

**D15A05.16**  
**Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention**

***Operating Budget Data***

(\$ in Thousands)

	<u>FY 02</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 03</u> <u>Approp.</u>	<u>FY 04</u> <u>Allowance</u>	<u>FY 03 - 04</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>FY 03 - 04</u> <u>% Change</u>
General Funds	\$7,313	\$7,355	\$7,088	-\$267	-3.6%
FY 2003 Cost Containment	0	-393	0	393	
Contingent & Back of Bill Reductions	0	-1	0	1	
<b>Adjusted General Funds</b>	<b>\$7,313</b>	<b>\$6,961</b>	<b>\$7,088</b>	<b>\$127</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
Special Funds	1,678	1,348	1,584	236	17.5%
Contingent & Back of Bill Reductions	0	0	0	0	
<b>Adjusted Special Funds</b>	<b>\$1,678</b>	<b>\$1,348</b>	<b>\$1,584</b>	<b>\$237</b>	<b>17.5%</b>
Federal Funds	38,559	36,974	34,783	-21,90	-5.9%
Contingent & Back of Bill Reductions	0	-1	0	1	
<b>Adjusted Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$38,559</b>	<b>\$36,972</b>	<b>\$34,783</b>	<b>-\$2,189</b>	<b>-5.9%</b>
Reimbursable Funds	419	0	0	0	
<b>Adjusted Grand Total</b>	<b>\$47,969</b>	<b>\$45,281</b>	<b>\$43,455</b>	<b>-\$1,826</b>	<b>-4.0%</b>

- The allowance provides \$7,260,156 for State funded grants for various crime prevention initiatives compared to \$7,250,166 in fiscal 2003.
- The allowance assumes the State will obligate \$34.8 million in federal funds, but more recent projections indicate \$28.8 million may be received.

***Personnel Data***

	<u>FY 02</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 03</u> <u>Working</u>	<u>FY 04</u> <u>Allowance</u>	<u>Change</u>
Regular Positions	38.00	37.00	34.00	-3.00
Contractual FTEs	10.90	10.90	8.90	-2.00
<b>Total Personnel</b>	<b>48.90</b>	<b>47.90</b>	<b>42.90</b>	<b>-5.00</b>

***Vacancy Data: Regular Positions***

Budgeted Turnover: FY 04	1.19	3.50%
Positions Vacant as of 12/31/02	8.11	3.00%

- Three positions are transferred to the new Governor's Grant Office.

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

For further information contact: James L. Stoops

Phone: (410) 946-5530

## ***Analysis in Brief***

---

### **Major Trends**

***Crime Totals in Maryland Have Dropped After Peaking in the Mid 1990s:*** Crime rates for violent crime (all Part I offenses) have declined 17% statewide between 1996 and 2000, while property offenses declined 18% during the same period.

***Violent Offender Truth in Sentencing Grant Is Terminated:*** The Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP) anticipated \$6,950,000 from this grant in fiscal 2004, but Congress has cancelled the grant to fund Homeland Security.

### **Issues**

***HotSpots:*** The HotSpot Program in 36 sites has reduced violent crime (Part I offenses) 22% more than the State overall decrease in crime totals since 1996.

***Management Study of GOCCP:*** GOCCP has lost focus as a public policy agency on Public Safety and Criminal Justice.

***Break the Cycle Report Not Submitted:*** Budget bill language added to the fiscal 2003 appropriation required GOCCP to submit a report to the budget committees on the outcome analysis of the Break the Cycle Program. The required report was not submitted.

***Reorganization of Victim Services:*** Budget bill language added to the fiscal 2003 appropriation required GOCCP to submit a report on the reorganization of victim services. The required report was not submitted.

