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INTRODUCTION

This Annual Report provides an overview of many of the projects undertaken and led by OJP in an effort to fulfill the vision of providing unparalleled resources to the justice community. These resources represent much more than the invaluable monies allocated by Congress. To ensure that the funds reach those programs most in need and most able to utilize them fully, OJP draws on a wealth of knowledge supported by research and many years of staff experience. OJP employees spend countless hours reaching out to criminal justice organizations to ensure that the funds are used wisely, to further progress in the criminal justice field, and to disseminate information on the best approaches to making America’s neighborhoods safer.

The information contained in this report provides an accounting of many of these efforts to support and lead criminal justice programming around the country. Several OJP bureaus also provide an annual report to Congress which cumulatively contain a more comprehensive look at OJP programming. This report describes numerous OJP program accomplishments in Fiscal Year 2006, but does not attempt to describe every program. Should additional information be needed, it can be found either by calling the Office of Communications at 202–307–0703 or by searching the OJP Web site at www.ojp.usdoj.gov.

OJP’s Vision

OJP will be the premier resource for the justice community. We will do this by providing and coordinating information, research and development, statistics, training, and support to help the justice community build the capacity it needs to meet its public safety goals. These initiatives will be accomplished by embracing local decision-making while also encouraging local innovation through strong and intelligent national policy leadership.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS’ OVERVIEW

For more than 20 years, the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) has effectively provided federal leadership in developing the nation’s capacity to prevent and control crime, improve the criminal and juvenile justice systems, increase knowledge about crime and related issues, and assist crime victims. OJP continues to be the premier resource and principal federal partner for the nation’s criminal and juvenile justice community. OJP’s role is to work in partnership with the justice community to identify the most pressing challenges confronting the justice system and to provide state-of-the-art knowledge, information, training, coordination, and innovative strategies and approaches for dealing with these challenges.

OJP’s record of providing an estimated 75,000 grants totaling close to $38.5 billion in assistance to state and local law enforcement and community organizations over these 20 years is impressive, yet the multiplier effect of those dollars has had an even greater impact on making America’s communities safer for our citizens. Beyond the funding and grant administration, OJP has provided countless hours of training and technical assistance as well as insightful research and statistical information to law enforcement, criminal and juvenile justice practitioners, policy makers, and community organizations. OJP has made a difference.

OJP is led by an Assistant Attorney General who ensures that OJP policies and programs reflect the priorities of the President, the Attorney General, and the Congress. The Assistant Attorney General provides leadership and promotes coordination among the major program units within OJP.

OJP’s MISSION

To increase public safety and improve the fair administration of justice across America through innovative leadership and programs.

OJP’s ORGANIZATION

OJP consists of the following bureaus and offices:

- Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS)
- National Institute of Justice (NIJ)
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)
- Office for Victims of Crime (OVC)
- Community Capacity Development Office (CCDO)
Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking Office (SMART)

Bureaus

The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) supports law enforcement, courts, corrections, treatment, victim services, technology, and prevention initiatives that strengthen the nation’s criminal justice system. BJA provides leadership, services, and funding to America’s communities by: emphasizing local control, building relationships in the field, developing collaborations and partnerships, promoting capacity building through planning, streamlining grant programs, increasing training and technical assistance, ensuring accountability of projects, encouraging innovation, and communicating the value of justice efforts to decision-makers at every level.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) is the primary statistical agency of the Department of Justice (DOJ). BJS collects, analyzes, publishes, and disseminates information on crime, criminal offenders, victims of crime, and the operation of justice systems at all levels of government. BJS provides the President, Congress, other officials, and the public with timely, accurate, and objective data about crime and the administration of justice. In addition, BJS provides financial and technical support to state, local, and tribal governments to develop their criminal justice statistical capabilities. This assistance targets the development of information systems related to national criminal history records, records of protective orders involving domestic violence and stalking, sex offender registries, and automated identification systems used for background checks.

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is the research, development, and evaluation agency of DOJ. NIJ provides objective, independent, evidence-based knowledge and tools to meet the challenges of criminal justice, particularly at state, local, and tribal levels. The Institute’s major program areas include: research on the causes and consequences of crime and ways to prevent it; research, development, and evaluation of technologies and practices to protect the safety and improve the effectiveness of law enforcement and corrections professionals; development and evaluation of crime control and prevention initiatives at the federal, state, local, and tribal levels and internationally; and activities to enhance the state of criminal justice procedure, such as the President’s DNA Initiative.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) supports state, tribal, and community efforts to prevent and respond to juvenile delinquency and victimization. OJJDP sponsors numerous research, program, and training initiatives; develops priorities and goals and sets policies to guide federal juvenile justice issues; disseminates information about juvenile justice issues; and awards funds to states to support local programming nationwide. Major areas of emphasis include programming to address missing and exploited children and to enhance gang reduction efforts. Through programs that incorporate proven prevention strategies, provide treatment and rehabilitation, and hold juvenile offenders accountable, OJJDP strives to improve the juvenile justice system so that the public is better protected, and youth and their families are better served.

The Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) is committed to enhancing the nation’s capacity to assist crime victims and to providing leadership in changing attitudes, policies, and practices to promote justice and healing for all crime victims. In this regard, OVC administers programs authorized by the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, as amended, and the Crime Victims Fund authorized by this statute. The fund is composed of criminal fines and penalties, special assessments, and bond forfeitures collected from convicted federal perpetrators, as well as gifts and donations received from the general public. Money deposited in the fund is used to support a wide range of activities on behalf of crime victims, including victim compensation and assistance services, training and technical assistance, and program evaluation and replication. OVC provides assistance and support to victims of crime in several areas.
including but not limited to the following: domestic and international terrorism, domestic violence, mass violence, identity theft, child sexual assault, and human trafficking.

**Program Offices**

The **Community Capacity Development Office** (CCDO) brings into focus one of OJP’s core missions: to work with local communities to analyze public safety and criminal justice problems, develop solutions, and foster local-level leadership to implement and sustain these solutions. CCDO administers the Weed and Seed program and provides training and technical assistance in support of this multi-agency approach to law enforcement, crime prevention, and community revitalization. CCDO also works on reentry issues, helping state and local agencies access and leverage resources from existing state formula and block grants to integrate returning offenders. It partners with public and private institutions and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in a public housing safety initiative for public and federally assisted housing, including American Indian housing. The American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) Affairs Desk enhances access to information by federally recognized American Indian and Alaska Native tribes regarding funding opportunities, training, and technical assistance.

The **Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking Office** (SMART) was authorized by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 and began operations early in Fiscal Year 2007. Therefore, SMART Office accomplishments are not included in this report. The SMART Office mission is to assure that convicted sex offenders are prohibited from preying on citizens through a system of appropriate restrictions, regulations, and internment. The role of the SMART Office is to (1) administer the standards for the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Program set forth in Title 1 of the Adam Walsh Act; (2) administer grant programs relating to sex offender registration and notification authorized by the Adam Walsh Act and other grant programs authorized by the Adam Walsh Act as directed by the Attorney General; and (3) cooperate with and provide technical assistance to states, the District of Columbia, principle U.S. territories, units of local government, tribal governments, and other public and private entities involved in activities related to sex offender registration or notification or to other measures for the protection of children or other members of the public from sexual abuse or exploitation.

**Support Offices**

The following offices within OJP provide agency-wide support:

- Office of Administration
- Office of the Chief Financial Officer
- Office of the Chief Information Officer
- Office for Civil Rights
- Office of Communications
- Office of General Counsel
- Office of Audit, Assessment, and Management
- Equal Employment Opportunity Office

**Contacting OJP**

The Office of Communications (OCOM) is the key point of contact for all of OJP. OCOM ensures effective communication with Congress, the media, outside organizations, and the public. OCOM can be reached at 202-307-0703.

OJP also maintains a Web site at [www.ojp.usdoj.gov](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov). In addition to general information about OJP and its bureaus, the Web site includes downloadable versions of many OJP publications and application kits, as well as useful links to selected criminal justice Web sites. Each bureau and office Web site includes an
e-mail address where the public can write with questions about the office or programs.

For ordering and other information about OJP publications, call the National Criminal Justice Reference Service at 1-800-851-3420 or visit www.ncjrs.gov.
BJA administers the Bulletproof Vest Partnership (BVP) Program. The BVP program helps protect the lives of public safety officers by assisting state, local, and tribal governments in equipping their officers with armor vests. The program pays up to 50 percent of the cost of each vest purchased by applicants. Eligible law enforcement officers include police officers, sheriff’s deputies, correctional officers, parole and probation agents, prosecutors, and judicial officials. Applicants can select and purchase any ballistic- or stab-resistant vest that meets applicable NIJ standards.

➤ In Fiscal Year (FY) 2006, BJA, through the Bulletproof Vest Partnership (BVP) program, made $28,997,518 in payments to 4,607 agencies supporting the purchase of 213,484 vests for law enforcement officers across the country. This includes $5,096,556 for the replacement of currently deployed Zylon® vests, which may not provide the intended level of ballistic resistance.

➤ Of the total amount, $12,377,163 in payments was made to large jurisdictions, and $16,620,355 to smaller jurisdictions. In addition, BJA, NIJ, and the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center partnered to ensure that the BVP Web site presents the most up-to-date and accurate information regarding NIJ vest testing results so that vest purchasers can make informed equipment choices.

Body Armor Safety Initiative

Thirty years ago, NIJ introduced a voluntary bullet-resistant body armor performance standard and an independent testing program to ensure that personal body armor meets minimum performance levels. Since then, ballistic-resistant body armor has saved more than 3,000 lives. After a reported failure of a relatively new Zylon®-based body armor vest worn by a police officer in Pennsylvania in 2003, former Attorney General John Ashcroft directed NIJ to examine Zylon®-based bullet-resistant armor and analyze upgrade kits provided by manufacturers to retrofit these armors.

In 2006, NIJ managed the implementation of the 2005 Interim Requirements for Bullet-Resistant Body Armor, the most important revision to the body armor standards program in more than a decade. The testing found that more than 700 models comply with the requirements of the new system.

Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor

The Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Act, enacted on May 30, 2001, created the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor as the highest
national award for valor by a public safety officer. It is awarded by the President to public safety officers cited by the Attorney General and recommended by the Medal of Valor Review Board. BJA works closely with the Office of the Assistant Attorney General at OJP to coordinate this effort.

A “public safety officer” is defined as a person (living or deceased) who serves(d) in a public agency, with or without compensation, as a firefighter, law enforcement officer (including a corrections or court officer, or a civil defense officer), or emergency services officer, as determined by the Attorney General. An act of valor is defined as: (1) above and beyond the call of duty; and (2) exhibiting exceptional courage, extraordinary decisiveness and presence of mind, and/or unusual swiftness of action, regardless of his or her personal safety, in an attempt to save or protect human life.

On March 16, 2006, the President awarded the 2004–2005 Medals of Valor during a White House ceremony in the Oval Office. Later that day, former Attorney General Alberto R. Gonzales and former Assistant Attorney General Regina B. Schofield honored the five award recipients during a public ceremony and reception at the Department of Justice. The Medal of Valor recipients represented fire, police, and emergency medical services from across the nation.

**WEED AND SEED**

CCDO administers a discretionary grant program to support the Weed and Seed Initiative. Weed and Seed is a community-based initiative that is an innovative and comprehensive multi-agency approach to law enforcement, crime prevention, and community revitalization.

Communities that develop a Weed and Seed strategy in coordination with their U.S. Attorney’s Office can submit an application for
Official Recognition to CCDO for review and approval. If the site is designated as Officially Recognized, it can receive preference in discretionary funding from other participating federal agencies, priority for participation in federally sponsored training and technical assistance, use of the Weed and Seed logo, and eligibility to apply for Weed and Seed funding, subject to the availability of funds.

Some 270 active Weed and Seed sites throughout the country, representing a combined population of almost 6.2 million, are fostering a community-based, multi-agency approach to law enforcement and crime prevention. Each Weed and Seed strategy must address the following elements: law enforcement and community policing (weeding); prevention, intervention, and treatment; and neighborhood restoration (seeding).

FY 2005 Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) reports indicated the following:

- A decline of 11.3 percent in homicides per site was reported from 2003 to 2004 (from 4.33 homicides per site, to 3.83) based on reports from 254 sites.

- A 2.7 percent increase in the average number of homicides per site was reported between 2004 and 2005 (nationally the number of homicides increased by 3.4 percent for the same time period).

- 69.2 percent of sites participate in Project Safe Neighborhoods.

- 96 percent of sites engage in three or more community policing activities.

- 95.4 percent of sites have a multi-jurisdictional taskforce.

- 37.4 percent of sites have a prosecutor dedicated to firearms cases.

This is the most recent GPRA data available and represents completed GPRA reports from 270 local sites.

Interagency linkages and gun tracing helped to lead to the identification, arrest, and extradition of a man charged with killing a police officer in Virginia. The gun tracing practices used grew, in part, from a Weed and Seed site’s planning process.

When Yonkers established its Weed and Seed site in 2004, the Weed and Seed planning process highlighted gun trafficking as a major local problem. This led YPD to expand

**GUN TRACING LEADS TO ARREST OF MURDER SUSPECT**

On November 26, 2005, members of the Yonkers Police Department’s (YPD) Task Force, Safe Streets Initiative, arrested two men on drug charges. In connection with the arrest, an apartment was searched and police found a handgun that was reported stolen in Virginia in October 2005. YPD traced the weapon and learned it had belonged to police officer Stanley Reaves of the Norfolk (Virginia) Police Department, who was killed in the line of duty on October 28, 2005. His gun was stolen at the time of the shooting. YPD detectives identified and arrested the current owner of the gun in White Plains, New York. He was extradited to Virginia to stand trial for the murder of Officer Reaves.
its gun tracing efforts and to join the Project Safe Neighborhoods task force, which also was focused on reducing gun-related violence. YPD’s participation in these federally supported collaborations led to an award of additional law enforcement funding from New York Operation Impact, a state-funded multi-agency law enforcement initiative patterned after Project Safe Neighborhoods, which later provided additional funding for gun tracing.

STATE AND LOCAL ANTI-TERRORISM TRAINING

Administered by BJA and coordinated by the Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR), the State and Local Anti-Terrorism Training (SLATT) Program is a training and research program that provides preincident awareness, preparation, investigation, prevention, and interdiction training and information to state and local law enforcement in the areas of terrorist and criminal extremist activity. A distinguishing feature of the SLATT Program is its capacity to tailor training to meet very specific needs of requesting agencies. The program also provides extensive ongoing anti-terrorism research and disseminates findings to law enforcement via resources and secure law enforcement Web sites.

➤ In FY 2006, BJA, through the SLATT Program, trained more than 10,000 officers in 125 events through specialized curriculum and disseminated vital terror updates describing trends and emerging groups. An additional 18,771 officers received terrorism prevention information from graduates of SLATT’s “Train-the-Trainer” program.

➤ Training updates took place continually, with new subjects being added to the program curriculum including: “Intermediate Interviewing Techniques,” “Native American Jurisdictional Issues,” and “Intelligence Sources in the Correctional System.” In response to the emerging challenges of tribal land border control, undocumented immigration, and jurisdiction issues, SLATT developed and delivered, through consultation and partnership with a wide range of federal, state, and tribal law enforcement, six Tribal Lands Anti-Terrorism Briefings to more than 200 tribal, local, state, and federal participants in several regions across the country.

PANDEMIC INFLUENZA PLANNING

DOJ is part of the national effort to plan for a pandemic influenza outbreak, as well as any other natural or manmade public health crisis, as outlined in the “President’s Implementation Plan for the National Strategy for Pandemic Influenza.” It is critical that all components of public safety (public and private) be concerned with preserving the rule of law in America’s communities, whether they be civil and criminal courts at the state, county, or municipal level; law enforcement and private security agencies; or institutional and community corrections agencies. At OJP, BJA has been leading this effort. Accomplishments in 2006 include the following:

➤ In May 2006, BJA held a national symposium “Justice and Public Health Systems Planning: Confronting a Pandemic Outbreak.” Approximately 230 representatives of federal, state, and local courts; corrections; law enforcement; public health; and other agencies relevant to pandemic emergency planning participated, representing 45 states and the District of Columbia. The symposium provided attendees with an overview of the nature of pandemic outbreaks and their potential impact for state and local public health and justice systems and an opportunity to engage in multidisciplinary discussions regarding essential planning and preparation tasks.

➤ Shortly after the symposium, BJA launched a dedicated Web portal for pandemic planning, which hosts the presentations of symposium presenters, including several online video presentations,
and a range of documents and resources related to pandemic planning for the courts and other justice components. The Web site is continually updated.

BJA, in partnership with the Police Executive Research Forum, developed and released *The Role of Law Enforcement in Public Health Emergencies: Special Considerations for an All-Hazards Approach*, designed to guide law enforcement planning efforts related to public health emergencies.

Since the development of this initiative, BJA has provided technical assistance to several jurisdictions, relying on a multidisciplinary pool of consultants drawn from the public administration and public health communities identified in the course of preparing for the BJA national symposium. To date, technical assistance has been provided to three state supreme courts, various associations, and law enforcement representatives responsible for planning within their own agencies.

BJA has provided outreach to many justice components and organizations regarding planning for public health emergencies, raising awareness, and identifying ongoing preparations. BJA also has developed a strong working relationship with the Department of Health and Human Service’s Public Health Service and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
TRIBAL COURTS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

BJA administers the Tribal Courts Assistance Program (TCAP). This program helps develop new tribal courts, improves the operations of existing tribal courts, and provides funding for technical assistance and training of tribal court staff.

