement
Simon Wiesenthal Center
Simon Wiesenthal Plaza
9760 West Pico Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90035-4792
(310) 553-9036

Hon. Ginger Lerner-Wren
Judge
Broward County
Mental Health Court
201 Southeast Sixth Street
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
(954) 831-5572

Mr. Alan Levitt
Senior Advisor and Chief
Education Branch
Executive Office of the President
Office of National Drug Control Policy
750 17th Street NW.
Washington, DC 20510
(202) 395-6794

Hon. Wilma A. Lewis
U.S. Attorney
District of Columbia
Judiciary Center
555 Fourth Street NW.
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 514-6600
(202) 353-0121 (fax)
Wilma.lewis@usdoj.gov

Mr. Tom (T.J.) Leyden
Task Force Against Hate
Simon Wiesenthal Center
Simon Wiesenthal Plaza
9760 West Pico Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90035-4792
(310) 553-9036

Ms. Waunetta Lonewolf
Oglala Nation
4721 West Wahalla Lane
Glendale, AZ 85308
(602) 492-9433
(602) 492-9520 (fax)

Ms. Mary Lopez
Director
Safe Futures Consortium
University of Nebraska at Omaha
1313 Farnam Street, PKCC Room 232
Omaha, NE 68182
(402) 595-1213
(402) 595-3229 (fax)
mlopez@unomaha.edu

M. Scott Lyons
Chief
Duluth Police Department
City Hall, Room 104
Duluth, MN 55104
(218) 723-3224

Mr. Dennis Maloney
Chief Probation Officer
Juvenile Community Justice
63333 West Highway 20
Bend, OR 97702
(541) 388-6673
(541) 383-0165 (fax)

Mr. George P. March
Chair
Pennsylvania Justice Network Steering
Committee
17 North Church Street, Suite 217
West Chester, PA 19380-0991
(610) 344-6866
(610) 344-6607 (fax)
g_march@mail.co.chester.pa.us

Mr. Jay A. Marshall
Senior Program Advisor for Community
Justice
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-3215
(202) 616-2421 (fax)
jay@ojp.usdoj.gov

Ms. Jimena Martinez
Director of Technical Assistance
Center for Court Innovation
351 West 54th Street
New York, NY 10019
(212) 373-8098
(212) 397-0985 (fax)
marinezj@communitycourts.org

Mr. Marc Mauer
Assistant Director
Sentencing Project
918 F Street NW., Suite 501
Washington, DC 20004
(202) 628-0871
(202) 628-1091 (fax)
mauer@sentencingproject.org

Ms. Judith White McBride
Senior Advisor to the Assistant Attorney
General
Office of Justice Programs
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 514-1563
(202) 514-1563 (fax)
mcbridge@ojp.usdoj.gov

Mr. Michael S. McCampbell
Project Director
Circle Solutions, Inc.
7913 Northwest 83rd Street
Tamarack, FL 33321
(954) 726-5322
(954) 721-0492 (fax)
mikielcircle@aol.com

Ms. Anne McDiarmid
Manager
Dakota County Community Corrections
201 North Concord Exchange
South St. Paul, MN 55075
(651) 552-3087
(651) 552-3070 (fax)
annemcd@surfree.com

Ms. Kim McGillicuddy
Bronx Youth Force
320 Jackson Avenue
Bronx, NY 10454
(718) 665-4268
(718) 665-4279 (fax)
wfmail@aol.com

Mr. James J. McGivney
Deputy Director for Government Relations
D.A.R.E.® America
P.O. Box 775
Dumfries, VA 22026
(703) 860-3273
(703) 730-7849 (fax)

Ms. Linda James McKay
Director
Analysis and Planning Division
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 514-6638
(202) 305-1367 (fax)

Mr. Stan M. McKinney
Director
Emergency Preparedness Division
Office of the Adjutant General
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 734-8020
(803) 734-8062 (fax)