*D15A05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

**Recommended Actions**

	<u><b>Funds</b></u>
1. Add budget bill language to require management study of GOCCP functions.	
2. Reduce general funds for HotSpot Communities Program to \$1,750,000 or one-half of the level provided in fiscal 2003.	\$ 1,510,000
3. Delete general funds for neighborhood grants to reduce the State budget deficit.	900,000
4. Reduce federal funds to reflect current projection of federal funds for State fiscal 2004.	6,064,282
<b>Total Reductions</b>	<b>\$ 8,474,282</b>

***D15A05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention***

**D15A05.16**  
**Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention**

***Operating Budget Analysis***

---

**Program Description**

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

**Performance Analysis: Managing for Results**

GOCCP distributes over 1,400 grants annually as indicated in **Exhibit 1**.

**Exhibit 1**

---

**Key Indicators**  
**Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP)**

	<u>FY 01</u>	<u>FY 02</u>	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>	<u>FY 02-03</u>	<u>FY 03-04</u>
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>%Change</u>	<u>%Change</u>
<b>GOCCP Grant Awards</b>						
Byrne Memorial Grants	169	118	230	230	94.9%	0.0%
Juvenile Justice Grants	10	46	45	45	-2.2%	0.0%
Drug Treatment Task Force Grants	1	1	1	1	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Free School Grants	6	14	15	15	7.1%	0.0%
Violence Against Women Grants	27	76	80	80	5.3%	0.0%
Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies	12	1	12	12	1,100.0%	0.0%
Neighborhood Grants	409	503	400	400	-20.5%	0.0%
Maryland Victim of Crime Grants	45	56	50	50	-10.7%	0.0%
Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants	19	280	200	200	-28.6%	0.0%
Curb Underage Drinking	30	32	35	35	9.4%	0.0%
Local Law Enforcement Grants	30	16	29	29	81.3%	0.0%
Domestic Violence Unit	24	6	0	0	-100.0%	n/a
HotSpot Communities Program	160	592	300	300	-49.3%	0.0%
Maryland After School Initiative	33	17	29	29	70.6%	0.0%
Prison Construction Grants	1	4	0	0	-100.0%	n/a
Residential Substance Abuse Treatment	4	3	3	3	0.0%	0.0%
Cigarette Restitution Fund	0	1	1	1	0.0%	0.0%
Rural Domestic Violence Grants	0	14	14	14	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Grant Awards</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>1,780</b>	<b>1,444</b>	<b>1,444</b>	<b>-18.9%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

Source: Governor's Budget Books

## Fiscal 2003 Actions

The cost containment actions approved by the Board of Public Works on January 8, 2003, included reductions of \$392,731 to the GOCCP fiscal 2003 budget – a hiring freeze (\$222,731) in regular positions and contractual positions (\$30,000) and a reduction in grants (\$140,000). Additional fiscal 2003 cost containment reflects the reversion of appropriations to support free transit ridership for State employees, contingent upon enactment of a provision in the Budget Reconciliation and Financing Act of 2003. The GOCCP fiscal 2003 appropriation included \$2,349 for this item.

## Governor's Proposed Budget

The fiscal 2004 allowance decreases \$1,828,208, or 4.0% from the fiscal 2003 adjusted budget. The general fund allowance increases \$126,329, or 1.8%, special funds increase \$236,463, or 17.5% and federal funds decrease \$2,188,700, or 5.9% from fiscal 2003 as indicated in **Exhibit 2** (Three positions are transferred to the new Governor's Grant Office D15A05.22.)

### Exhibit 2

---

#### Governor's Proposed Budget Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention

	<u>FY 02</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 03</u> <u>Approp.</u>	<u>FY 04</u> <u>Allowance</u>	<u>FY 03 - 04</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>FY 03 - 04</u> <u>% Change</u>
General Funds	\$7,313	\$7,355	\$7,088	-267	-3.6%
FY 2003 Cost Containment	0	-393	0	393	
Contingent & Back of Bill Reductions	0	-1	0	1	
<b>Adjusted General Funds</b>	<b>\$7,313</b>	<b>\$6,961</b>	<b>\$7,088</b>	<b>\$127</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
Special Funds	1,678	1,348	1,584	236	17.5%
Contingent & Back of Bill Reductions	0	0	0	0	
<b>Adjusted Special Funds</b>	<b>\$1,678</b>	<b>\$1,348</b>	<b>\$1,584</b>	<b>\$237</b>	<b>17.5%</b>
Federal Funds	38,559	36,974	34,783	-2,190	-5.9%
Contingent & Back of Bill Reductions	0	-1	0	1	
<b>Adjusted Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$38,559</b>	<b>\$36,972</b>	<b>\$34,783</b>	<b>-\$2,189</b>	<b>-5.9%</b>
Reimbursable Funds	419	0	0	0	
<b>Adjusted Grand Total</b>	<b>\$47,969</b>	<b>\$45,281</b>	<b>\$43,455</b>	<b>-\$1,826</b>	<b>-4.0%</b>