In FY 2006, BJA awarded grants to 26 tribal communities. BJA also worked with the Tribal Judicial Institute at the University of North Dakota Law School, the TCAP Advisory Board, other Indian Country providers, and local government agencies to

- promote cooperation among tribal, federal, and state courts
- conduct training, presentations, and special exchanges at judicial conferences
- engage representatives of tribal and state judiciaries in forums and other training activities
- design and implement a training calendar of core subjects and special topical areas

Together, this resulted in more than 34 BJA-sponsored training events that reached 2,207 people representing 300 tribes.

In FY 2006, BJA continued to support

- the National Tribal Justice Resource Center to continue its tribal justice system clearinghouse and information center
- the provision of scholarships to tribes needing assistance to cover travel costs for training events
- the collaboration with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to complete a review of practice and refine culturally competent assessment tools
- the American Probation and Parole Association as it develops a tribal community supervision curriculum to help reduce relapse and recidivism
- the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement (part of the University of Arkansas System) to assist with information sharing efforts among tribal and non-tribal justice systems

CAPITAL LITIGATION

In response to a goal President Bush identified in the 2005 State of the Union Address, DOJ launched the Capital Case Litigation Initiative (CCLI) to improve the quality of representation and the reliability of verdicts in local and state capital cases through training for prosecutors,
defense counsel, and trial judges. To accomplish this goal, DOJ led an effort to develop curricula for the key constituencies and provide technical assistance to practitioners in the field trying capital cases.

In FYs 2005 and 2006, BJA partnered with three national associations that support defense counsel, prosecutors, and trial judges in developing training curricula (piloted in 11 states) suited to the needs of their constituents. The national partners also provided technical assistance to support implementation of the training.

Deliverables completed under the planning grants included development and implementation of three state curricula (one for each of the three disciplines); state sub grants for delivery of the curricula; and technical assistance by the national organizations to state-level practitioners. The curricula focused on investigation techniques; pretrial and trial procedures including jury selection; the use of expert testimony, forensic science evidence, and discovery issues; advocacy in capital cases; and capital case sentencing-phase procedures. More than 400 prosecutors, defense attorneys, and judges received training by the end of 2006.
PRISONER REENTRY INITIATIVE

In support of the President’s focus on prisoner reentry, OJP is administering programs that help prison and jail inmates reenter our communities and develop expertise and practical resources that help local jurisdictions address this pressing issue. Nearly $15 million in related funding was awarded in FY 2006.

 BJ A, in coordination with a companion U.S. Department of Labor grant program, awarded 30 Prisoner Reentry Initiative (PRI) grants to 20 states in September 2006. The PRI grants fund prerelease services for nonviolent inmates, including, but not limited to, assessment, employment assistance, educational assistance, substance abuse treatment, cognitive restructuring, motivational interviewing, mental health and health services, and mentoring.

 BJ A was instrumental in the publication of The Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council, developed by the Council of State Governments, which is often used as the framework for developing local and state reentry programs.

 BJ A funds several other prison and jail reentry initiatives and programs, including:

  - the Urban Institute, John Jay College of Criminal Justice (City University of New York), and Montgomery County (Maryland) Department of Correction and Rehabilitation partnership, which addresses jail reentry
  - the Center for Effective Public Policy, which provides reentry-related training and technical assistance to grantee sites, as well as to selected states who applied for more intense reentry training on collaboration and partnerships
  - the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA), which aims to determine the supervision and service needs of methamphetamine-addicted released offenders
  - the Institute for Intergovernmental Research, APPA, and the Association of State Correctional Administrators partnership, which addresses gang member reentry and focuses on information sharing between corrections and law enforcement agencies.
➤ OJJDP manages 22 reentry grants that focus on an adolescent population. A collaborative effort among multiple federal partners, this initiative provides funding to state juvenile correctional agencies to develop, implement, enhance, and evaluate reentry strategies that address both preservation of safety and the reduction of serious and violent juvenile delinquency. The focus is on increasing the number of targeted offenders who are successfully reintegrated into their communities following an extended period of secure confinement in a state training school, correctional facility, or other institution for adolescents.

➤ NIJ has funded nine evaluations of reentry programs. Most evaluations are ongoing and have not yet produced results. The largest research project is a multisite evaluation of the Serious and Violent Offender Initiative, which is a collaborative federal effort to improve reentry outcomes.
PROJECT SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS/ANTI-GANG INITIATIVE

Created in 2001 by President Bush, Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) links federal, state, and local law enforcement, prosecutors, and community leaders in a comprehensive strategy of deterrence, prevention, and prosecution of gun crime. Anti-gang funding has been combined with PSN funding to more effectively coordinate the two efforts. Technical assistance to sites and support for research and analysis is made possible by NIJ through grants to the University of Michigan.

Accomplishments in 2006 include the following:

➤ In FY 2006, BJA awarded $30 million to support local PSN partners in their anti-gang efforts.

➤ BJA is directly involved in overall grant management and enforcement and re-entry efforts falling under the Attorney General’s Six City Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative described below.

YOUTH GANG REDUCTION PROGRAM

In February 2006, former Attorney General Alberto R. Gonzales announced the DOJ initiative to combat gangs. The strategy is twofold: (1) prioritize prevention and (2) ensure robust enforcement policies. OJJDP took the lead in launching and supporting the gang prevention strategy. OJJDP youth gang reduction initiatives during 2006 are described below.

Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative

In 2006, the Attorney General launched the Six City Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative. This initiative has significantly enhanced resources and coordination of gang enforcement, prevention, and reentry efforts in the targeted areas of Los Angeles, CA; Dallas/Ft. Worth, TX; Tampa, FL; Cleveland, OH; Milwaukee, WI; and the 222 corridor north of Philadelphia, PA. Coordinated through U.S. Attorneys’ offices, this initiative emphasizes the importance of federal and state agencies working with local partners to coordinate anti-gang strategies. The program has helped U.S. Attorneys’ offices expand their focus beyond enforcement-only anti-gang strategies. OJJDP provided $6 million (out of a total of $15 million for the initiative) to support gang prevention activities in the six sites. OJJDP provides technical assistance to this initiative through the National Youth Gang Center with resources beyond the direct program grants. In 2007, four additional cities are being added.
Gang Prevention Resources for U.S. Attorneys

The Attorney General directed all U.S. Attorneys to sponsor gang prevention summits in their districts during 2006. OJJDP worked with the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, the Executive Office of U.S. Attorneys, and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) office to develop guidelines for these summits and make resources available to support this effort. In addition to taking the lead in developing resource materials and guidelines, OJJDP provided subject matter experts to deliver onsite presentations at summits in California, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin. These summits brought together more than 10,000 local enforcement and prevention partners from across the country to better understand youth gangs and coordinate local gang prevention efforts.

In partnership with the COPS Office, OJJDP delivered a two-part interactive teleconference (satellite and Web cast) entitled “Preventing Gangs in Our Communities” that featured national gang prevention experts and was viewed live by more than 3,000 viewers. Many communities organized town hall meetings or summits around the teleconference and used it as a starting point for further discussion and coordination of local challenges.
The teleconference has been downloaded thousands of times since the initial airing in June 2006.


**Ongoing Anti-Gang Projects**

OJJDP continues to support anti-gang demonstration projects including the Gang Reduction Program and the Gang-Free Schools and Communities Program. Both of these programs feature targeted applications of multiple anti-gang strategies led by multidisciplinary local partnerships. Independent evaluations on each program will be completed by the end of 2007. Program sites for the Gang Reduction Program are in Los Angeles, CA; Milwaukee, WI; Richmond, VA; and North Miami Beach, FL. Program sites for the Gang-Free Schools and Communities program are in Houston, TX, and Pittsburgh, PA.

In Los Angeles, one of the OJJDP-supported programs is Homeboy Industries, which is a job training program that educates, trains, and finds jobs for at-risk and gang-involved youth.

OJJDP continues to work with the National Youth Gang Center (NYGC). NYGC was launched in 1995 to expand and maintain the body of critical knowledge about youth gangs and effective responses to them. NYGC provides training and technical assistance on community-based responses to youth gangs. This includes assistance to OJJDP-funded demonstration programs. Another of NYGC’s major activities is to conduct the National Youth Gang Survey, an annual survey of police and sheriffs’ departments to determine the extent of the nation’s gang problem. The table below, from the OJJDP Fact Sheet, *Highlights of the 2004 National Youth Gang Survey*, summarizes law enforcement agency reports of gang problems, 1996–2004.

### Law Enforcement Agency Reports of Gang Problems 1996–2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural counties</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller cities (population 2,500</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to 49,999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban counties</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger cities (population 50,000</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: To account for regular year-to-year fluctuations, 3-year averages are shown.*
Support for International Gang Prevention

OJJDP is supporting increased federal involvement and interest in anti-gang efforts that cross international lines. In coordination with other DOJ components, the State Department, and the U.S. Agency for International Development, OJJDP is involved in the International Anti-Gang Task Force and interagency working group. As part of this effort, OJJDP staff provided onsite training and technical support on gang prevention in El Salvador and Jamaica in 2006. This included delivering training on gang prevention at the International Law Enforcement Academy in San Salvador, El Salvador, to law enforcement personnel from El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Mexico, Panama, and Belize.

Gang Resistance Education and Training Program

An important component of DOJ’s anti-gang strategy is the Gang Resistance Education And Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program, a school-based, law enforcement officer-instructed classroom curriculum. The program’s primary objective is prevention and is intended as an immunization against delinquency, youth violence, and gang membership.

In FY 2006, more than 140 local law enforcement agencies received nearly $16 million in funding to implement the G.R.E.A.T. program, administered by BJA. These local programs are now serving tens of thousands of youth in high-risk rural, suburban, and urban communities nationwide, helping them to reduce their crime victimization, increase their negative views about gangs, and improve their attitudes towards police. In September 2006, BJA staff delivered eight grant-writing workshops to more than 250 agency representatives interested in applying for FY 2007 G.R.E.A.T. grants.

In FY 2006, NIJ awarded $2.5 million to the University of Missouri-St. Louis to evaluate the effectiveness of G.R.E.A.T.’s revised curriculum.
Congress established OJJDP and created the Formula Grants program in 1974 to support local and state efforts to prevent delinquency and improve the juvenile justice system. The Formula Grants program provides funds directly to states to help them implement comprehensive juvenile justice plans based on detailed studies of needs in their jurisdictions.

To receive a formula grant from OJJDP, a state must address four core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act. It must

- deinstitutionalize status offenders (DSO), separate juveniles from adults in secure facilities (separation)
- remove juveniles from adult jails and lockups (jail removal)
- reduce disproportionate minority contact (DMC) with the juvenile justice system

These core requirements were designed to ensure the appropriate treatment of juvenile offenders within the juvenile justice system.

All states that receive full federal Formula Grants allocations use the funds to maintain compliance with the JJDP Act core requirements and to implement prevention and intervention programming for juveniles. States that are out of compliance with any one of the core requirements lose a portion of their federal funding and must use a portion of the remainder to achieve compliance. OJJDP provides extensive training and technical assistance to support state compliance activities. This has influenced all 55 states and territories participating with the JJDP Act in making significant progress toward achieving compliance with the four core requirements.

OJJDP has seen a growing momentum and focus on DMC at the state and local levels. For example, during FY 2006, the number of states that named DMC coordinators increased (35, up from 32 in FY 2005), as did the number of states (32, up from 21 in FY 2005) with targeted local DMC reduction sites. Thirty-eight states have DMC subcommittees under their state advisory groups. This progress can be attributed in part to OJJDP-sponsored training and technical assistance efforts, which emphasize the importance of designating state and local DMC coordinators, forming DMC subcommittees for enhanced and sustained state and local leadership, and selecting appropriate local sites to invest DMC reduction resources and efforts. OJJDP’s review of the states’ latest comprehensive 3-year plans indicates that all states but two are in compliance with the DMC core requirement.

Other DMC accomplishments in FY 2006 include the following:

- OJJDP published the third edition of its DMC Technical Assistance Manual that
provides the latest information and tools for understanding and addressing minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system. The online manual includes links to reference materials, is updated regularly, and is widely used.

➤ OJJDP completed the development of its Web-based DMC Data Entry System, a companion tool to the DMC Technical Assistance Manual. This system serves as an online repository for all DMC data collected by states and targeted DMC reduction sites. Using this system, OJJDP, states, and localities can track DMC trends and produce other useful reports.


➤ In 2006, the Youth Law Center, which received a congressional earmark grant, worked to examine and reduce DMC among primarily Hispanic youth in two targeted sites: Reno, NV, and Travis County, TX. OJJDP will share lessons learned in this project with other DMC-reduction efforts for Hispanic youth.

**TITLE V COMMUNITY PREVENTION GRANTS PROGRAM**

The Title V Community Prevention Grants Program supports a comprehensive research-based approach to delinquency prevention among youth through reducing the risk factors and enhancing the protective factors in their schools, communities, and families. Extensive research has shown that risk factors are associated with the likelihood that a youth will engage in delinquent behavior, and protective factors help prevent or reduce that likelihood. The Title V program provides funds that enable communities to address these factors in a locally suitable and sustainable manner. The program encourages local leaders to initiate multidisciplinary needs assessments of the risks and resources in their communities and develop locally relevant prevention plans that simultaneously draw on community resources, address local gaps in services or risks, and employ evidence-based or theory-driven strategies.

In FY 2006, OJJDP continued to work with states to collect quantitative performance measurement data. A preliminary analysis of this data showed that in FY 2006, Title V programs served more than 340,000 youth, of which 86 percent completed program requirements. Twenty-nine percent of the 545 local Title V programs implemented were evidence based. These local programs addressed a wide range of youth behaviors. Overall, 50 percent of youth participants exhibited the desired behavioral changes in such areas as lessened antisocial behavior (72 percent), reduced substance abuse (57 percent), improved family relationships (54 percent), and elevated grade point average (44 percent). The ultimate outcome measure for delinquency prevention programs is a low offending rate among program participants. In FY 2006, the offending rate for Title V program participants was 7 percent.

**JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM**

The Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) program provides funds to the states to support programs that promote juvenile offender and system-based accountability. For the juvenile offender, accountability means facing individualized consequences through which he or she is made aware of and held responsible for the loss, damage, or injury that the victim experiences. For the juvenile justice system, accountability means developing an increased capacity to enhance youth competence, to efficiently track juveniles through the system, and to provide options such as restitution, community service, victim-offender mediation, and other restorative justice sanctions. States can use their JABG funds for 17
Juvenile Justice purpose areas, including developing graduated sanctions for juveniles, hiring additional prosecutors, and establishing juvenile drug and gun courts. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories of American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, are eligible for JABG funds. The program’s FY 2006 appropriation was $50 million.

In FY 2006, OJJDP offered two trainings to the field: (1) the Gender-Responsive Programming (GRP) for Girls II and (2) the Mental Health Service Delivery for Youth in Detention/Corrections. The GRP curriculum addressed girls’ unique experiences as they relate to race, culture, gender, development (emotional/intellectual/physical), economic status, and physical appearance. The training focused on system integration, innovative and evidence-based practices, assessment, and outcome measurement. The Mental Health Service Delivery for Youth in Detention/Corrections training concentrated on how to effectively treat youth in custody who suffer from mental illness. The training focused on screening, assessment, treatment, and system integration.

**ENFORCING UNDERAGE DRINKING LAWS PROGRAM**

OJJDP has administered the Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL) Program since Congress created the $25 million annual program in 1998. Through grants, training, and technical assistance, the EUDL program helps states, territories, and the District of Columbia prevent underage drinking by emphasizing law enforcement. With the distinction of being the only federal initiative engaged exclusively in underage drinking prevention, the program is implemented at state and local levels through a governor-designated agency in each of the 50 states. As a result, OJJDP works with 50 multidisciplinary agencies and the District of Columbia creating an opportunity for diverse, multilevel collaboration on a single issue.

EUDL’s four programmatic elements are:

- annual block grants to each state and the District of Columbia to fund the establishment of a statewide task force and innovative programs to prevent underage drinking, with a strong emphasis on law enforcement
- discretionary grants to selected states to fund the demonstration of best or most promising strategies at the local level
- training and technical assistance to guide states and communities in their efforts
- a national evaluation of the EUDL program

Across the nation, states and local communities engage in environmental strategies to address underage drinking. Many successes have been reported since the beginning of the EUDL initiative. Here are brief examples:
➤ Tennessee. Through its EUDL grant, Knoxville’s Metro Drug Commission (MDC) formed the Underage Drinking Policy Panel, comprised of 25 of the city’s elected officials, law enforcement, legal counsel, juvenile court judges, and the Knox County District Attorney General. The panel uses Knoxville’s MDC EUDL Marketing Campaign as part of a community-wide prevention strategy to discourage underage alcohol use and enforce underage drinking laws. As a result of the marketing efforts, compliance checks have increased 10 percent, beer packets are given to new permit holders at each City and County Beer Board meeting, and 150 businesses cited for selling alcohol to minors were sent free prevention materials.

➤ Colorado. Rates of retailer noncompliance with minimum legal drinking age laws in Colorado plummeted from 47 percent in 2004 to 18 percent in 2006, a 29 percent improvement over a 2-year period. These results may be attributed to a comprehensive approach to reducing commercial availability of alcohol to underage youth. The approach was implemented by the Colorado Liquor Enforcement Division, which has primary responsibility for the enforcement of liquor laws and regulations for the state and administers the EUDL grant.