Mr. Garry A. Mendez, Jr.
Executive Director
National Trust for the Development of
African-American Men
6811 Kenilworth Avenue
Riverdale, MD 20737
(301) 887-0100
(301) 887-0405 (fax)
mendezjr@msn.com

Mr. Andy Mitchell
Deputy Director
Office for State and Local Domestic
Preparedness Support
Office of Justice Programs
800 K Street NW., Ninth Floor
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 305-9889
(202) 616-2922 (fax)
Andy@ojp.usdoj.gov

Mr. Cranston Mitchell
Chair
Missouri Parole Commission
1511 Christy Drive
Jefferson City, MO 65101
(573) 526-6551
(573) 651-8501 (fax)

Mr. E. Mick Mollica
Special Consultant
Learn Associates
Folsom, CA 95630
(916) 227-3219

Mr. Richard Moore
Director
Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning
Division
Lucas Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
(515) 242-5816
(515) 242-6119 (fax)
dick.moore@cjjp.state.ia.us

Mr. Charles A. Moose
Chief
Portland Police Department
1111 Southwest Second Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 823-0008
(503) 823-0342 (fax)
Cmoose@police.ci.portland.or.us

Mr. Dennis Murphy
Deputy Capital Defender
Capital Defender Office
915 Broadway, Seventh Floor
New York, NY 10010
(212) 780-5620
cdomurph@aol.com

Mr. Robert T. Murray
Chief
Falls Church Police Department
300 Park Avenue
Falls Church, VA 22046
(703) 241-5055

Mr. Timothy J. Murray
Director
Program Development Division
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-8933
(202) 514-5956 (fax)
murrayt@ojp.usdoj.gov

Mr. James Mustin
Consultant
National Institute of Corrections
32 Oak Grove Road
Palmyra, VA 22963
(804) 589-4239
(804) 589-6520 (fax)
mustin@cstone.net

Dr. David F. Musto
Department of History
Yale University
P.O. Box 208324
New Haven, CT 06520-8324
(203) 432-1366
(203) 432-7587 (fax)

Hon. George W. Neilson
Presiding Judge
22nd Judicial District
Jefferson County Courthouse
75 Southeast C Street
Madras, OR 97741
(541) 475-3421
(541) 475-3421 (fax)

Mr. Scott C. Newman
Prosecuting Attorney
Marion County
200 East Washington Street
560 City-County Building
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 327-5662
(317) 327-5325 (fax)
snewman@indvgov.org

Mr. Leonard E. Noisette
Director
Neighborhood Defender Service
55 West 125th Street, 2nd Floor
New York, NY 10027
(212) 876-5500
(212) 876-5586 (fax)

Hon. Raymond Norko
Judge
Community Court
80 Washington Street
Hartford, CT 06106
(860) 756-7010
(860) 756-7025 (fax)

Ms. Victoria Nute
Maine Department of the Attorney General
6 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0006
(207) 738-2252

Ms. Rose Ochi
Director
Community Relations Service
U.S. Department of Justice
600 E Street NW.
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 305-2935
(202) 305-3009 (fax)

Ms. Nancy Odierno
Coordinator
Drug Elimination Program
Menominee Tribal Housing Authority
P.O. Box 459
Keshena, WI 54135-0459
(715) 799-3236
(715) 799-4306 (fax)

Ms. Jean F. O'Neil
Director
Research and Policy Analysis
National Crime Prevention Council
1700 K Street NW., Second Floor
Washington, DC 20006-3817
(202) 261-4128
(202) 296-1356 (fax)
oneil@ncpc.org

Hon. Frank A. Orlando
Judge
Center for the Study of Youth Policy
Shepard Broad Law Center
Nova Southeastern University
3305 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314
(954) 262-6239
(954) 262-3822 (fax)
orlandof@nsu.law.nova.edu