*D15A05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

**Where it Grows:**

**Personnel Expenses**

Hiring freeze fiscal 2003 impact .....	\$223
Three positions transferred to Governor's Grant Office .....	-209
Health insurance .....	58
Cost containment restored .....	4
Delete 401(k) match .....	-12
Employee transit subsidy.....	2
Reduction in turnover expectancy .....	37
Other changes .....	-105
<b>Sub-total Salaries and Wages</b>	<b>-2</b>

**Where it Grows:**

Contractual hiring freeze fiscal 2003 impact .....	30
Abolish two FTE contractual positions.....	-138
Telephone & telecommunications .....	-24
Postage.....	8
Out-of-state conferences.....	15
Travel and in-state conferences .....	18
Contractual services.....	6
Data processing personal computers.....	-29
Grants.....	-1,968
Grants fiscal 2003 cost containment impact .....	140
Rent .....	18
Other fixed charges.....	92
Other expenses.....	8
<b>Total Changes</b>	<b>-\$1,826</b>

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

**Impact of Cost Containment**

The fiscal 2004 allowance already deletes the State 401(k) subsidies. This item was \$11,738 in the fiscal 2003 budget.

**General Fund Grants**

The 2004 allowance includes \$7,260,156 for State grants, an increase of \$9,990 from the fiscal 2003 level as indicated in **Exhibit 3**. The significant general fund grant items are the After School Initiative (\$1,150,156) and the HotSpot Communities Program (\$3,260,000). The After School Initiative is funded at the fiscal 2003 level, but the HotSpot funds are reduced from the \$3,500,000 fiscal 2003 funding level.

*D15A05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

The After School Initiative provides mentoring and counseling services and other activities to at risk youth to occupy them after school into the early evening hours when they are most likely to get into trouble. The \$400,000 Victim Information and Notification Everyday (VINE) contract is with an outside vendor to provide computerized victim notification.

The Victims of Crime Fund is a special fund that consists of district and circuit court fees assessed in criminal cases. The fund is used to fund a number of community advocacy and outreach services to victims of crime. In addition, it provides funds for victim assistance in local State's Attorney offices. The Victim and Witness Protection Program is also financed with fees assessed in court criminal cases and from transfers from the Victims of Crime Fund.

**Exhibit 3**

---

**Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention State Grants**

	<u>Actual Fiscal 2002</u>	<u>Appropriation Fiscal 2003</u>	<u>Allowance Fiscal 2004</u>
<b>Grant Programs - State Funds</b>			
VINE Contract - Statewide Maryland Victim/Witness Notification System	\$396,032	\$400,000	\$400,000
After School Initiative	1,335,596	1,150,156	1,150,156
HotSpot	3,142,514	3,500,000	3,260,000
Neighborhood Grants	988,174	900,000	900,000
Domestic Violence Unit Pilot Program Fund	74,114	200,000	200,000
<b>Subtotal General Fund Grants</b>	<b>\$5,936,430</b>	<b>\$6,150,156</b>	<b>\$5,910,156</b>
Victims of Crime Fund	1,147,336	900,010	1,150,000
Victim/Witness Protection	160,242	200,000	200,000
<b>Subtotal Special Fund Grants</b>	<b>\$1,307,578</b>	<b>\$1,100,010</b>	<b>\$1,350,000</b>
<b>Grand Total State Fund Grants</b>	<b>\$7,244,008</b>	<b>\$7,250,166</b>	<b>\$7,260,156</b>

Source: Governor's Finance Office

---

**Federal Funds and Grants**

The 2003 budget anticipates the receipt of federal funds from a number of grants from federal fiscal (FFY) 2003 and FFY 2004 as indicated in **Exhibit 4**, but this is only a best guess. Congress has not appropriated funds for FFY 2003, let alone for fiscal 2004; yet these funds are reflected in the State budget. Currently, federal grants for FFY 2003 are funded under a continuing resolution at FFY 2002 levels.