➤ Michigan. The Downriver Party Patrol Task Force teamed with the Wayne County Sheriff’s Department to address underage drinking issues on the Detroit River and several small islands bordering Canada and to increase its enforcement and educational activities. The task force also set up a successful tip line for residents to report underage drinking parties. Since the program’s inception, Downriver has made more than 500 minor-in-possession arrests. In addition, the program has significantly reduced the number of large teenage parties in the area.

➤ Mississippi. Agents of the Office of Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC) participated in enforcement efforts to address underage drinking problems at universities, especially at sporting events. This initiative resulted in a 47-percent increase in alcohol-related arrests. About 25 percent of the individuals younger than 21 who were arrested for an alcohol-related violation possessed a fake ID. Additionally, ABC’s increased enforcement has resulted in increased safety, not only for those younger than 21, but for the community at large.

The Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center (UDETC) provides science-based, practical, and effective training and technical assistance services to the states in support of their efforts to reduce underage drinking. As of 2006, UDETC has conducted 102 trainings reaching more than 6,300 individuals in 32 states, created a Web site that has received more than 4 million hits, and disseminated nearly 8,000 documents across the country.

Tribal Youth Program

OJJDP’s Tribal Youth Program (TYP) supports and enhances tribal efforts to prevent and control delinquency and improve the juvenile justice system for American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) youth. Many AI/AN communities face chronic under funding for their justice systems, lack access to meaningful training for law enforcement and justice personnel, and lack comprehensive programs that focus on preventing juvenile delinquency, providing intervention services, and imposing appropriate sanctions. Furthermore, while violent crime arrest rates have declined throughout the United States, they continue to rise in tribal communities. According to BJS data, American Indians experience violent crime at a rate twice that of the general population. Of particular concern to tribes and OJJDP is the increasing number of violent crimes committed by and against tribal youth. OJJDP is collaborating with tribes on a number of programs to address this disturbing trend.
Since FY 1999, OJJDP has awarded 294 grants to 173 federally recognized tribes to help them develop and implement culturally sensitive programs in two of the five following categories:

- Prevention services to impact risk factors for delinquency, including risk factor identification, anti-gang education, youth gun violence reduction programs, truancy prevention programs, school dropout prevention programs, afterschool programs, and/or parenting education programs

- Interventions for court-involved tribal youth, including graduated sanctions, restitution, diversion, home detention, foster and shelter care, and mentoring

- Improvements to the tribal juvenile justice system, including developing and implementing indigenous justice strategies, tribal juvenile codes, tribal youth courts, intake assessments, advocacy programs, and gender-specific programming, and enhancing juvenile probation services and reentry programs

- Alcohol and drug abuse prevention programs, including drug and alcohol education, drug testing, and screening

- Mental health program services, including development of comprehensive screening tools, crisis intervention, intake assessments, therapeutic services, counseling services for co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders, drug testing, and referral and placement services

OJJDP convened focus groups in 2005 to identify significant tribal youth issues, the role of government in addressing those issues, and ways that TYP can support tribes in responding to areas of concern. As a result of these focus groups, in its FY 2006 TYP solicitation, OJJDP offered a 4-year grant period, which included a planning year. OJJDP provided extensive training to the FY 2006 grant recipients in completing their comprehensive strategic plans, including training that focuses on successful community planning through an innovative approach known as the Community Analysis Process for Planning Strategies.

During FY 2006, OJJDP condensed regional TYP training into a preconference and tribal track as part of the 2006 OJJDP National Conference. In keeping with OJJDP’s support of community-based partnerships, the training was designed to help tribes build on their proven strengths and life experiences as a way of enhancing their capacity to develop and maintain programs that are valuable to their communities. OJJDP also provided orientation and training to 25 new grantees who received FY 2006 funding. Training topics for 2006 included grants management, evaluations, community planning strategies, and training and technical assistance opportunities.

TYP has joined other OJP programs in supporting the “One OJP” Tribal Justice and Safety Training and Technical Assistance Sessions. This model initiative advances the Assistant Attorney General’s plan to provide training and information on OJP/OJJDP tribal and general resources to tribal leaders, tribal administrators, and other tribal program managers/grant writers. TYP has coordinated its regional training schedule to coincide with One OJP sessions. The first of the One OJP sessions included TYP workshops that highlighted the work of TYP and addressed juvenile justice priorities related to public safety in Indian Country and information on the funding cycle and resources available.

TYP staff provided cultural sensitivity training for OJJDP staff in 2006. The workshop was designed to teach specific skills to representatives of the
federal government who oversee Native American programs. The training provided the participants with the opportunity to examine the complex issues regarding providing service to diverse tribal communities in a culturally sensitive manner.

➤ OJJDP continued to support the Tribal Juvenile Accountability Discretionary Grant (JADG) program, which funds program reforms that hold AI/AN youth accountable for their offenses. OJJDP made three awards of $300,000 each in 2006.

OJJDP also initiated evaluations and research projects related to several tribal programs in FY 2006. For further details, please refer to chapter 10 under the Evaluation of Juvenile Justice Programs section.

**MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN**

**AMBER Alert**

AMBER Alert is a voluntary partnership between law enforcement agencies and broadcasters to activate an urgent bulletin in the most serious child abduction cases. AMBER, which stands for America’s Missing: Broadcast Emergency Response, exemplifies how local partnerships, such as those between the media and law enforcement agencies, can make a difference when a child has been abducted. In addition to AMBER Alert plans in all 50 states, 28 regional and 40 local plans also have been established.

➤ The commemorative AMBER Alert stamp shown below was issued in honor of Missing Children’s Day 2006.

➤ The fourth National Training Conference on AMBER Alert was held in July 2006 in Albuquerque, NM. A primary goal of the conference was to involve representatives from Indian Country, law enforcement, and community organizations in Mexico and Canada to discuss best practices for neighboring jurisdictions to work together to develop a seamless AMBER Alert network.

➤ In FY 2006, 85 children were recovered as a result of the AMBER Alert program.

➤ From the program’s inception in 1998, until June 2006, 278 children have been safely recovered as a result of the AMBER Alert program.

➤ In 2006, the AMBER Alert program released the publication, *AMBER Alert: Best Practices Guide for Public Information Officers.*
In 2006, under a cooperative agreement with Fox Valley Technical College, 10 “Investigative Strategies for Missing and Abducted Children” training programs were provided to 492 participants across the country. This 4 1/2-day training program was designed for experienced investigative professionals. The course focused on legal issues, forensic evidence collection, computer forensics, interviewing and interrogation, cold cases, human trafficking, information use, and resource sharing.

OJP launched a Child Abduction Response Team (CART) Initiative in November 2005 in order to provide a quick response to incidents of missing and abducted children. The teams include regional law enforcement investigators, forensic experts, AMBER Alert coordinators, search and rescue professionals, policy makers, crime intelligence analysts, victim service providers, and other interagency resources. CART can be used for all missing children's cases, can be deployed as part of an AMBER Alert, or when a child is abducted or missing, but the abduction/disappearance does not meet the AMBER Alert criteria.

In 2006, under a cooperative agreement with Fox Valley Technical College, 11 CART training programs were provided to 620 participants across the country. Participating agencies were encouraged to review existing policies and practices and ways interagency and regional cooperation could improve missing and abducted children casework. Participants developed an outline for a memorandum of understanding that gave team members knowledge of the numerous regional resources that may be required during an investigation.

Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program/Project Safe Childhood

In 1998, OJJDP created the Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force to encourage communities to adopt a multidisciplinary, multijurisdictional response to technology-facilitated child sexual victimization, including online enticement and the proliferation of child pornography. This program is a network of 46 multi-agency, multijurisdictional Regional Task Forces that receive funding to provide nationwide coverage in the investigation and prosecution of ICAC cases. Over 1,300 agencies are affiliated with the task forces.

ICAC Task Forces are a key part of the Attorney General's Project Safe Childhood campaign to protect our children as they navigate the Internet. The campaign was announced in February 2006. Other key campaign components are U.S. Attorneys and partners such as federal law enforcement agencies and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

- In FY 2006, ICAC Task Forces reviewed more than 18,000 complaints of technology facilitated child sexual exploitation and arrested and successfully prosecuted over 2,000 individuals. This brings the ICAC arrest total to more than 8,000 since 1998.
- ICAC Task Forces investigated 5,416 cases of Internet predator traveler/child enticement in 2006.
- ICAC Task Forces provided 6,784 instances of technical assistance to law enforcement agencies investigating computer-facilitated crimes against children in 2006.
- ICAC Task Forces identified 1,121 exploited child victims in pornographic images in 2006. Over 15,000 persons, including law enforcement and prosecutors, were trained during 2006. ICAC developed two new courses for experienced investigators and prosecutors.
in FY 2006, including an introductory course for probation and parole services officers who monitor sex offenders and undercover operations in peer-to-peer file sharing environments. In FY 2006, ICAC made available training for Unit Commanders and a course on Investigating Wireless Technologies.

➤ One undercover operation led to the identification of nearly 10 million transactions of child pornography among 3.2 million Internet provider addresses in the trafficking of child sexual abuse images worldwide. The operation involves positioning 800 investigators in 18 countries, including many European Union countries, to identify criminal conduct originating from 200 countries.

These achievements demonstrate the increasing impact the ICAC Task Forces have on assisting federal, state, and local law enforcement in effectively addressing technology-facilitated child exploitation cases.

National Center for Missing and Exploited Children

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) is a private, nonprofit corporation that provides 24-hour services and support to families, children, law enforcement agencies, and federal agencies on all aspects involving missing and exploited children. In partnership with OJJDP, NCMEC supports law enforcement at the federal, state, and local levels in cases involving missing and exploited children. NCMEC operates a 24-hour hotline (800–843–5678 or 800–THE–LOST) that has received over two million calls.

➤ During FY 2006, NCMEC answered 131,085 calls on its hotline and assisted in the recovery of 10,754 children.

➤ Both private citizen and Internet service providers use NCMEC’s online reporting system, www.cybertipline.com, to report child pornography on the Internet. Leads are referred to law enforcement for investigation. NCMEC’s CyberTipline handled 69,576 reports of child exploitation in FY 2006.

➤ The Child Victim Identification Program (CVIP) has been used to identify more than 260 children in pornographic images and videos. CVIP hosted the “Victim Identification Lab” at the Dallas Crimes Against Children Conference in August 2006 and the Project Safe Childhood National Conference in December 2006.

➤ In FY 2006, 166 newly identified series were added to the Child Recognition and Identification System.

➤ NCMEC works with the private sector to distribute photos of missing children. During FY 2006, 219 children were found as a result of the photo distribution program.

➤ NCMEC uses computer technology and graphic artists to age progress photos of long-term missing children. To date, over 740 missing children whose photographs were computer age enhanced have been located, and 20 unidentified deceased children have been identified as a result of NCMEC’s imaging specialists’ work on facial reconstructions.
In 2006, Team Adam, a group of retired law enforcement officers with experience working missing children cases, was available to assist local law enforcement at NCMEC’s expense. During FY 2006, Team Adam members participated in 57 cases, 42 of which resulted in the recovery of the missing child.

In 2006, Team HOPE, a group of parent volunteers who have experienced a child abduction, was available to assist a family faced with the tragedy of child abduction, at NCMEC’s expense. In FY 2006, Team Hope members provided assistance in 3,791 missing child cases.

The Victim Reunification Travel program returns American child victims of international parental abduction from overseas and facilitates the reunification process. In FY 2006, the program made 15 awards for international travel to the victim parent, guardian, or custodial grandparent. See chapter 7 for additional information about this program.

At the request of the Department of Justice, NCMEC rapidly created the Katrina Missing Persons Hotline, a call center equipped with 30 telephones and 160 trained, certified Project ALERT volunteers, to take reports of missing or displaced persons from those areas hit by the hurricane. Since beginning operations in September 2005, the hotline has handled more than 32,000 calls and received more than 5,100 reports of missing or displaced children. One hundred percent of missing or displaced child cases were resolved by spring 2006.

In partnership with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and Fox Valley Technical College, OJJDP supported more than 170 training programs for law enforcement in 2006. More than 7,200 law enforcement officers and prosecutors participated in specialized courses including: “Child Abuse and Exploitation Investigative Techniques,” “Responding to Missing and Abducted Children,” and “Protecting Children Online for Prosecutors.”

Preventing the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children

The commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) refers to crimes of a sexual nature committed against juvenile victims primarily or entirely for financial or other economic reasons. OJJDP funds several programs to combat CSEC.

OJJDP funds anti-CSEC demonstration sites in New York City and Atlanta. Atlanta focuses on intervention and service delivery strategies to divert victims from the pimps who exploit them. New York focuses on partnerships between police and service providers and innovative prosecution strategies used by the district attorney’s offices. OJJDP manages the initiative under a cooperative agreement with the Office of the Mayor in New York and with the Fulton Juvenile Justice Fund in Atlanta.

OJJDP has committed to working with the pilot sites for 5 years. The agency’s primary goal for the initiative is to support collaborative work between law enforcement, the courts, and practitioners who work with youth to improve the identification and delivery of services, the prevention of future exploitation, and the investigation and prosecution of the adults who exploit them. In 2004, Atlanta and New York City received funds for the first year of the initiative to plan their strategies. In 2006, the two cities received supplemental funding to implement a number of policy and procedural changes.

In November 2006, OJJDP awarded a grant to the Salvation Army to develop a national, multisite training and technical assistance program to assist communities in aligning investigative, prosecutorial, and victim service resources to reduce the impact of CSEC in five select communities: Atlantic City, NJ; Chicago, IL; Denver, CO; San Diego, CA; and Washington, DC. The Salvation Army is currently developing the curriculum.
Other agencies OJJDP supports that serve children who are commercially sexually exploited include Standing Against Global Exploitation (SAGE) in San Francisco, CA, which provides outreach and comprehensive health, legal, advocacy, and other support services to these youth; and the Paul & Lisa Program, headquartered in Westbrook, CT, which helps children, teens, and women escape from prostitution and establish positive and productive lives. OJJDP awarded a grant to SAGE to provide training and technical assistance to community-based organizations that seek to incorporate services for commercially sexually exploited children into the other services they provide. In 2006, SAGE trained staff from 28 organizations and made presentations at five large conferences.

In 2006, OJJDP awarded four grants for research on CSEC:

- The University of New Hampshire Crimes Against Children Research Center will collect data on the numbers and characteristics of Internet-facilitated CSEC to determine how offenders use Internet technology to perpetrate CSEC crimes.

- The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority will work to expand the understanding of CSEC, particularly the prostitution of children.

- The University of Massachusetts Lowell will attempt to understand the perspective of CSEC victims, identify factors contributing to the problem's continuation and escalation, and determine factors impeding an individual from leaving exploitative situations.

- The Urban Institute will conduct a longitudinal analysis of federal prosecutions since the passage of the Trafficking of Persons Protection Act of 2000 and will focus on the influences of those prosecutions on both CSEC service providers and victims.

**Project ChildSafe**

A component of Project Safe Neighborhoods, Project ChildSafe supports efforts to reduce gun crime. This nationwide firearms safety program teaches firearms owners how to properly store and safely handle their weapons. Through the distribution of gunlocks and gun safety information, Project ChildSafe works to prevent children from accessing loaded firearms in the home. BJA partners with the National Shooting Sports Foundation, which administers the program and works with governors and local officials to raise awareness of firearms safety and promotes the availability of safety kits.

In FY 2006, Project ChildSafe reached its goal by distributing, beginning in 2003, more than 35 million safety kits to gun owners in all 50 states and five U.S. territories. Project ChildSafe continues to help its law enforcement partners promote firearms safety by providing educational materials and support services.
Crime Victim Compensation

OVC awards funding authorized by the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) of 1984 to state crime victim compensation programs in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and Puerto Rico to cover crime-related expenses incurred by citizens who suffer physical and psychological injuries as a result of crime. These programs reimburse victims of crime for expenses such as medical costs, mental health counseling, funeral and burial costs, and lost wages or loss of support.

Although each state compensation program is administered independently, most programs have similar eligibility requirements and offer comparable benefits. Maximum awards generally range from $10,000 to $50,000 with the median at $25,000. The average payout per claim is approximately $3,000. Compensation is paid only when other financial resources, such as private insurance and offender restitution, do not cover the loss. Some expenses are not covered by most compensation programs, including theft, damage, and property loss.

In Fiscal Year 2006, OVC awarded $143,418,000 to state crime victim compensation programs. Those programs paid 143,005 claims for compensation with a total payout of $423,336,063 from state and federal funding sources.

Crime Victim Assistance

OVC awards VOCA funds to states to support community-based organizations that serve crime victims. Some 5,100 grants are made annually to domestic violence shelters, rape crisis centers, child abuse programs, and victim service units in law enforcement agencies, prosecutors’ offices, hospitals, and social service agencies. These programs provide services, including crisis intervention, counseling, emergency shelter, criminal justice advocacy, and emergency transportation. States and territories are required to give priority to programs serving victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and child abuse. Additional funds must be set aside for underserved victims, such as survivors of homicide victims and victims of drunk drivers. During FY 2006, funded programs provided assistance to 3,610,492 victims of crime with 36.55 percent receiving domestic violence services. Nationwide, 1,777 VOCA grants were awarded in the amount of $66,480,296 to serve victims of domestic violence.