Mr. Thomas J. Pagel
Director
Division of Criminal Investigation
316 West 22nd Street
Cheyenne, WY 82002
(307) 777-7181
(307) 777-7252 (fax)
tpagel@missc.state.wy.us

Ms. Rae Ann Palmer
Coordinator
Special Projects and Community Programs
City of Hartford
525 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06106
(860) 543-8681
(860) 722-6215 (fax)
raeann_palmer@ursa.hartnet.org

Dr. Mario A. Paparozzi
Assistant Professor
The College of New Jersey
P.O. Box 7718
Ewing, NJ 08628-0718
(609) 771-2288
(609) 397-4635 (fax)
paparozz@tcnj.edu

Mr. Samuel Payne
Youth Coordinator
Phyllis Wheatley Community Center
1019 Olson Memorial Highway
Minneapolis, MN 55405
(612) 374-3061

Mr. Albert Antony Pearsall III
Acting Director
National Programs Division
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-3298
(202) 305-1367 (fax)

Ms. Elizabeth A. Pearson
Senior Staff Associate
National Criminal Justice Association
444 North Capitol Street NW., Room 618
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 624-1445
(202) 508-3859 (fax)
eapncja@sso.org

Dr. Sheila D. Peters
Project Manager
Greene, Peters & Associates
1018 16th Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37208
(615) 327-0329
(615) 327-1422 (fax)
greenpet@worldnet.att.net

Ms. Judith N. Phelan
Staff Assistant
Multnomah County District Attorney's Office
1021 Southwest Fourth Avenue, Room 600
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 248-3335
(503) 248-3643 (fax)
judy.n.phelan@co.multnomah.or.us

Mr. Rick Phillips
Executive Director
Community Matters
P.O. Box 14816
Santa Rosa, CA 95402
(707) 823-6159
(707) 823-3373 (fax)
team@commatters.org

Mr. Jack Riley
Director
Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program
National Institute of Justice
810 Seventh Street NW., Seventh Floor
Washington, DC 20531

Dr. Carmen Peña Rivera
Director
Bureau of Evaluation and Assessment
Correction Administration of Puerto Rico
161 Ponce De Leon Avenue, Sixth Floor
Hato Rey, PR 00917
(787) 767-6982
(787) 767-6982 (fax)

Mr. David J. Roberts
Deputy Executive Director
SEARCH Group, Inc.
7311 Greenhaven Drive, Suite 145
Sacramento, CA 95831
(916) 392-2550 x 210
(916) 392-8440 (fax)
david.roberts@search.org

Mr. Robert E. Roberts
Professor/Director
Tulane University Project Return
2703 General DeGaulle Drive
New Orleans, LA 70114-6222
(504) 263-8977
(504) 263-8976 (fax)
bob@projectreturn.com

Hon. Laurie O. Robinson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Justice Programs
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 307-5933
(202) 514-7805 (fax)

Ms. Jeanne Robison
Assistant City Prosecutor
City Prosecutor's Office
451 South 200 East, 4th Floor
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(801) 535-7960
(801) 535-7235 (fax)
jean.robison@ci.sl.c.ut.us

Rico Rush
Alliance of Concerned Black Men
1424 16th Street NW., Suite 103
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 535-1131
(202) 535-1059 (fax)

Mr. Wayne Sakamoto
Violence Prevention Coordinator
San Diego County
6401 Linda Vista Road
San Diego, CA 92111
(619) 292-3569
(619) 571-6046 (fax)

Ms. Maude Saunders
Assistant Director for Resident Services
Richmond Housing and Redevelopment
Authority
901 Chamberlayne Parkway
Richmond, VA 23220
(804) 780-4200
(804) 649-0659 (fax)
mssaunders@rrha.state.va.us

Mr. Michael Scagnelli
Assistant Chief
New York Police Department
Patrol Borough Manhattan South
230 East 21st Street
New York, NY 10010
(212) 477-9130