Support for Victims of Terrorism, Mass Violence, and Other International Crimes

OVC is authorized under the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to provide assistance to victims of
terrorism or mass violence occurring within and outside of the United States. This is done through three principal programs administered by OVC:

➤ The Antiterrorism and Emergency Assistance Program (AEAP) provides grants to states, victim service organizations, public agencies, and nongovernmental organizations to provide emergency relief, including crisis response efforts, assistance, training and technical assistance, and ongoing assistance. Under AEAP, communities responding to incidents of terrorism or mass violence could be eligible to receive a crisis response grant, a consequence management grant, a criminal justice support grant, a crime victim compensation supplemental grant (only state crime victim compensation programs are eligible), or training and technical assistance via OVC’s Training and Technical Assistance Center. Funding may be used for a range of services to victims, including crisis counseling, emergency transportation, criminal justice advocacy, and the coordination of services and assistance within affected communities.

In FY 2006, OVC provided crisis response and compensation support via AEAP to two jurisdictions in response to the shooting and carjacking that originated at the Fulton County Courthouse in Atlanta, Georgia, and the school shooting at Red Lake, Minnesota. Funds supplemented resources from the state’s crime victim compensation program to cover out-of-pocket costs incurred by victims and victim family members for mental health counseling, lost wages, medical care, and funeral and burial costs, and to support mental health counseling services for the victims and witnesses. As a result of these efforts, nearly 50 victims received assistance.

➤ Over the years, hundreds of U.S. nationals, officers, and employees of the U.S. Government have been killed or injured in acts of international terror-

ism occurring outside the United States. These incidents of terrorism continue worldwide. Recognizing that providing assistance and support to these victims presents a number of challenges and obstacles, Congress amended the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 by authorizing an International Terrorism Victim Expense Reimbursement Program (ITVERP) so that victims of acts of terrorism that occur outside the United States may receive reimbursement for associated expenses. ITVERP became operational in October 2006, and OVC received its first requests for assistance.

Prior to implementation, OVC submitted the first ITVERP Report to Congress in February 2006. The report captures the challenges and obstacles encountered during the development of ITVERP and discusses the mechanisms for providing interim emergency assistance to victims while program regulations were being finalized.

In conjunction with the implementation of ITVERP, OVC increased outreach efforts to government agencies and the public. Informational materials and briefings on ITVERP were given to the Department of State and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). In September 2006, an ITVERP workshop was held at the National Training Conference for State VOCA Compensation program managers in Seattle, Washington. Within the first weeks after implementation, 252 ITVERP applications were mailed to potential claimants. Sample application packets and program materials were distributed to the U.S. Attorneys’ Offices.

➤ Before OVC began receiving claims under ITVERP, it entered into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the FBI and the Department of State that outlines the conditions and procedures to be followed by each agency in providing emergency assistance to victims of international terror-
VICTIM REUNIFICATION
TRAVEL ASSISTANCE

OVC also supports a Victim Reunification Travel Assistance program to assist the left-behind parent in cases of international child abduction. The program is funded with discretionary dollars allocated for victims of federal crime. Support under this program is provided via an interagency agreement with OJJDP and a cooperative agreement with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. In FY 2006, OVC provided assistance in 26 cases of international parental child abduction, which resulted in 27 children being reunited with their custodial parent and nine children not being reunited.

SERVICES FOR TRAFFICKING VICTIMS DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAM

OJP received funding authorized by the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 and amended by the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Acts of 2003 and 2005 to address the problem of human trafficking in the United States. All efforts supported by this program must address severe forms of trafficking, defined as (a) sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such an act has not attained 18 years of age; or (b) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjecting to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery.

OJP tasked OVC and BJA with developing a comprehensive, coordinated effort to combat human trafficking and respond to the victims of this heinous crime. Building on accomplishments on this front in FY 2005, the two bureaus continued to work collaboratively to administer the Services for Trafficking Victims Discretionary Grant Program. OVC and BJA released a joint solicitation in April 2006. BJA works with state and local law enforcement agencies to organize human trafficking task forces so that such agencies can better identify victims of human trafficking, proactively investigate businesses where human trafficking might be occurring, conduct local public awareness campaigns, and work collaboratively with trafficking victim service providers, federal investigative agencies, and U.S. Attorneys to rescue victims of trafficking and prosecute traffickers. OVC works with federal, state, and local government agencies and private nonprofit organizations to develop comprehensive and specialized services and assistance, primarily to precertified human trafficking victims. The strategy developed involves a three-pronged approach—establishing multidisciplinary task forces, developing a comprehensive service network, and coordinating efforts with the Department’s Office of Overseas Prosecutorial Development, Assistance and Training and the Criminal Division of the Department.

By the end of FY 2006, BJA funded 42 multidisciplinary Law Enforcement Anti-Trafficking Task Forces, and OVC provided funding to 30 new and continuation projects to work collaboratively with law enforcement task forces funded by BJA, ensuring the provision of comprehensive services to victims of human trafficking.
This coordination effort across the Department is the key to the successful investigation and prosecution of traffickers, which contributed to a 600 percent increase in trafficking prosecutions. Highlights of these joint efforts during FY 2006 include the following:

➤ In FY 2006, BJA awarded nearly $4.4 million to 10 jurisdictions in 8 states and territories to support Human Trafficking Task Forces. Funding of up to $450,000 was provided to each jurisdiction for 3 years to work collaboratively with U.S. Attorneys, federal law enforcement, and victim services agencies to rescue victims of human trafficking and prosecute traffickers. This brought the total number of BJA-supported task forces to 42 nationwide.

➤ Supplemental trafficking victim services program funding was provided to 15 programs and 15 new comprehensive service projects, allowing all 42 human trafficking task forces to have OVC-funded trafficking victim services.

➤ The Human Trafficking Train-the-Trainer program reached 1,577 law enforcement trainers from six Regional Community Policing Institutes, administered by DOJ’s Office of Community Oriented Policing Services and supported by BJA.

➤ Since the inception of the program in 2003, through June 30, 2006, OVC grantees have provided services to 1,529 trafficking victims and have trained more than 65,000 practitioners, including law enforcement officials, prosecutors, victim service providers, medical and mental health practitioners, clergy, and others, such as students, teachers, and business leaders.
➤ Seventeen briefings on human trafficking victim issues and the OJP trafficking grant program were provided to international visitors from October 2005 through January 2007.

➤ OVC continued to provide technical assistance to its grantees through its grantee, Safe Horizons, and the OVC Training and Technical Assistance Center, including monthly conference calls with grantees.

➤ BJA helped plan and facilitate OJP’s first Human Trafficking Conference, held in New Orleans, Louisiana, in October 2006. The conference brought together a diverse audience, including law enforcement officers, victim advocates, justice professionals, and faith- and community-based providers, to discuss the complex issues surrounding human trafficking and collaborate on strategies to help reduce and prevent crime in the future. OVC and BJA gave a joint presentation on the OJP trafficking grant program and strategy.

Children’s Justice Act

The Children’s Justice and Assistance Act (CJA) of 1986, as amended by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, authorizes funding to states to establish programs to effectively handle child abuse cases in AI/AN communities. Funding is available to develop, establish, and operate programs to improve the investigation and prosecution of child abuse cases, particularly cases of child sexual abuse. A total of $3 million is available annually to support grants to tribes and nonprofit tribal agencies through the CJA grant program. OVC has funded more than 243 grant programs since the program’s inception.

The program has made numerous systemic improvements in the handling of child abuse cases. The CJA program has enhanced coordination and collaboration between U.S. Attorneys’ Offices, the FBI, and other federal and tribal agencies; enhanced the investigation and prosecution of child abuse cases; reduced the number of child interviews, thus reducing the trauma to child abuse victims; increased the number of established and functional multidisciplinary teams and/or child protection teams; revised tribal codes and procedures to address child sexual abuse; adapted culturally sensitive services and practices into the investigation, prosecution, and overall handling of child abuse cases; and hired specialized staff to handle child abuse victim cases.

In 2006, OVC announced a competitive solicitation of the CJA program. From this announcement, 12 tribal communities received funding to establish the CJA program in their communities. Examples of proposed activities anticipated to yield promising practices among the FY 2006 CJA grant recipients include the following:

➤ The Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians will adapt the systems of care framework to enhance the delivery of services to child victims of crime. The systems of care approach will enable the coordination of services among providers at any point of entry in the system. The guiding principles of this are essential to the effective delivery of services among the providers in the Choctaw community. By implementing this approach, the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians will promote interagency collaboration, provide culturally competent services tailored to the unique needs of the child victims, and develop outcome-based interventions that are effective and can be replicated in other communities.

➤ The Kaw Nation in Oklahoma will use the child abuse needs assessment survey, a program database tracking system, and child abuse instructional curricula to enhance service delivery to child victims. These tools, developed solely for the Kaw Nation, will be used to train collaborative partners and improve the investigation, prosecution, and case management of child sexual abuse cases. The implementation of these activities will
enhance the Kaw Nation child abuse victim services delivery system and provide strategies for replication in other tribal communities.

COUNSELING FOR CRIME VICTIMS IN INDIAN COUNTRY BY FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

The high rate of crime in AI/AN communities and villages reflected in numerous studies demonstrated the need for victim assistance programs to help victims cope with and heal from crime. Many rural, remote AI/AN communities are impoverished and isolated, and they lack victim assistance services. Crime victims, like others in crisis, frequently turn to spiritual leaders for support in times of need. Although members of the clergy, spiritual leaders, and traditional healers are often experienced with issues arising from a range of social justice problems, such as poverty, homelessness, and drug abuse, they are frequently not familiar with the particular dynamics of crime victimization. Victim assistance programs bring the knowledge and practical resources for responding to the immediate needs of victims, but they might not be able to address the profound spiritual crisis brought on by a criminal act.

Since 2004, OVC has supported the implementation of counseling and faith-based services in Indian Country. In January 2006, OVC announced the continuation of faith-based funding support for all of the FY 2004 Counseling for Crime Victims in Indian County by Faith-Based Organizations (CCVIC/FBO) grantees. These organizations, which serve tribal communities in Alaska, Montana, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and Washington state, continued to make great strides in the effort to enhance collaborations between victim services and the faith-based communities. These strong partnerships strengthen the quality of service delivery to crime victims in Indian Country. Examples of promising practices among these grantees include the following:

➢ Through collaboration and training, the Sitkans Against Family Violence shelter (SAFV) staff have enhanced collaborations with the faith community. Prior to this award, the shelter had no working relationship with any of the 25 churches in Sitka. SAFV has attended the Sitka Ministerial Association Meeting to discuss domestic violence and the impact of these crimes on children. SAFV also has conducted training for church clergy on effective strategies for providing services to crime victims using nationally renowned trainers. More recently, the SAFV has gained a liaison from the ministerial association that participates in its domestic violence task force meetings.

➢ The Tundra Women's Coalition (TWC) in Arkansas has been able to provide support, training, and technical assistance to faith-based organizations, spiritual leaders, and traditional healers to enhance its provision of counseling services to crime victims. Prior to receiving the grant, TWC encountered numerous barriers to collaborating with the faith community. The CCVIC/FBO grant facilitated the establishment of these vital relationships by providing TWC with the tools to train, educate, and collaborate with the faith community. These relationships have greatly increased the faith community’s ability to provide counseling services to crime victims. Through the CCVIC/FBO grant, TWC successfully conducted the annual faith and families’ conference. Conference attendees included all faith denominations, pastors and their spouses, church volunteers, community members, social workers, victim advocates, counselors, Indian Child Welfare Act workers, medical providers, and law enforcement.
TRIBAL VICTIM ASSISTANCE DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAM

OVC continued to fund the Tribal Victim Assistance (TVA) program to develop and improve the quality of direct services for victims of crime in AI/AN communities. AI/AN communities use funds to provide direct services to victims of crimes such as child abuse, homicide, elder abuse, driving while intoxicated, and gang violence. Direct services may include counseling, referrals, emergency services, court accompaniment, and assistance obtaining victim compensation. OVC increased funding allocated for the TVA by $1.7 million to increase the number of victim assistance programs funded as well as expand the delivery of training and technical assistance to tribal leaders.

OVC has a unique responsibility to serve all victims of crime. Further, OVC is responsible for supporting victims of federal crimes; more than 120 tribes fall under federal criminal jurisdiction, in which crimes are investigated and prosecuted by federal agencies. An additional 430 federally recognized tribes exist; however, crimes against these sovereign nations are prosecuted by tribal and state criminal justice agencies.

In FY 2006, the TVA program awarded $3.5 million to 30 tribal grant recipients across the nation. This was the first year of a 3-year grant cycle. Through a separate discretionary award, $600,000 was awarded to provide training and assistance.

VICTIM ASSISTANCE

In September 2006, the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma's grant program was responsible for the “lost child station” at the tribe’s annual festival, where an estimated 2,000 people picked up victim assistance program information. Victim advocate Vicki Perez tells the following success story.

Our program responded to a call for help from a 16-year-old Choctaw girl a few months ago. The girl had confided in a cousin that she was being sexually abused by her stepfather, but did not want to discuss this with any adults. It seems she had discussed her ordeal before but was not taken seriously by the people she trusted to help her. After much persuasion by the cousin, who had become familiar with the Choctaw Nation Victim Assistance (CNVA) program through program outreach, the young girl agreed to talk to an advocate. With the help of CNVA, Indian Child Welfare, the state child welfare program, and the court system, she was removed from the home and placed with family. The services she has received from CNVA include the following: emergency food and clothing, transportation, accompaniment to the hospital for exams, counseling, and courtroom advocacy. Although this young girl's journey is not over, she is beginning to become more involved and interactive with family, friends, and school, and will be seeking a part-time job.
technical assistance to these 30 grantees. The following is an example of the exemplary services being provided through TVA grants:

In Native American communities with a paucity of resources and unacceptably high rates of crime, TVA funds highlight victim issues and improve awareness of the significant trauma faced by victims of violent crime. The TVA program has increased the number of victims who receive comprehensive services in Indian Country, increased the number of victim advocates and victim program managers who are trained to provide high-quality services to victims, and has increased awareness of victims’ rights in Indian Country.

Victim Assistance in the Federal System

Improving the administration of and access to the justice system by crime victims was a priority of former Attorney General Alberto Gonzales. A number of collaborative efforts were supported in FY 2006 to advance victims’ rights not only at the federal level but also at the tribal, state, and local levels. OJP and its component bureaus supported this goal via a number of initiatives.

In FY 2006, OVC provided funding support to the FBI for hiring 112 full-time victim specialists to improve victim service delivery for each of the 56 FBI field offices and 25 largest resident agencies. Thirty-one of the positions assist victims in Indian Country.

The FBI victim specialists also are responsible for complying with the policies set forth in the FBI Manual of Investigative and Operational Guidelines. The FBI’s Office for Victim Assistance, whose mission is to ensure that victims of federal crimes have access to their rights, is centralizing the authority of the victim assistance program by providing fiduciary, policy and programmatic oversight, as well as training and supervision authority over the 112 victim specialists across the country. In 2006, the FBI Director established four major priorities for the victim assistance program: child victims, violent crime victims, terrorism victims, and Indian Country victims.

In 2006, the FBI opened more than 23,496 investigations with 129,274 victims identified in relation to those investigations. A total of 139,229 notifications were made. The FBI victim specialists provide specialized services to child victims, victims in Indian Country, and victims of terrorism and mass casualty. Special emphasis has been on meeting the unique and challenging needs of children and adolescents who are victims of Internet crime, prostitution, and international parental kidnapping. The FBI used emergency assistance funds for victims with urgent needs more than 74 times.

In FY 2006, OVC provided funding for 170 victim witness coordinator positions assigned to United States Attorney’s Offices (USAOs) in 93 districts across the country. These coordinators provided direct services to federal victims of crime to ensure that victims’ rights enumerated in the Attorney General Guidelines for Victim and Witness Assistance were provided to victims. Several USAO victim-witness personnel coordinate and/or participate in coalitions or local task forces against human trafficking. These task forces consist of representatives from federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies and local nongovernmental organizations. Most notably, in FYs 2005–2006, the USAO for the Eastern District of Virginia victim-witness coordinator had lead responsibility for coordinating assistance to approximately 40 family members who elected to participate in the prosecution of Zacarias Moussaoui. Massive outreach was made to family members and a toll free telephone line was created to provide critical case information and
to gather information regarding family member interest in attending the trial.

➤ OVC provided the Executive Office of U.S. Attorneys (EOUSA) with funding for training and technical assistance. For example, OVC provided $1 million to EOUSA to train federal victim-witness personnel, prosecutors, and law enforcement on how to comply with the Crime Victims’ Rights Act and the amended Attorney General Guidelines for Victim and Witness Assistance. In addition, the USAO in the Southern District of California received funding from OVC for a National Drug Endangered Children (DEC) Training Coordinator and Training program to provide multidisciplinary training to statewide and regional groups around the Nation on how to create DEC programs. This program conducted training for more than 3,000 individuals. As a result of this training, additional DEC teams and alliances have been created across the country. OVC funded six regional (covering 14 states) annual multidisciplinary conferences to train and educate victim assistance personnel, mental health professionals, and law enforcement agents who work with crime victims in Indian country. The EOUSA was involved in coordinating a number of OVC sponsored conferences, including a national symposium on victims of federal crime, human trafficking training, and training on forensic interviewing of children in Indian Country.

Crime Victims’ Rights Act and the Attorney General’s Guidelines for Victim and Witness Assistance

OVC provided discretionary funding resources to EOUSA to support training for federal prosecutors and victim-witness personnel on the requirements of the new CVRA and the revised Attorney General Guidelines for Victim and Witness Assistance. Funding was used by EOUSA to conduct training at the National Advocacy Center, to develop a training video, and to print and disseminate 9,500 copies of the guidelines to the 94 U.S. Attorneys’ Offices. OVC supported training on the CVRA and the guidelines to approximately 700 federal employees within the Department at several training events and conferences. In addition, presentations of victim-witness responsibilities have been broadcast via the Justice Television Network and a 30-minute training video for prosecutors and investigators on the Attorney General Guidelines was produced with funding support from OVC.

OVC also provided demonstration funding to the United States Attorneys Office in the Eastern District of California to support the

Department of Justice
Office of the Victims’ Rights Ombudsman

The Crime Victims’ Rights Act (CVRA) authorized in 2004 expanded rights for crime victims and directed certain actions on the part of the Department of Justice to ensure that rights are implemented and enforced. The act required that the Department establish an ombudsman to receive and investigate complaints filed by crime victims against its employees in accordance with provisions contained in the CVRA. The new office was established within the Executive Office for United States Attorneys in FY 2005. It has developed procedures to promote employee compliance with the crime victims’ rights obligations. OVC provided support to this new office by reviewing complaint forms, establishing procedures on how to file a complaint, coordinating the translation of the forms to Spanish, assisting with the conversion of the forms for posting on the Department’s Web site, and helping to identify appropriate links to nongovernmental organizations for the site. OVC also provided funding support to assist with the presentation of training for prosecutors and federal victim-witness coordinators and dissemination of information about the CVRA and the new ombudsman office.
implementation of the Crime Victims’ Rights Act. With OVC funding, the United States Attorney hired two part-time contractors who serve as lead and assistant lead intern supervisors. They work together with the victim coordinator in that office to recruit, train, and supervise a cadre of interns each semester who provide support to the victim assistance program. During FY 2006, through the efforts of the intern supervisors, the U.S. Attorney’s Office provided more than 4,000 services to victims that included providing case status information, court escort, court preparation, and assistance with victim impact statements and restitution.

National Crime Victims’ Rights Week

Each April, America recognizes National Crime Victims’ Rights Week (NCVRW), which honors victims, survivors, allied practitioners, and dedicated service providers. As a prelude to NCVRW, OVC hosts a national candlelight observance and an awards ceremony in Washington, DC, to pay tribute to crime victims and those who serve them. At the 2006 candlelight observance, OVC was honored to host Sharon Rocha, mother of murder victim Laci Peterson and unborn grandson Connor, who gave moving remarks about her tragic experience as a survivor of homicide victims and her efforts to gain passage of fetal homicide legislation. The first Ronald Wilson Reagan Public Policy Award, given to honor an individual whose work on behalf of victims has led to significant changes in pubic policy, was presented by Attorney General Gonzales to Jeffery R. Dion for his grassroots advocacy efforts that resulted in the enactment of 13 bills into law in Virginia on behalf of crime victims.

OV C produces an annual resource guide to help local communities coordinate NCVRW events tailored to their own needs. To further encourage communities to participate, OVC supported the NCVRW Community Projects Awareness Projects initiative with grants of up to $5,000 for public awareness events and activities at the local level. These funds were used for projects such as those described in the sidebar.

Millions of Americans learned about NCVRW in 2006 through a unique partnership between OVC and the U.S. Postal Inspection Service, a component of the U.S. Postal Service. Posters highlighting the theme, “Victims’ Rights: Strength in Unity,” were displayed in more...
than 11,000 post offices serving an estimated seven million customers daily. Post offices also distributed cards with national crime victims' rights organization toll free numbers and other criminal and juvenile justice resources.

NATIONAL CRIME VICTIM LAW INSTITUTE

Since the passage of the 1982 Victim and Witness Protection Act, tremendous strides have been made to enact crime victims' rights laws and improve victim services. OVC funded the National Crime Victim Law Institute (NCVLI) project to improve the capacity of private attorneys to represent victims in the enforcement of their constitutional and statutory rights in federal court. This effort clearly supports the Department’s strategic goal of upholding and defending the rights of victims as well as OJP’s mission to assist crime victims by providing national leadership in a groundbreaking area—the pro bono representation of victims of crime in the enforcement of their rights in criminal court. The aim of this project is to substantially increase pro bono representation of victims by private attorneys. At the conclusion of this multiyear demonstration program, nine viable victim legal clinics will exist and replication materials will be developed by NCVLI based on the experience of the clinic sites. In addition, hundreds of law students and attorneys will have been educated on victims’ rights issues. OVC will help promote the concept of victim legal clinics nationwide.

During 2006, NCVLI and the nine funded legal clinics trained a total of 727 law students, 1,036 attorneys, and 2,234 service providers and members of the public. The membership of National Association of Victims’ Rights Attorneys (NAVRA) has grown to 333 from 16 members when OVC funding began. NCVLI has convened five annual conferences and will convene a sixth in 2007. OVC continues to provide ongoing technical assistance to the grantee in the areas of program development, financial accountability, and program parameters. Staff correspond with the grantee by telephone, review progress, grant deliverables, and financial reports, and attend sponsored events.

NATIONWIDE AUTOMATED VICTIM INFORMATION AND NOTIFICATION SYSTEM

The Victim Information and Notification System (VNS) is a shared Web-based application involving the FBI, the U.S. Postal Inspection Service, the U.S. Attorneys’ Offices, the Criminal Division, and the Bureau of Prisons. Notification of case events begins during the investigative stage and continues throughout the prosecution and corrections stages of a case. VNS provides victims with access to a VNS toll free number where they can access current case information. VNS also supports the Victim Internet System (VIS) Web site that allows victims to view their notifications and update their personal contact information. In cases with numerous victims, use of the VIS and the VNS Call Center becomes the most cost-effective and efficient means of notification. OVC funding provides for technical support, four positions (one within EOUSA), and mailings.

The Crime Victims’ Rights Act, which gives victims the right to be notified in a timely manner of “any public court proceeding... involving the crime,” was passed in late 2004. Prior to passage of the Crime Victims’ Rights Act, victims were notified of major case events, such as the filing of charges, trial, and sentencing. Now victims are entitled to notice of every single public court proceeding involving the crime, including status hearings, pretrial motion hearings, appellate arguments, and hearings to revoke or modify supervised release, as well as notice every time a public court proceeding is rescheduled.

In FY 2006, about 8.4 million notification events occurred, which was an increase from FY 2005 of nearly 6.5 million. More than 1.1 million people opted into the system, and nearly 135,000 individuals visited the Web site.
that was developed in the past year. Significant changes to the system included:

- Automatic sending of e-mail notifications when the U.S. Attorney’s Office has the e-mail address of the crime victim on file.
- Enabling of attachments to letters to allow victim coordinators to add information relevant for the particular victim.
- Review and upgrades to security documentation.

**DATABASE OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND TRIBAL VICTIMS’ RIGHTS LAWS**

With the passage of the first state bill of rights for crime victims more than two decades ago, an era of change began for victims’ rights. Since then, every state has enacted laws that protect victims’ rights, and 33 states have approved state constitutional victims’ rights amendments. During that period, numerous federal statutes were enacted to protect the rights of crime victims. In spite of the passage of these laws, victims are still being denied the right to participate fully in the justice system. Court cases have been filed around the country to challenge the abridgment of victims’ rights under these state constitutions and statutes. However, before victims’ rights can be fully enforced, victims, victim advocates, lawyers representing victims, criminal justice practitioners, and others must know the relevant statutes and case law. OVC funded a 5-year project to develop and refine a comprehensive online database of federal, state, and tribal victims’ rights statutes and codes and relevant case law. When completed, the database will provide accurate, up-to-date information, including statutes, constitutional amendments, tribal codes, court rules, and related case law about the rights of victims in any jurisdiction in the country. OVC anticipates tremendous reliance on this database by those in the field who are working to implement and enforce victims’ rights. Additionally, the database will be a crucial tool in documenting how states are developing statutes that complement the Crime Victims Rights Act.

**VICTIMS’ RIGHTS COMPLIANCE PROJECT**

OVC provided funding for the Oregon Department of Justice and the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency to plan, develop, and implement statewide programs to facilitate compliance with state victims’ rights laws. In the first year, each of the grantees conducted a statewide needs assessment, obtained the necessary support from stakeholders for the initiative, and planned a strategy to implement a compliance initiative that involves coordination and collaboration with victim service organizations and state and local criminal justice agencies.

The Oregon Department of Justice is currently in its second year, undertaking implementation of its strategy. Specific project activities to date include the development of several materials aimed at raising awareness about victims’ rights, such as a victims’ rights notification wallet card to be given to victims by law enforcement personnel, a roll call video for law enforcement personnel, a victims’ rights brochure and booklet for distribution by the offices of district attorneys and juvenile department directors, a form for victims to use in requesting certain legal rights, and victims’ rights posters. The grantee also established a toll free information line for victims and developed a crime victims’ rights Web site. The project has provided extensive training to criminal justice agencies in the state. Planned activities include development of a process for reporting noncompliance and a system for review and response to such reports. The Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency will begin implementation of its strategy in 2007.

It is anticipated that these projects will result in an increase in the number of collaborative partners, as well as increased compliance with
victims’ rights laws in the respective states. At the end of the OVC grant, the grantees will produce reports documenting the development of the victims’ rights compliance programs that may be incorporated by OVC into a bulletin to promote the replication of such programs in other states.

**Enhancing Police Response to Victims: Designing a 21st Century Strategy for State and Local Law Enforcement**

Law enforcement officers often provide the first response to victims of crime. They frequently are the only contact victims have with the criminal justice system and are uniquely positioned to provide victims with needed assistance and information following a crime. OVC provided funding for the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) to design and implement a national strategy to create systemic change among law enforcement agencies in their response to victims of crime. The mission of the project is to guide policies, standards, and training in state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies through the United States to substantially enhance the culture and practice of serving victims’ needs. It also provides critical support to law enforcement in improving their approach to a primary constituency.

With funding support from OVC, IACP developed the draft national strategy and is pilot testing it in a small, a medium, and a large law enforcement agency. Based on the strategy concepts, the three sites, with intensive technical assistance from IACP, are assessing and enhancing departmental policies and standards and training curricula, and are collecting and analyzing baseline data to measure the impact of efforts. Following the pilot test, IACP will refine the draft strategy and develop a toolkit of resources for replication. In the next project period, IACP will conduct a validation test of the strategy and toolkit with eight law enforcement agencies of varied size and function.

**National Victim Assistance Academy**

The National Victim Assistance Academy (NVAA) was established in 1995 as a product of a cooperative agreement between OVC and the Victims’ Assistance Legal Organization (VALOR) on behalf of a consortium of national victim assistance organizations. Its purpose is to offer an academic-based curriculum emphasizing foundation-level education in victimology and victims’ rights and services. Since 1995, approximately 1,800 victim service professionals throughout the United States and several foreign countries have attended the academy. A formal evaluation, *The Assessment of the Effects of the National Victim Assistance Academy*, was completed in 2003. The evaluation assessed the appropriateness and effectiveness of the overall academy model and the impact on academy students, institutions of higher learning, and
the victim services field in general. While the findings were generally positive about the value of the NVAA experience, the overall conclusion across all respondents was that both the structure of NVAA and the academy “text” needed to be revised and updated. The need to develop a standardized curriculum was also identified as important.

OVC redesigned the program strategy based on evaluation findings and convened a working group to develop a revised comprehensive foundation-level training curriculum. In FY 2006, the curriculum was pilot tested with 30 advocates and service providers across the country. The curriculum is currently being modified based on the input of the participants. The new NVAA model will provide victim service providers and allied professionals with an academy experience that includes three distinct tracks, each of which serves a specific purpose, and all of which would potentially engage victim service professionals on a returning basis to continuously enhance their knowledge and skills.

STATE VICTIM ASSISTANCE ACADEMY

The State Victim Assistance Academy (SVAA) initiative began in 1999 to support state efforts to provide comprehensive, academic-based, fundamental education for victim assistance providers, advocates, and allied professionals who routinely interact with crime victims, based on the National Victim Assistance Academy text developed with funding from OVC. In FY 1999, OVC funded the first five state academies, and it has generally funded four new academies each year in an effort to reach its goal of seeding the creation of state victim assistance in all 50 states. Each of the funded states receives a 3-year funding commitment to support planning, implementation, and refinement of its academy text and format. As a condition of funding, states must certify that they will secure alternative funding to continue academy operations at the end of the federal funding cycle. Each state also is required to provide a 25-percent in-kind match. Hence, as each group of states cycles into its first-, second-, and third-year funding cycle, OVC begins offering funding to the next group of states.

With development of the first SVAA, OVC has made a major commitment to the victims’ field to help institutionalize comprehensive, academic-based training for a diverse group of victim service providers, including federal, tribal, state, and local justice and allied professionals. OVC has provided funding for 29 states to develop and offer an SVAA for training and educating victim service providers. To date, all but three have continued to offer the SVAA after OVC funding ended. Of the three, two are actively working to reestablish the program. OVC is helping to raise the professionalism and knowledge of victim advocates through the SVAA and is moving the infrastructure of the victims’ field forward.

WEB FORUMS

OVC developed the HELP for Victim Service Providers message board as a tool for victim service providers and allied professionals to share ideas, suggestions, and recommendations concerning promising practices, best practices, and victim issues. In 2006, OVC hosted 13 Web Forums. Forum topics were as follows: “Serving Victims of Impaired Driving,” “Crime Victim Compensation and Best Practices,” “Children Exposed to Domestic Violence,” “International Victims,” “Rural Victimization Assistance,” “Campus Victimization and Assistance Services,” “Internet Safety and Identity Theft,” “Posttraumatic Stress Disorder,” “Assisting Victims of Sexual Assault Through a Multidisciplinary Response,” “Youth Violence,” “Elder Abuse,” “National Crime Victims’ Rights Week Awareness Campaign,” and “Sexual Assault and Stalking.”
**Unidentified and Missing Persons**

OVС provided funding to the International Association of Homicide Investigators Association (IHIA) to provide a means of coordinating the efforts of professionals serving as homicide investigators, medical examiners, coroners, forensic pathologists, and other scientists in addressing the problem of unidentified and missing persons. In the first year of the project, IHIA convened an advisory board of experts from these disciplines to make recommendations for improving the current systems and coordinating the activities of the appropriate agencies for investigative purposes. Recommendations were compiled into a comprehensive report to OVC.

In the second phase, with the assistance of an expert working group, the grantee undertook one of the primary recommendations of that report: development of standard protocols, procedures, and best practices for law enforcement, medical examiners, and coroners, as well as other scientific specialists, victim advocates, and prosecutors to follow in handling these cases of unidentified persons who are probable crime victims. Particular emphasis was placed on the needs of victims and impact of these cases on covictims/survivors. Additional information on OJP efforts in this area can be found in Chapter 9 in the section on the President’s DNA Initiative.

**Identity Theft**

OJP established an internal working group composed of representatives from each program office to discuss research, statistics, programs, projects, training, education, prevention, and victim assistance related to identity theft. During FY 2006, the Working Group provided input to the various subcommittees tasked with developing recommendations for the President’s Task Force on Identity Theft, which issued an interim report in September 2006. OVC is helping to raise awareness of identity theft consequences for victims and has sponsored several initiatives to help victims of identity theft. OVC also supports service providers, allied professionals, law enforcement personnel, and others tasked with helping victims. OVC also participates in several federal working groups that share information and foster collaboration in addressing the myriad
issues associated with identity theft. OVC will continue to take a prominent role in federal efforts addressing identity theft victimization and to assist law enforcement, prosecutors, victim advocates, and state agencies through education, outreach, research, and innovative programs to help victims recover.

OVC funded the Ohio Attorney General’s Identity Theft Verification Passport program to help consumers avoid these problems and set the record straight. As of February 2005, Ohio victims of identity theft may apply for a “passport” after filing a police report. Using biometric and other technologies to create digital identifiers, the passport helps victims identify and/or defend themselves against fraudulent criminal charges, restore credit, and prevent further misuse of their personal information. The program also prevents duplicate entries of the victim’s information. The program has conducted more than 25 trainings for law enforcement, involving nearly 300 agencies and 600 officers. NIJ is conducting an evaluation of the Ohio program. If the program proves to be effective, and if funding is available, OVC anticipates working with other states that want to implement a passport program.

OVC also is working closely with BJS to update its National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) to include, for the first time, a series of questions about identity theft.

**OVC’s Training and Technical Assistance Center**

OVC’s Training and Technical Assistance Center (OVC TTAC) was established to support victim services across the country. The center assists victim service providers, advocates, and allied professionals in learning new skills and adopting best practices to enhance their continued success in providing quality victim services. The mission of OVC TTAC is to bridge the gap between knowledge, experience, and the victim assistance practice to help the still evolving victim assistance field successfully meet the challenges of an increasingly complex service delivery environment.

- OVC, in FY 2006, developed a comprehensive training strategy, which presents the training goals and objectives, identifies resources and entry points, and identifies target audiences, as well as strategic partners.

- In FY 2006, OVC TTAC supported 76 requests for training and technical assistance to 34 states via the field generated requests system; supported 7 state conferences and 3 national conferences; and awarded, on behalf of OVC, 198 professional development scholarships, 73 OVC state crime victim/survivor scholarships, and 256 scholarships via the State Conference Support program.
The RSAT program is a critical aspect of offender reentry programs and addresses the issue of substance abuse dependence and the direct link to public safety, crime, and victimization by providing treatment and services within the institution and in the community. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories receive RSAT grants and operate about 400 RSAT programs. Ultimately, every RSAT-funded program’s goal is to help offenders become drug-free and learn the skills needed to remain drug-free upon their return to the community.