Mr. Michael D. Schrunk
District Attorney
Multnomah County District Attorney's Office
1021 Southwest 4th Avenue, Room 600
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 248-3143
(503) 248-3643 (fax)
michale.d.schrunk@co.multnomah.or.us

Mr. Michael Serra
Youth Forum Representative
38 Lockwood Street
Meriden, CT 06451
(203) 639-8315
(203) 639-8314 (fax)

Mr. Leonard Seumanutafa
Program Specialist
Criminal Justice Planning Agency
P.O. Box 6642
EOB, Third Floor
Pago Pago, AS 96799
(684) 633-5221
(684) 633-7552 (fax)
keener@samoatelco.com

Mr. David Singh
Special Assistant to the Director
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-6500
(202) 305-1367 (fax)

Mr. Douglas F. Smith
Director
Arizona HIDTA Center
6868 South Plumer Avenue
Tucson, AZ 85706
(520) 547-8899
(520) 547-8989 (fax)

Ms. Patricia Smith
Assistant Director
CCP/Hotspots
Mayor's Coordinating Council on Criminal
Justice
10 South Street, Suite 400
Baltimore, MD 21202
(410) 396-4370
(410) 625-2107 (fax)
pat_smith@mail.ci.baltimore.md.us

Mr. Rodney A. Sprauve
Project Director
Harlem Community Justice Center
351 West 54th Street
New York, NY 10019
(212) 373-8091
(212) 397-0985 (fax)
sprauver@CommunityCourts.Org

Mr. Richard L. Stalder
Secretary
Department of Public Safety and Corrections
P.O. Box 94304
Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9304
(225) 342-5723
(225) 342-2486 (fax)

Mr. Henry J. Steadman
President
Policy Research Associates, Inc.
262 Delaware Avenue
Delmar, NY 12054
(518) 439-7415
(518) 439-7612 (fax)
hsteadman@prainc.com

Mr. Thomas Sweed
National Youth Forum
5075 Ursula Way
Denver, CO 80239
(303) 371-3426
tsweed99@aol.com

Ms. Barbara E. Thomas
Projects Manager
The Family Institute
1915 Kalorama Road NW., Room 504
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 265-5927
(202) 265-5926 (fax)
BarberaTFI@aol.com

Mr. Mark C. Thompson
Director of Administration
Office of the Attorney General
New Hampshire Department of Justice
33 Capitol Street
Concord, NH 03301-6397
(603) 271-1234
(603) 271-2110 (fax)
mthompson@doj.state.nh.us

Ms. Tammy Tramble
National Youth Forum
2815 Jasmine Street
Denver, CO 80207
(303) 322-9206

Hon. Jeremy Travis
Director
National Institute of Justice
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 307-2942
(202) 307-6394 (fax)
travisj@ojp.usdoj.gov

Mr. Tony Truong
Outreach to New Americans
1412 East Boyd Street
Des Moines, IA 50316
(515) 263-1048

Ms. Kathryn M. Turman
Acting Director
Office for Victims of Crime
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-2145
(202) 514-6383 (fax)

Mr. R. Lewis Vass
Captain
Division Commander
Criminal Justice Information Services
Virginia State Police
P.O. Box 27472
Richmond, VA 23621-7472
(804) 674-2147
(804) 674-2105 (fax)

Ms. Maria Theresa Viramontes
Executive Director
East Bay Public Safety Corridor Partnership
1222 Preservation Park Way, Ground Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 832-7071
(510) 832-7073 (fax)

Ms. JoAnn Wallace
Director
Public Defender Service
451 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 628-1200
(202) 626-8423 (fax)

Mr. Irvin Waller
Director General
International Centre for Prevention of Crime
507 Place D'Armes, Room 2100
Montreal, Quebec
Canada H2Y 2W8
(514) 288-6731
(514) 288-8763 (fax)

Mr. Richard H. Ward III
Deputy Director
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 514-6278
(202) 305-1367 (fax)
ward@ojp.usdoj.gov