➤ In FY 2006, the RSAT program received $10 million in funding.

➤ BJA has identified several strategies to strengthen RSAT: develop one underlying, evidence-based RSAT treatment model with staff receiving specific training to ensure that they are familiar with the particular treatment modality selected for the program; ensure that the Department of Corrections and prison administration officials are committed to adhering to treatment goals and minimizing disruptions to the treatment process; and focus on providing coordinated services for offender aftercare treatment and reentry into the community.

Juvenile and Family Drug Courts

Beginning in FY 2005, OJJDP assumed leadership of the juvenile and family components of OJP’s Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program, previously administered by BJA. The Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program provides financial and technical assistance to states, state courts, local courts, units of local government, and tribal governments to develop and implement treatment drug courts. These courts integrate substance abuse treatment, mandatory drug testing, sanctions and incentives, and transitional services in a judicially supervised court setting. Court clients must be nonviolent, substance-abusing juvenile offenders and/or substance-abusing adults who are involved with the family court due to child abuse and/or neglect issues.

➤ In 2006, OJJDP awarded a family drug court implementation grant to Dunklin County, MO.

➤ In 2006, OJJDP, through the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) and the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP), provided training and technical assistance through numerous telephone calls and onsite visits. Onsite visits covered topics including drug court design, adolescent treatment, case management, sustainability planning, family engagement, and relapse prevention.
In 2006, OJJDP, through NCJFCJ, NADCP, and the Drug Court Planning Initiative, offered training programs to jurisdictions interested in implementing a drug court.

**INDIAN ALCOHOL AND CRIME DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM**

BJA administers the Indian Alcohol and Substance Abuse Program (IASAP). IASAP provides resources to American Indian and Alaska Native communities to plan, develop, and implement tribal justice strategies to control and prevent alcohol- and substance abuse-related crime and violence. Since FY 2001, BJA has awarded more than $26 million in grant funding to 65 tribes and provided technical assistance and training to grantees and approximately 100 non-grantee communities.

In FY 2006, BJA awarded grants to 15 tribal communities. BJA also worked with Fox Valley Technical College to establish a technical assistance and training strategy to more cost effectively deliver services. Overall, 14 training programs were conducted, 3 major conferences were planned and managed, and 13 onsite technical assistance visits were coordinated. These events reached nearly 1,750 individuals representing 187 tribes. In addition, 112 training scholarships were provided to persons from 50 tribes who required travel assistance. Special forums also were conducted in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Washington to enhance tribal-state-federal partnerships. These venues helped bridge the gap between State Administering Agencies and tribes. In Minnesota and Wisconsin, tribal and state criminal justice officials and community members were brought together to discuss the emerging issues regarding methamphetamine as well as the historic challenges of alcohol and substance abuse and the strategies that are being implemented. The State of Washington brought together tribal, state, and local officials to look at the impact of methamphetamine, jurisdictional-related problems, and how relationships and information sharing can be improved.
In July 2005, the Attorney General launched the National Sex Offender Public Registry (NSOPR). NSOPR is a searchable Web site administered by BJA that links state and territory sex offender public registries and allows users access to public information about sex offenders throughout the country. It allows states and territories to participate in this unprecedented public safety resource by sharing comprehensive, free-of-charge public sex offender data with citizens nationwide, without relinquishing any control of their data.

By July 2006, all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico were linked to the Web site. In addition, more than 1,000 organizations have provided NSOPR as a link on their Web sites.

On October 5, 2006, the Department announced the designation of NSOPR as the Dru Sjodin National Sex Offender Public Web site. Dru Sjodin, a 22-year-old University of North Dakota student, was murdered after disappearing from a shopping mall parking lot in November 2003. This change in designation is a result of the passing and implementation of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, which was signed into law in July 2006 and which strengthens federal laws to protect children from sexual and other violent crimes, prevent child pornography, and make the Internet safer for children.

NIJ administers the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grant Program. Coverdell grants are intended to improve the quality and timeliness of forensic science and medical examiner services, including services provided by laboratories operated by states and those operated by units of local government. Both states and units of local government can apply directly to NIJ for funding. In 2006, NIJ provided over $18 million in awards to 88 state and local agencies. These awards allowed the agencies to increase the capacity of crime laboratories and medical examiners in all forensic disciplines, including controlled substances, firearms examination, forensic pathology, latent prints, questioned documents, toxicology, and trace evidence.

Advancing Justice Through DNA Technology is the President’s multi-million dollar, 5-year federal initiative launched in 2003 to strengthen and improve the current federal and state DNA collection and analysis systems. The President’s DNA Initiative is a comprehensive strategy designed to maximize the use of forensic DNA technology to solve crimes, protect the innocent, identify the missing, and save lives. The initiative includes formula
grants to state and local laboratories to: (1) reduce the nationwide backlog of DNA casework; (2) reduce the nationwide backlog of convicted offender DNA samples; and (3) increase the capacities of DNA laboratories to efficiently and effectively manage DNA evidence and prevent future DNA backlogs. In 2006, NIJ awarded over $107 million and reported the following accomplishments under the President’s DNA Initiative.

- NIJ delivered four cold case and missing persons training events and produced an interactive resource tool titled “Principles of DNA for Officers of the Court.”

- Multisite studies are examining how forensic evidence helps identify suspects, whether forensic evidence influences a suspect’s decision to confess, and whether jurors are more likely to convict in cases where DNA forensics testimony is given.

- NIJ continued to support cutting-edge research to advance the tools for examining DNA evidence, especially when the DNA is degraded, damaged, or limited in quantity. Additionally, DNA research funded in prior years was successfully implemented in operational forensic laboratories. Research in other forensic disciplines, such as impression evidence, toxicology, crime scene and other non-DNA areas, was greatly expanded in 2006.

- DNA Initiative funding in 2006 substantially reduced backlogs of untested DNA evidence. Funding was provided to test over 16,000 backlogged cases and over 800,000 backlogged samples from convicted offenders.
As part of the President’s DNA Initiative, NIJ manages the Web site www.dna.gov. In September 2006, the site was one of 11 finalists and one of six in its category to win the “Federal Web Managers Best Practice Awards.”

In one of NIJ’s projects, DNA identification methods such as those featured in the TV drama CSI are offered to law enforcement in the real world. At the Center for Human Identification (UNTCHI) at the University of North Texas Health Science Center, any state or local law enforcement agency can have DNA testing performed at no charge. Tests are provided for human remains and for reference samples provided by families of missing persons. UNTCHI also performs examinations on human remains to determine the manner and cause of death. The DNA profiles are then uploaded to UNTCHI’s special database for searching nationwide. NIJ’s funding of this revolutionary project means that every jurisdiction has access to one of only three laboratories in the country capable of this type of search. The project recently solved a cold case of a missing woman whose remains had been unidentified for more than 21 years. UNTCHI’s work continues to solve missing person and unidentified human remains cases.

LESS-LETHAL TOOLS

In 2006, NIJ initiated a major review of deaths following the use of electro-muscular disruption devices to help understand whether the technology can contribute to or cause death and, if so, in what ways. A panel of physicians and law enforcement professionals are collaborating on the project, Death Following Electro-Muscular Disruption, which began in May 2006. Results are expected in 2008. NIJ also produced prototypes of the first two directed-energy weapon less-lethal devices for law enforcement use. Prototypes of directed-energy devices show promise.

JUSTICE INFORMATION SHARING

Overcoming obstacles to sharing information among law enforcement and other justice system components is a significant issue that affects public safety. Doing so not only increases their ability to solve crimes and keep communities safer, but also helps them meet their increasing responsibilities. While criminal justice agencies are responsible for the sharing of information, DOJ and BJA are committed to providing the resources and assistance needed to make it as easy and secure as possible.

DOJ has been a leader in supporting the sharing of information between all levels of government through its Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global). BJA is active in this initiative that has brought together national leaders to craft solutions to some of the biggest problems facing information sharing, including security, privacy, and a common transfer language. Global’s committees meet on a regular basis and develop useful guidance and reference materials for executives and justice practitioners.

The DOJ Global Justice Extensible Markup Language (XML) Data Model (Global JXDM) was created to give justice leaders a common language, allowing for easier exchange of justice data while maintaining security and local...
control. In addition, the cost of making connection was reduced, so agencies of all sizes can now participate in local, regional, and even national information sharing projects.

➤ The release of the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan* (NCISP) and the *9/11 Commission Report* made it clear that exchanging and sharing intelligence information was critical. BJA has worked diligently to bring together the intelligence networks to discuss information sharing, including its recent efforts with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to co-host four regional fusion center meetings. These meetings brought together local, state, and federal intelligence and fusion center leaders to improve fusion center capabilities, leverage existing efforts, identify promising practices, and recommend solutions and models for resolving issues regarding fusion center operations. Attendees received copies of the recently updated resource CD, *Fusion Center Guidelines: Law Enforcement Intelligence, Public Safety, and the Private Sector*, Version 2. The new guidelines were developed for the law enforcement intelligence component to include public safety and the private sector.

➤ One of the BJA-administered programs, the Regional Information Sharing Systems (RISS), has been a leader in intelligence sharing for years. The network consists of six regional information centers servicing all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories. Three foreign countries are authorized to be RISS members: Canada, England, and Australia (foreign country members must be approved by the U.S. State Department). In 2006, member law enforcement agencies accessed RISS 6.1 million times per month through Web inquires.

➤ RISS also has developed the Automated Trusted Information Exchange (ATIX) communication system, which allows first responders, critical infrastructure personnel, and public safety and law enforcement personnel to share terrorism and homeland security information in a secure, real-time environment. Such technology brings together partners like the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Law Enforcement Online (LEO), DHS’s Homeland Security Information Network, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives’ Gang Task Forces to discuss intelligence sharing.

➤ One avenue that is often excluded from discussions about information sharing is cyber crime issues. Nearly all crimes have some link back to an electronic device such as a computer, cellular phone, or handheld device. These types of crimes span the nation, and BJA is working to bring cyber crime initiatives together by working with other federal agencies and grantees like the National White Collar Crime Center (NW3C) and SEARCH to discuss common crime methods and ways to share information. BJA has funded more than 20 different cyber crime courses designed to help investigators deal with this growing problem.
REAL-TIME COMMUNICATION

The police department in Danville, VA, and neighboring counties had no way to communicate with police officers in surrounding states or counties. A major thoroughfare easily took suspects across county and state borders. The police could only use a cell phone to call a dispatcher, who would call a dispatcher in the neighboring county, who would call a patrol car. The system was inefficient, often resulting in missed opportunities for arrest.

When Cisco Systems corporation announced that it had a Voiceover Internet Protocol (VoIP) system that would allow officers in different jurisdictions to communicate in “real time” from their patrol cars, NIJ, through its CommTech program jumped at the chance to evaluate the product. Cisco, NIJ, and the Danville police department formed a public-private partnership.

Within the partnership, Cisco provides Danville with a VoIP system, giving the department advanced technology it might not otherwise be able to afford, and NIJ has an opportunity to independently evaluate the project so other public safety agencies can understand the product’s strengths and weaknesses. The partnership has had outstanding success at solving Danville’s interoperability problems, and jurisdictions around the country are awaiting NIJ’s assessment and recommendations for repeating the effort.

evaluation; pilot programs; technology transfer and assistance; and outreach. CommTech works closely with several federal partners in interoperability, mainly the Departments of Homeland Security and Defense. An example of a CommTech success in 2006 is described above.

NIJ has plans to form additional public-private partnerships to assess six state-of-the-art technologies that have the potential to advance communications, sensor surveillance, and provide information sharing for law enforcement.

CRIMINAL RECORDS IMPROVEMENT

From 1995 to 2006, BJS distributed $506 million under the National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP) to states to support improvements to state records systems. These improvements permit participation in national background check systems for pre-sale firearms transfers, sex offender registries, national protection order files, and automated fingerprint identification systems. States have made progress in automating their criminal history files and in improving access to and the utility of these files. Since the inception of NCHIP, the number of records available for sharing under the FBI’s Interstate Identification Index (III) climbed threefold, or as fast as the rate of growth in all criminal records.

➤ At the end of 2003, the states and the FBI maintained criminal history records on 68 million individuals. Of these, more than 50 million records were available for interstate background checks. Since the inception of NCHIP in 1995,
the national number of criminal history records has increased 35 percent. Over the same period, the number of records available for sharing under III has climbed 97 percent.

➤ Since 1993, the number of states participating in III has grown from 26 to 48. The most recent data indicate that 74 percent of criminal records nationwide are now accessible for a background check through the III system.

➤ Forty-nine states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands now participate in the FBI’s Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System. The system began operation in July 1999, with states using NCHIP funds before that date to prepare for participation.

➤ Through NCHIP, BJS has introduced live scan technologies in the courts to improve the ability to connect a disposition and an arrest transaction to reduce the presence of open arrests in criminal records. BJS identified thousands of court dispositions in state records repositories that could not be linked to a defendant’s records, and BJS encouraged states to use NCHIP funds to acquire live scan technology in order to make that link biometrically.

➤ The National Instant Criminal Background Check System supports eight million checks annually at the pre-sale stage of firearms transfers. From the inception of the Brady Act on March 1, 1994, to December 31, 2005, nearly 70 million applications for firearm transfers were subject to background checks. About 1.4 million, or 1.9 percent of all applications, were rejected, primarily for the presence of a prior felony conviction. State and local agencies conducted checks on about 40 percent of the applications for firearm transfers or permits in 2005, and the FBI handled the rest.

➤ NCHIP funds have facilitated the integration of databases within states. The number of rejections by state and local agencies for reasons other than felony convictions increased 32 percent from 1999 to 2005. The percentage of rejections for non-felony reasons increased from 28 percent to 57 percent. Over the last several years, more states have devoted part of their NCHIP funds to the improvement of mental health databases to support background checks. However, a principal focus of NCHIP funding continues to be on the building of complete disposition information associated with each arrest transaction.

➤ NCHIP funds have assisted the states in building sex offender registries and participating in the FBI’s National Sex Offender Registry (NSOR), which became operational in July 1999. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have provided records to NSOR. As of February 2007, NSOR maintained registry records for more than 462,000 sex offenders nationwide.

➤ States have used NCHIP funds to initiate the flagging of criminal history records evidencing convictions for domestic violence or the issuance of a protection order. Forty-six states, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands now submit data to the FBI’s National Crime Information Center (NCIC) Protection Order File, which became operational in May 1997. As of February 2007, the file included almost 970,000 records of protection orders.

➤ The federal-state partnership under NCHIP established the national infrastructure that now allows about 67 million records maintained in 13 different databases to be scanned instantly at the time of a firearms purchase for prohibiting background characteristics. This infrastructure will play an increasingly important role in criminal
Justice background checks and, when supported by fingerprints, will assist in other kinds of background checks for both homeland security and various non-criminal justice checks required under new legislative requirements.

**Tribal Criminal History Record Improvement Program**

The Tribal Criminal History Record Improvement Program (T-CHRIP), administrated by BJS, assists tribes in improving the accuracy, completeness, and interstate availability of criminal history records by automating the capture and reporting of fingerprints and arrest records to tribal, state, and national databases. T-CHRIP is designed to improve the ability of tribes to identify individuals for criminal justice and non-criminal justice purposes, including persons: convicted of serious crimes occurring in Indian Country either by tribal or other law enforcement; ineligible to hold positions involving children, the elderly, or the disabled; subject to protection orders or wanted for violation of protection orders; arrested, or convicted of stalking and/or domestic violence; ineligible to be employed or hold licenses for specified positions; ineligible to purchase firearms; or potentially presenting threats to public safety.

In 2006, BJS funded two new sites, the White Earth Indian Reservation, in Minnesota and the Pueblo of Isleta in New Mexico. BJS provided for the continuation of two projects, the Little Traverse Bay Band of Odawa Indians in Michigan and the Western Pueblos Consortium, in New Mexico. The sites in New Mexico have begun the second phase of their T-CHRIP projects, which entails developing a tribally operated Tribal Justice Information System (repository), covering 2 years, 2006–2008. This facility will serve as a central repository and be interfaced for the tribal criminal records in New Mexico to share information among tribal jurisdictions and with the state. The new T-CHRIP grantee from New Mexico will be working with the other tribes in the state to further enhance the development of a statewide system. The efforts of the T-CHRIP program grantees may serve a model for other tribes for the full implementation of the requirements for the Violence Against Women Act III, 2005 and the Adam Walsh Act, 2006.

**Violence Against Women Act II Stalking Databases**

This program provides assistance to states and units of local government to improve processes for entering data regarding stalking and domestic violence into local, state, and national crime information databases. Funds provided to states are being used to upgrade the quality of state and local protection order systems and ensure that such systems are capable of supplying data on a real-time basis to the FBI’s NCIC Protection Order File. In addition, funds are being used to ensure that states are in position to initiate or enhance efforts to collect and flag misdemeanor records that involve domestic violence and that represent a prohibiting category of firearm purchases under the Brady Act. BJS administers this program as a component of NCHIP.

As of February 2006, 46 states, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands submit data to the National Crime Information Center Protection Order File, which became operational in May 1997 and includes more than 970,000 records of protection orders. Funds awarded under NCHIP will allow several states and territories that were not yet submitting records to the NCIC Protection Order file to fully participate. Awards also allowed some states to initiate special data collection and submission activities around misdemeanor convictions for domestic violence.
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND EVALUATION PROGRAMS

Violence Against Women and Family Violence

Research and evaluation about violence against women, family violence, and victimization remains a high priority at NIJ. The NIJ portfolio contains projects to better understand and prevent violence and victimization, to effectively detect and respond to violence, and to increase the system’s capacity to respond to an increasingly diverse population. NIJ works closely with DOJ’s Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) to determine the research topics of most importance to the field.

In FY 2006, NIJ awarded more than $5 million to study violence and victimization; much of the funding was a result of the Violence Against Women Act. NIJ managed 17 active grants about domestic violence, sexual violence, and elder and child abuse. Descriptions of many of these programs are found below.

➤ NIJ-funded researchers administered surveys and conducted interviews with court and community organizations nationwide in a project that investigated the courts’ ability to meet the needs of battered women with limited English proficiency.

Findings suggested that courts perceive they are meeting the needs of victims, but victims often do not feel their needs are met. Many courts provided an interpreter only at the final stage of a protection order, and smaller courts often could not find qualified interpreters. The study’s recommendations included providing forms in multiple languages, improving outreach, and advancing language and interpretation services.

➤ NIJ-funded researchers are examining the issues of mothers who flee with their children to the United States to escape their abusive partners. A grant awarded to the University of Minnesota will assess the impact of crossing international borders. Preliminary results indicate that these women may subsequently be charged with international child abduction under the Hague Convention.

➤ An NIJ-funded study examined how sexual victimization and violence in a woman’s background influences her later mental and physical health. The Kansas-based study gathered data about women living in a rural community, women who were recipients of social services, and women who were incarcerated.

Of the 423 women in the study, 85 percent reported being sexually assaulted; the highest percentage of this group were in the prison community. More than 90 percent of these women had experienced intimate partner violence. Child physical and sexual abuse had a negative impact on women’s physical and
mental health as adults. Rape in adulthood had a negative impact on women's physical and mental health, but intimate partner violence in adulthood did not appear to affect women's well-being. The authors suggest that early intervention and social services for assault victims can prevent criminal behavior in adulthood.

▶ Elderly people who are physically abused or neglected often have few support structures to stop abuse or report abusers. NIJ funds research that identifies signs of physical or sexual elder abuse, examines what factors put the elderly at risk for abuse, and evaluates programs designed to prevent elder abuse. For example, one FY 2006 study at the University of California, is examining pressure ulcers in the elderly and will determine when an ulcer is a sign that that person has been abused.

▶ To ensure that NIJ’s research addresses the needs of women, NIJ sponsors workshops that bring together practitioners from the field, subject matter experts, and policymakers to learn from one another and help NIJ shape its research agenda. In 2006, at one of these events, professionals from the U.S. Departments of Justice, Defense, Education, and
Health and Human Services, and the Government Accountability Office discussed strategies for coordinating dissemination, improving methodology and study design, and creating effective support systems. Another workshop brought together people who work with teen issues to help NIJ shape its research agenda on teen dating violence. The extent of teen victimization is difficult to estimate because teens are often unwilling to report violence.

➤ Title IX of the Violence Against Women Act directs NIJ to conduct a national baseline study on violence against Indian women. The study has three purposes: to examine the types and magnitude of violence against women in Indian Country; to evaluate the effectiveness of federal, state, and local responses to violence against native women; and to propose recommendations to increase the effectiveness of these responses. The crimes that will be studied include domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking, and murder.

Eliminating Prison Rape and Sexual Violence

In 2006, NIJ received two final reports that responded to critical issues under the Prison Rape Elimination Act. The Culture of Prison Sexual Violence, by M.S. Fleisher and J.L. Krienert is the largest ethnographic study of inmates ever conducted. The researchers found that inmates generally do not define or consider sexual relationships and rape in the same way that persons within free society view them. The study found that 66 percent of male inmates and 71 percent of female inmates were aware of inmate-staff sexual relationships. Collectively, 9.1 percent of male and female inmates reported that they were aware of an inmate who had been raped by a correctional staff member. About 34 percent of male inmates and 28 percent of female inmates reported that they knew of an inmate who reported rape to staff members. A high percentage of both male and female inmates indicated corrections officers try to protect inmates from being victimized.

The NIJ-funded study, Addressing Sexual Violence in Prisons: A National Snapshot of Approaches and Highlights of Innovative Strategies, by J.M. Zweig, R.L. Naser, J. Blackmore, and M. Schaffer examined the policies and practices of state corrections departments in response to the Prison Rape Elimination Act. From 2004 to 2005, 27 states reported specific written policies related to prison sexual violence, 19 of which comprehensively addressed prevention, investigation, response, and victim services. Several states also reported proactive efforts to involve the medical community in collecting rape kits for evidence, working with local district attorneys to promote prosecution of offenses, and investing in training staff to engage in investigations of allegations.

Federal Death Penalty Analysis

A quantitative study sponsored by NIJ concluded that neither the recommendations of the United States Attorney’s Office nor the Attorney General’s decision to seek the death penalty was driven by defendant or victim race/ethnicity. The report, Race and the Decision to Seek the Death Penalty in Federal Cases, by S. Klein, R. Berk, and L. Hickman found that death penalty decisions were based on legal factors such as heinousness of the crime; the decisions were not capricious. U.S. Attorney Offices in southern districts were more likely to recommend the death penalty, but race/ethnicity did not seem to play a part in the decision. The study, Investigation and Prosecution of Homicide Cases in the U.S.: The Process for Federal Involvement, by P. Newton, C. Johnson, and T. Mulcahy, found that homicide case transfers from state and local authorities to federal authorities were rare, unless local resources and capabilities were an issue. When transfers did happen, each district (and each of the state/local jurisdictions within each district) was unique in its decisionmaking. Districts varied on whether federally eligible crimes (e.g., bank robbery or kidnapping) were brought to federal attention. Minority representation in cases
could be explained by disproportionate involvement by minorities in serious homicide cases that have potential for transfer.

**Criminal Justice Statistical Programs**

BJS maintains statistical series that cover each stage of the criminal justice system, including:

- the *National Crime Victimization Survey*, the nation's primary source of information on criminal victimization
- cyber crime statistics on the incidence, magnitude, and consequences of electronic and computer crime to households and businesses
- law enforcement data from more than 3,000 agencies on the organization and administration of police and sheriffs’ departments
- nationally representative prosecution data on resources, policies, and practices of local prosecutors
- court and sentencing statistics, including federal and state case processing data
- data on correctional populations and facilities from federal, state, and local governments.

During 2006, BJS maintained more than four dozen of its ongoing core data collections, collecting and publishing data on:

- criminal victimizations and the consequences of these crimes for victims
- populations under correctional supervision
- federal criminal offenders and case processing
- administration of law enforcement and correctional agencies

- felony trial courts
- prosecutorial practices and policies, and
- criminal justice expenditures and employment.

BJS released 30 publications, six of these were in electronic and CD format only.

In addition, the BJS Web site now provides users with access to over 11,898 products online, including spreadsheets and data files, for use by Web visitors seeking time series and geographically distributed data on crime and justice. The BJS Web site is currently recording up to 22,000 users daily. In FY 2006, BJS estimates that the average number of user sessions per month was over 450,000.

Many BJS reports are accompanied by press releases or placed directly on the newswire and are given prominent coverage in the nation's electronic and print media. BJS data are frequently cited in Congressional testimony and findings, court opinions, law reviews, and social science journals. In FY 2006, 15 federal and state court decisions cited BJS. Over 1,200 citations of BJS data were recorded in law reviews and journals, social science journals, and secondary analyses publications.

**Courts and Sentencing Statistics**

- For the first time, BJS released data on federal prosecutions of human trafficking offenses for the period of 2001-2005. The report, *Federal Prosecution of Human Trafficking, 2001-2005*, presents federal criminal case processing statistics on peonage and slavery statutes in the U.S. criminal code with a focus on human trafficking offenses created by Congress in the Trafficking in Victims Protection Act of 2000. The report includes national data on the number and type of human trafficking offenders referred to and prosecuted by U.S. attorneys and describes human trafficking case processing, including number of convictions and types of sentences imposed.
In 2006, BJS presented findings from an analysis of appeals from general civil trials in 46 large counties for the period of 2001-2005. The report, *Appeals from General Civil Trials in 46 Large Counties, 2001–2005*, presents information on general civil cases concluded by bench or jury trial in 2001 that were subsequently appealed to a state's intermediate appellate court or court of last resort. Information presented includes the flow of civil cases through the appeals process and the effect of appeals on trial court outcomes. The report describes the types of civil bench and jury trials appealed, the characteristics of litigants filing an appeal, the frequency in which appellate courts affirm, reverse, or modify trial court outcomes, and the percentage of appeals that produced a published opinion. Also described are cases further appealed from an intermediate appellate court to a state court of last resort and the impact of that final level of appeal on litigation outcomes.

In 2006, BJS presented findings from the 2005 National Survey of Prosecutors, the latest in a series of data collections about the Nation's 2,300 state court prosecutors' offices that tried felony cases in state courts of general jurisdiction. This study provides information on the number of staff, annual budget, and felony cases closed for each office. Information is also available on the use of DNA evidence, computer-related crimes, and terrorism cases prosecuted.

**Corrections Statistics**

BJS published findings from its annual collections on corrections statistics including: *Prisoners in 2005, Capital Punishment, 2005*, and *Probation and Parole, 2005*. In addition, the following statistical studies were carried out:

- In 2006, BJS initiated the 2006 Census of Adults under Parole Supervision. The census enumerated all state agencies and regional offices responsible for parole and other post-custody supervision on June 30, 2006. The census provides a sampling frame for a study of sexual victimization based on self-reports of former state inmates. The census was last conducted in 1991.

- In 2006, BJS released several reports on health issues in the correctional population, including: *Medical Problems of Jail Inmates*, which provides findings on jail inmates who reported a current medical problem, a physical or mental impairment, or an injury since admission based on data from the 2002 Survey of Inmates in Local Jails; *Mental Health Problems of Prison and Jail Inmates*, which presents estimates of the prevalence of mental health problems among prison and jail inmates using self-reported data on recent history and symptoms of mental disorders; and *HIV in Prisons, 2004*, which reports the number of female and male prisoners who were HIV positive or AIDS active, the number of AIDS-related deaths in state and federal prisons, a profile of those inmates who died, and a comparison of AIDS rates for general and prisoner populations.

- In 2006, BJS released Drug Use and Dependence, State and Federal Prisoners, 2004, which presents data from the 2004 Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities on prisoners’ prior use, dependence, and abuse of illegal drugs. Tables include trends in the levels of drug use, type of drugs used, and treatment reported by state and federal prisoners since the last national survey was conducted in 1997. The report also provides data on the levels of prior drug use (with an in-depth look at methamphetamine use), dependence, and abuse by selected characteristics, such as family background, criminal record, type of drug used, and offense.

- In 2006, BJS initiated the study, *State Prison Expenditures*, to obtain data on
state outlays for prison salaries, wages and employee benefits; capital expenditures; and cost of utilities, medical care, food service, and contractual housing of inmates. The study is based on institutional corrections elements of the Survey of Government Finances, which state budget officers reported to the U.S. Census Bureau.

➤ In 2006, BJS continued to implement the national data collection requirements of the Prison Rape Elimination Act. BJS completed the second Annual Survey of Sexual Violence, which collected data on allegations and substantiated incidents during 2005. Survey findings were released in July 2006, as a special report, Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2005. BJS completed the development and testing of self-report methodologies, surveying more than 900 offenders under state parole supervision in 16 parole offices. BJS also completed a national pretest of survey methodologies for inmate self-reports in prisons and local jails. The pretest was conducted in eight facilities with more than 1,300 respondents. Testing in juvenile facilities is underway. BJS will survey youth in 10 facilities between October 2006 and March 2007. In December 2006, BJS hosted a workshop entitled “National Rollout: Sexual Violence Reported by Prison and Jail Inmates using Audio Computer Assisted Self-Interview (ACASI) Technology.” The discussions included the results of the pretest, the sampling process, and collection protocols, followed by a demonstration of the ACASI instrument to be used by inmates to report incidents of sexual assault.

Victimization Statistics

➤ BJS conducts the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) which collects data from a nationally representative sample that contacts approximately 77,000 households comprising more than 134,000 persons on the impact, frequency, and consequences of criminal victimization in the United States. Survey data reveal the number of rapes, sexual assaults, robberies, assaults, thefts, household burglaries, and motor vehicle thefts United States residents and their households experience each year. NCVS, which is continuously conducted, provides details on victims and offenders and the circumstances under which they come together and the contingencies of crime, such as weapon use, place and time of occurrence, costs of crime, and perceived alcohol and drug use by the offender. NCVS also serves as a national platform to periodically conduct special data collections on topical issues, such as cyber crime-related victimizations, school crime, workplace violence, and police-public contacts. In September 2006, BJS released its annual report titled Criminal Victimization, 2005.

➤ In April 2006, BJS released Identity Theft, 2004, which reports findings on identity theft victimization and its consequences using data collected from NCVS. This was the first report from new identity theft questions added to the survey in July 2004 and encompasses credit card thefts, thefts from existing accounts, misuse of personal information, and multiple types at the same time. The report included information on economic loss, how the theft was discovered, whether misuse is ongoing, and problems experienced as a result of the identity theft.

➤ BJS, in collaboration with OVW, conducted a supplement to the NCVS to estimate the extent and characteristics of stalking in the United States. Currently, there are no national estimates of the prevalence and incidence of stalking. The survey obtained information about the identity of the stalker, the nature of the stalking incidents, the consequences to the victim, and actions the victim took in response to the
victimization, including whether it was reported to the police. BJS expects findings to be released in 2007.

➤ In 2006, BJS added a section to its Web site on “Intimate Partner Violence in the United States.” This new Web page examines fatal and non-fatal violence by intimates (current or former spouses, girlfriends, or boyfriends) since the redesign of the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) in 1993. Victim characteristics such as race, sex, age, income, and ethnicity are presented. The Web page includes data on murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault experienced by males and females age 12 years and older. In addition, characteristics of the victimization are presented, such as offender use of alcohol/drugs, offender use of weapons, place and time of victimization, reporting to police, victim injury and medical treatment, and presence of children in the household.

➤ In December 2006, BJS released the report *Indicators of School Crime and Safety, 2006*. This report is a collaboration between BJS, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in the U.S. Department of Education, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The report presents data on crime and safety at school from the perspectives of students, teachers, principals, and the general population. It also provides the most current detailed statistical information on the nature of crime in schools, school environments, and responses to crime at school.

**Law Enforcement and Forensic Statistics**

➤ In 2006 BJS began data collection for the *Census of Law Enforcement Training Academies*. First conducted in 2002, the survey will collect data on personnel, facilities and resources, trainees, and training curricula of law enforcement academies in the United States. Selective findings will include training issues, training policies as they relate to terrorism, community policing, and racial profiling. Data collection will be completed in 2007.
BJS completed the statistical data collection of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies in 2006. The Census collected data describing some 600 campus law enforcement agencies serving U.S. 4-year universities or colleges with 2,500 or more students. Data will be analyzed and published on agency personnel, expenditures and pay, operations, equipment, computers and information systems, policies, and special programs.

During 2006, BJS continued to expand its statistical collection and reporting activities regarding the nation’s forensic crime labs, and medical examiners/coroners’ offices. These initiatives will generate much needed information on workload backlogs, equipment and staffing needs, as well as procedures for handling unidentified persons and national level statistics on the volume and characteristics of DNA evidence.

In 2006, BJS released the report Federal Law Enforcement Officers, 2004, which reports the results of a biennial census of federal agencies employing personnel with arrest and firearms authority. Using agency classifications, the report presents, by agency and state, the number of officers working in the areas of police response and patrol, criminal investigation and enforcement, inspections, security and protection, court operations, and corrections as of September 2004.

Tribal Justice Statistics

2006 marked the third year of the implementation of the Tribal Criminal History Record Improvement Program (TCHRIP). Funds were awarded to support the implementation of the Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems (AFIS) in ten tribal justice agencies. In addition, 2006 funds are being used by one state to develop a Sovereign State Based Tribal Justice Information System (TJIS).

In 2006, BJS released data from the 2004 Survey of Jails in Indian Country, an enumeration of 68 confinement facilities, detention centers, jails, and other facilities operated by tribal authorities or the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The report, Jails in Indian Country, 2004, presents data on the number of adults and juveniles held, type of offense, number of persons confined on the last weekday of each month, average daily population, peak population, admissions in June 2004, and number of inmate deaths. Based on an addendum to the 2004 survey, data are presented on inmate medical and mental health services, suicide prevention, substance dependency programs, domestic violence counseling, sex offender treatment, educational programs, and inmate work assignments.

State Justice Statistics Program

BJS administers the State Justice Statistics program for Statistical Analysis Centers (SACs). Through the years, SACs have been established in all states and most territories to centralize and integrate criminal justice statistical functions within the state. BJS provides financial and technical assistance to the state SACs to coordinate statistical activities within the state, conduct research as needed to estimate impacts of legislative and policy changes, and serve a liaison role to assist BJS in gathering data from respondent agencies within their states. During 2006, BJS encouraged many states to use SAC funds to assist BJS in the collection of data on deaths in custody. Other areas of research being conducted by the SACs include: prison rape and victimization in confinement facilities, civil justice statistics, computer related crimes, and analysis of criminal history records and incident-based crime data.
Juvenile Justice Research and Statistics Programs

OJJDP has primary responsibility for developing and disseminating statistical information on the juvenile justice system and does so through several mechanisms.