Ms. Nancy M. Ware
Director of Technical Assistance and Training
Executive Office for Weed and Seed
810 Seventh Street NW., Sixth Floor
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-1152
(202) 616-1159 (fax)
waren@ojp.usdoj.gov

Ms. Beverly Watts-Davis
Executive Director
San Antonio Fighting Back of United Way
2803 East Commerce
San Antonio, TX 78203
(210) 271-7232
(210) 271-1087 (fax)
hn2560@earthlink.net

Mr. Randy A. Weaver
Chief
National Drug Assessment Group
National Drug Intelligence Center
319 Washington Street
Johnstown, PA 15901
(814) 532-4552
(814) 532-4032 (fax)
aaraw@ndic.osis.gov

Mr. David M. Wertheimer
Administrator
Service and Systems Integration
Administration
Department of Community and Human
Services
700 5th Avenue, Suite 3800
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 205-1354
(206) 296-5260 (fax)

Mr. Stephen L. Wessler
Assistant Attorney General
Maine Department of the Attorney General
6 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0006
(207) 626-8845
(207) 624-7730 (fax)
stephen.wessler@state.me.us

Mr. Nigel Whiskin
Chief Executive
Crime Concern
Beaver House
147-150 Victoria Road
Swindon, England
SN1 3BU
(44) 1793-863500
(44) 1793-514654 (fax)

Ms. Janet K. Wiig
Associate Director
Institute on Criminal Justice
University of Minnesota Law School
430 Law Center
229 19th Avenue, South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
(612) 626-9138
(612) 624-1823 (fax)
wiggxool@tc.umn.edu

Ms. B. Diane Williams
President/CEO
SAFER Foundation
571 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60661-5701
(312) 922-8033
(312) 922-7640 (fax)
dianesafer@aol.com

Mr. Richard Wilson
Professor
American University
Washington College of Law
4801 Massachusetts Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20016
(202) 274-4246
(202) 274-0659 (fax)
rwilson@wcl.american.edu

Mr. Neil R. Woodcock
Director
Law Enforcement Support Services
Department of Crime Control and Public
Safety
1950 Garner Road
Raleigh, NC 27610-3926
(919) 715-5478
(919) 715-5546 (fax)
nwoodcock@NCCrimecontrol.org

Bureau of Justice Assistance Information

General Information

Callers may contact the U.S. Department of Justice Response Center for general information or specific needs, such as assistance in submitting grants applications and information on training. To contact the Response Center, call 1-800-421-6770 or write to 1100 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20005.

Indepth Information

For more indepth information about BJA, its programs, and its funding opportunities, requesters can call the BJA Clearinghouse. The BJA Clearinghouse, a component of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS), shares BJA program information with state and local agencies and community groups across the country. Information specialists are available to provide reference and referral services, publication distribution, participation and support for conferences, and other networking and outreach activities. The Clearinghouse can be reached by:

- Mail**
P.O. Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000
- Visit**
2277 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850
- Telephone**
1-800-688-4252
Monday through Friday
8:30 a.m. to 7 p.m.
eastern time
- Fax**
301-519-5212
- Fax on Demand**
1-800-688-4252
- BJA Home Page**
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA>
- NCJRS World Wide Web**
<http://www.ncjrs.org>
- E-mail**
askncjrs@ncjrs.org
- JUSTINFO Newsletter**
E-mail to listproc@ncjrs.org
Leave the subject line blank
In the body of the message,
type:
subscribe justinfo
[your name]



BJA World Wide Web Address

For a copy of this document online,
as well as more information on BJA,
check the BJA Home Page at
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA>

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Assistance

Washington, DC 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

SPECIAL STANDARD MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/BJA
PERMIT NO. G-91

Ms. Lesley Flaim
Reference Supervisor
National Drug Control Policy Clearinghouse
2277 Research Blvd.
Rockville, MD 20850

2B