➤ In 2006, OJJDP released *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2006 National Report*, the third in OJJDP’s series of comprehensive reports containing critical information about juvenile crime, victimization, and the juvenile justice system. The 2006 National Report draws upon reliable data and relevant research to provide a comprehensive view of the nature of juvenile crime and violence across the country. The first report was published in 1995 and a second in 1999.

➤ In FY 2006, the National Juvenile Court Data Archive project collected case-level data on several million delinquency cases handled by juvenile courts around the nation dating back to 1985. Data from state and local administrative information systems were standardized for reporting in the annual *Juvenile Court Statistics* report and various presentations on the *Statistical Briefing Book*. These data provide users with national estimates of juvenile court delinquency case processing and profiles of the youth involved. A number of new data sets were processed, stored, and restructured into the national reporting format in 2006. To prepare for the future, the progress of numerous state information technology projects and many local information system implementations is being monitored.

In 2006, the National Juvenile Court Data Archive project supported a wide range of printed and electronic dissemination activities, including updates to the National Juvenile Court Data Archive Web site, *Easy Access to State and County Juvenile Court Case Counts*, and *Easy Access to Juvenile Court Statistics*, as well as the “Juveniles in Court” section of OJJDP’s *Statistical Briefing Book*. Further, the project produced *Juvenile Court Statistics 2003–2004*, the Archive’s flagship publication, which includes 20 years of data describing the workload of the nation’s juvenile courts. The project also produced three Fact Sheets released by OJJDP: *Delinquency Cases in Juvenile Court, 2002; Juvenile Delinquency Probation Caseload, 1985–2002; and Person Offenses in Juvenile Court, 1985–2002.*

➤ OJJDP’s two primary Juvenile Custody Statistics data collections, the *Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement* and the *Juvenile Residential Facility Census*, are administered in alternating years. The *Juvenile Residential Facility Census* data were gathered with an October 2006 reference date. Data were reported by over 3,200 juvenile facilities nationwide. This facility census is designed to provide information on how facilities operate and the services
they provide. It also collects information on facility crowding, security, and juvenile deaths in custody. In addition, OJJDP worked with the Census Bureau to plan for the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement to be administered in 2007. This effort collects information on each youth held in residential placement as a result of contact with the juvenile justice system.

The National Juvenile Justice Data Analysis Project has enabled OJJDP to expand its roles as a data collector and disseminator of juvenile justice statistics. The project has changed the landscape of juvenile justice statistical information available in the country by creating an infrastructure of data and dissemination tools that have become indispensable resources for informed policy decision-making. The project’s primary dissemination vehicles are OJJDP's Statistical Briefing Book and the Juvenile Offenders and Victims report series. In 2006, the project's primary product was Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2006 National Report (discussed above). The project also produced two OJJDP bulletins in 2006: Juvenile Arrests 2004 (see table below), and Juvenile Residential Facility Census, 2002: Selected Findings.

A primary product of the Data Analysis Project is OJJDP's Statistical Briefing Book which offers an array of statistical information on juveniles, including offending, victimization, and involvement in the juvenile justice system. It provides timely and reliable answers to questions that practitioners, policymakers, and other concerned citizens frequently ask. In recent years, the OJJDP

Data sources: Analysis of arrest data from the FBI and population data from the U.S. Census Bureau and the National Center for Health Statistics.
"Statistical Briefing Book" (see excerpt below) has become a primary source of information on juvenile crime and the juvenile justice system for individuals within the United States and throughout the world. During 2006, almost 15.7 million pages were requested from the Statistical Briefing Book Web site or more than 43,000 each day. The typical visitor session lasts about 12 minutes.

➤ OJJDP supports the Crimes Against Children Research Center (CCRC) at the University of New Hampshire. The mission of the CCRC is to combat crimes against children by providing high-quality research and statistics to the
public, policymakers, law enforcement personnel, and other child welfare practitioners. CCRC is concerned with research about the nature of crimes including child abduction, homicide, rape, assault, and physical and sexual abuse as well as their impact. In 2006, the center was involved in the following research projects:

❖ The project on reducing the negative impact of publicity in child victim cases is analyzing the role of the media and publicity in child abuse and its effect on both families and investigations.

❖ The Youth Internet Victimization Prevention Survey project focuses on preventing unwanted exposure to sexual solicitations and pornography in children ages 10–17, as well as measuring the impact of these exposures.

❖ The Developmental Victimization Survey project is a national survey to capture victimization experiences and measure the effects of those experiences on delinquency and mental health.

❖ The goals of the assessment of child neglect in community and agency samples project are to develop two survey instruments to measure neglect (a parent self-report tool and a child self-report tool) and test the reliability and validity of both instruments.

❖ Following up on research that identified specific cases of juvenile prostitution, the National Juvenile Prostitution Study: The Criminal Justice Response consists of interviews of a national sample of local, state, and federal law enforcement investigators to gather the details about juvenile prostitution cases in the criminal justice system (i.e., educational, criminal, employment, and mental health histories).

❖ The juvenile victimization questionnaire development project is developing an understanding of polyvictimization among youth and identifying predictive factors (i.e., family, social, community, and school factors).

❖ The project, Developing New Knowledge for Effective Children’s Advocacy Centers (CAC): Employing the NCATrak Data System for CAC Research, builds on OJJDP’s investment in the National Children’s Alliance (NCA) NCATrak system. The NCATrak system allows for standardized data entry, organization, and retrieval of case information among child advocacy centers. Specifically, this project establishes procedures for obtaining consent from the CACs for data transfer and analysis for research purposes.

EVALUATION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

Evaluation of the Enforcing the Underage Drinking Laws Program

In FY 2003, the Enforcing the Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL) Community Trials Initiative was launched. The purpose is to determine whether implementation of best and most promising practices at the local level will provide evidence of effectiveness that can serve as a model for states and communities that are working to reduce underage drinking. Five states—California, Connecticut, Florida, Missouri, and New York—were selected to implement “best or most promising practices” in seven communities per state. This national evaluation is being conducted by Wake Forest University School of Medicine (WFUSM). The goals of the evaluation are to determine the effect of the “best or most promising practices” as indicated by (1) youth behavior regarding alcohol use and alcohol-related risk taking.
behavior and (2) commercial and social sources of alcohol. Five quantitative and one qualitative data collection components will be implemented for this national evaluation.

In addition to the surveys, WFUSM will conduct three site visits to each participating state to assess program implementation. The process evaluation includes an activity tracking system, a local coalition survey, a policy tracking survey, and site visits to states participating in the trial. The impact evaluation analysis is consistent with the methods used in the analysis of baseline to first follow-up changes reported in the Year 2 report of the National Evaluation. Researchers from the EUDL national evaluation team will share findings with the field once evaluation of the project has concluded in 2007.

In response to the FY 2004 Enforcing the Underage Drinking Laws Discretionary Program: Rural Communities Initiative, OJJDP has awarded grants to Pennsylvania, Illinois, Nevada, New Mexico, California, Oregon, and Washington. Each state has identified three or four rural communities to participate in the program. The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism is collaborating with OJJDP on this project to evaluate programming to reduce the underage drinking problem in small towns in rural America. The primary goals of this evaluation effort are to document EUDL activities in rural communities receiving OJJDP discretionary funds relative to comparison communities of comparable size and make-up and to assess the impact of EUDL activities on underage drinking and alcohol-related problems (e.g., drinking and driving, motor vehicle crashes, etc.) in rural communities receiving OJJDP discretionary funds relative to comparison communities. Specific activities that will be assessed include:

- underage sales compliance checks
- shoulder-tap operations
- warnings or citations issued for outlets selling alcohol to minors or third parties purchasing alcohol for minors
- party patrols
- warnings or citations issued for possession and consumption of alcohol by minors
- DUI monitoring and arrests, and
- media advocacy to increase community awareness of EUDL activities

**Evaluation of Free To Grow**

Free To Grow is a national demonstration program supporting the implementation of best or promising programs, policies, and practices directed toward Head Start and non-Head Start families, other community residents, and community institutions. It is designed to build stronger families and communities. The program started in 2001 as a partnership among the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the Doris Duke Charitable Foundations, OJJDP, Columbia University, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, and 18 local Head Start agencies.

The specific aims of the evaluation are to (1) evaluate the process of implementation of Free To Grow and (2) evaluate the impact of the program in building strong community partnerships and reducing the risks and increasing the resilience of families and neighborhoods. Data for the process evaluation is being collected through a record of families’ participation in Free To Grow, semiannual site visits and surveys of program staff, annual surveys of Free To Grow community partners, biennial surveys of national Head Start leadership, and reports from the National Program Office. For the impact evaluation, data is collected through annual telephone surveys of families in the 15 Free To Grow sites (both families participating in the program and a comparison group of families who are not participating, but live in the same neighborhoods). The year two evaluation site report documents the many changes that have occurred across the sites during implementation. The funding for Free To Grow sites ended in May 2005 and final evaluation results are expected in 2007.
Replication and Evaluation of Promising Programs for Substance Abuse

OJJDP has funded replications of evaluations of two programs, Project ALERT and Project SUCCESS, both designed to prevent or reduce substance use among youth. The Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE) is conducting process and outcome evaluations of these two programs in multiple sites. These programs are currently listed as “promising” and could possibly reach “model” status if the outcome evaluations produce positive results.

Since the inception of this project, PIRE has developed and refined the study’s methodology, which calls for recruiting a total of 24 schools for the evaluation of Project ALERT and 14 schools for the evaluation of Project SUCCESS. PIRE will implement its longitudinal randomized control trial of each program in two cohorts, each of which will last approximately 30 months, which will allow for a 1-year follow-up of all students after program completion. At present PIRE is collecting baseline data from students in an initial cohort of 10 Project ALERT and 6 Project SUCCESS schools. Final evaluation results will be available in 2008.

Evaluation of Other Juvenile Justice Programs

The Tribal Youth Program National Process Evaluation was awarded to CSR, Inc., in October 2006. The goals are to gather information about the program, its grantees, and the impact of its funded activities that will allow TYP staff and OJJDP to better serve AI/AN youth and families. The evaluation will

➤ identify the characteristics of tribes and tribal governments that apply for and receive funds, apply for and do not receive TYP funds, and do not apply for TYP funds

➤ describe the program areas and interventions for which TYP funds are allocated and identify program areas for which there may be gaps in funding
identify factors that contribute to the sustainability of projects and/or initiatives after the conclusion of TYP funding support.

These data are expected to allow OJJDP to reach out to tribes who have not applied for or not received TYP funding; determine the specific types of activities that TYP grantees support, appreciate the community dynamics that influence these decisions to inform OJJDP technical assistance activities; and understand the factors that support or inhibit TYP project sustainability. The evaluation will be completed by 2009.

OJJDP also funded two outcome evaluations (using a quasi-experimental research design) of specific tribal youth programs through the agency’s Field-Initiated Research and Evaluation solicitation. The purpose of these efforts is to identify more evidence-based programs/practices in the tribal youth area. These include the Evaluation of Project Venture, an American Indian evidence-based, culturally guided substance abuse and delinquency prevention program conducted by the National Indian Youth Leadership Development Project, Inc. and an Evaluation of the TuuCai Tribal Wellness Court (a juvenile drug court) for American Indian youth, being conducted by the University of Colorado at the Denver Health Sciences Center.

The Tribal Youth Evaluation Facilitation Project provided training and technical assistance to AI/AN tribes that implemented juvenile delinquency prevention initiatives under TYP. The project worked with the Hannahville Indian Community in upper Michigan, the Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe of Washington, the Puyallup Tribe of Indians in Washington, the Eastern Aleutian Tribes in Alaska, and the Navajo Nation in Arizona. The Michigan Public Health Institute, in partnership with the Native American Institute at Michigan State University, conducted the evaluation.

The American Youth Policy Forum was awarded a grant in FY 2006 to produce and disseminate a report comprised of compelling case studies that provide insight into TYP practices and policies among six select TYP grantees. This report will feature promising practices that demonstrate infrastructure connected to funding and the leveraging of resources. Case studies will focus on TYP performance measures in the five TYP program categories. The report will feature significant challenges that face the implementation of TYP in Indian Country and will serve as an educational tool for TYP programs and tribes as well as an outreach tool to national and local level policymakers.

Also, in FY 2006, through its Field-Initiated Research and Evaluation solicitation, OJJDP awarded an 18-month grant to the Justice Research and Statistics Association to conduct an evaluation of the efficacy of disproportionate minority contact (DMC) reduction efforts of selected sites. This project will examine steps these sites have taken to reduce DMC and assess and document the outcomes they have achieved.

OJJDP, which established the Girls Study Group in 2004 to learn more about why an increasing number of girls are entering the juvenile justice system and to better understand how to prevent and intervene in girls’ delinquency, completed the following activities in 2006:

Secondary analysis of both official and self-report data to determine whether there really has been a rise in girls’ violence. Some possible reasons for the increasing number of girls entering the system may include zero tolerance policies that require arrests. A major finding was that official (arrest) data recorded an increase in the number and proportion of girls being arrested, yet, self-report data such as the National Crime Victims Survey and Monitoring the Future did not show a rise in girls’ violent behaviors. Mandatory arrest rules in cases of domestic violence (disputes between a parent and daughter), or changes in police interpretations of offenses that used to be considered status offenses (such as the designation “ungovernable” now being classified as “simple assault”).
A review of evaluations of girls' delinquency programs to identify promising and effective programs. A major finding is that there are few high-quality evaluations of girls' delinquency programs. The Girls Study Group identified several programs as promising, inconclusive, or having insufficient evidence. Promising programs included Project Chrysalis, Urban Women Against Substance Abuse, Reaffirming Youth Sisters Excellence, and Naja Project. A review of the existing Blueprints model programs also indicates that, for those that measured effects by gender, most of these programs were effective for both girls and boys.

A review of screening and assessment instruments used for girls. The major finding was that the bulk of screening and assessment instruments that juvenile justice systems use have not been validated. The Girls Study Group is developing an online tool that program providers can use to learn more about various instruments, their level of validation, and whether they have been used and tested for girls.

**Outcome Data/Performance Measures**

In 2006, OJJDP made significant progress in establishing, implementing, and collecting performance measurement data from its grantees and programs. Beginning in 2005, OJJDP established core performance measures for its state-level grantees and subgrantees to collect outcome data related to the prevention and/or reduction of delinquency. The core measures are outlined below in the data section. In 2006 (beginning with awards made in September 2006), OJJDP extended the requirement to report data in support of these core performance measures through an online system to the following grant programs:

- Congressional earmark grantees receiving more than $246,807 (161 grantees)
- All Tribal Youth Program grantees, and
- All Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws Block grantees.

To prepare these grantees to collect and report data, OJJDP conducted a number of teleconference training calls for grantees and staff. OJJDP also established and enhanced its performance measures Web page.

In addition, OJJDP conducted trainings and presentations on the agency's performance measures system and requirements at several grantee cluster meetings and conferences. OJJDP also provided states with their own state-specific reports of their Formula, Title V, and JABG performance measures data (released at the state regional trainings in fall 2006).

For much of 2006, OJJDP was also engaged in a “Juvenile Justice Programs” Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) evaluation conducted by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). A number of staff and contractors were involved in collecting data, responding to key questions, meeting with OJP’s Office of Management and Budget Services, Justice Management Division, and OMB, and analyzing data results. OJJDP received a PART rating of 64.5 (Adequate) and was determined to be a “Performing” agency.
# Appendix

## Fiscal Year 2006 Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Grant Count</th>
<th>Grant Amount (in $)</th>
<th>Non-Grant Count</th>
<th>Non-Grant Amount (in $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAW ENFORCEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>43,128,862.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed and Seed</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>49,532,805.00</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>6,293,986.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Litigation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>929,918.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>742.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Courts Assistance Program</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7,445,928.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29,656.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORRECTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner Reentry Initiative</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14,872,077.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29,572.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GANGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Safe Neighborhoods/Anti-Gang Initiative</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>46,130,941.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,563,228.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Resistance Education and Training Program</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>25,551,353.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>325,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUVENILE JUSTICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing the Underage Drinking Laws Program</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23,762,305.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133,275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39,900,409.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: Formula</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74,710,295.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,777,041.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing and Exploited Children</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47,735,887.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>252,156.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ChildSafe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>917,850.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V Community Prevention Grants Program</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7,108,857.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,224,132.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Youth Program</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9,054,545.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>350,230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Gang Reduction Program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,380,698.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Grant Count</td>
<td>Grant Amount (in $)</td>
<td>Non-Grant Count</td>
<td>Non-Grant Amount (in $)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICTIMS OF CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Justice Act</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,766,911.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>131,784.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Victim Assistance</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>395,918,319.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Victim Compensation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>143,418,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for Trafficking Victims Discretionary Grant</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16,634,193.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,668.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Victims of Terrorism, Mass Violence, Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>153,000.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,250,604.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Victim Assistance Discretionary Grant Program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,551,940.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Assistance in the Federal System</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,236,532.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3,583,382.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Alcohol and Crime Demonstration Program</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4,102,758.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,228.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile and Family Drug Courts</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6,286,997.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,846,727.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Program</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9,753,361.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124,456.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNOLOGY TO FIGHT CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Records Improvement</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9,403,965.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Coverdell Grants</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14,903,695.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s DNA Initiative</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>81,127,929.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23,714,868.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against Women Act II Stalking Databases</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,420,247.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH, STATISTICS AND EVALUATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Statistical Programs</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9,419,222.00</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29,899,024.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, and Evaluation Programs</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37,005,683.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>21,454,959.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>