*D15A05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

The funds indicated for State fiscal 2003 and 2004 generally conform to FFY 2003 and FFY 2004, but not exactly because the federal fiscal year runs between October 1 and ends September 30 while the State fiscal year runs from July 1 and ends June 30. In addition, GOCCP can carry forward federal funds from a prior State fiscal year that are unspent. Therefore, State fiscal 2004 could consist of funds from FFY 2003, FFY 2004 and other years (most likely FFY 2002). Some federal grants have longer than 12 months in which to obligate (apply for the grant) and even longer to actually draw down or expend the funds and for the State to receive the actual cash via the State Treasurer banking system from the Federal Reserve System.

**Exhibit 4**

**Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention  
Federal Fund Income**

<u>CFDA No.</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Actual Fiscal 2002</u>	<u>Appropriated Fiscal 2003</u>	<u>Anticipated Fiscal 2004</u>
16.540	Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Formula Grants	\$1,041,490	\$1,277,000	\$1,236,000
16.548	Title V	1,045,033	699,000	499,000
16.549	State Challenge	151,477	144,000	142,000
16.523	Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant	5,346,986	4,025,700	3,564,700
16.588	Violence Against Women Act	2,487,983	2,459,000	2,451,000
16.590	Grants to Encourage Arrest Policy	675,951	911,683	911,683
15.588	Rural Domestic Violence & Child Victimization Enforcement Grant	100,092	450,000	450,000
16.579	Drug Law Enforcement & Systems Improvement Grant (Byrne)	13,183,282	9,107,619	9,009,474
16.592	Local Law Enforcement Block Grant	658,863	583,611	437,708
16.593	Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Grant	467,538	1,093,907	1,213,703
16.586	Violent Offenders Truth In Sentencing <sup>1</sup>	7,357,661	7,000,000	0
16.607	Bullet Proof Vest	5,044	0	0
16.712	Police Corps <sup>2</sup>	3,479,022	4,318,579	3,140,000
16.727	Underage Drinking Block Grant	464,589	360,000	360,000
16.727	Underage Drinking Discretionary Grant	206,220	400,000	400,000
84.186a	Safe and Drug Free Schools	1,307,269	1,314,988	1,325,341
93.230	Substance Abuse Prevention Initiative	580,769	2,828,461	2,828,461
new	Substance Abuse Prevention Initiative – Enhancement <sup>3</sup>			750,000
	<b>Total Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$38,559,269</b>	<b>\$36,973,548</b>	<b>\$28,719,070</b>

CFDA=Code of Federal Domestic Assistance

<sup>1</sup>The Violent Offenders federal grant is terminated with a loss of \$7.0 million to Maryland. This program was terminated to fund Homeland Security programs at the federal level.

<sup>2</sup>The Police Corps funds are reduced. The program will no longer provide funds to local police agencies.

<sup>3</sup>This is a new grant GOCCP will apply for the enhancement.

Source: Governor's Finance Office and Budget Books.

*D15A05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

Generally speaking, GOCCP has awarded federal funds to grantees through FFY 2002 but not for FFY 2003. The Department of Legislative Services can provide the current fund status on any single grant that GOCCP has made that had an open balance on December 12, 2002, – there are over 1,400 of these currently. A significant number of these grants are for the HotSpot Communities Program (HSC). In the case of HotSpot grants, individual grants to local jurisdictions may consist of funds from several federal grants and State obligated funds across several State fiscal years. **Appendix 3** provides a complete funding stream of the \$46,366,009 for the HotSpot program initiative from inception in State fiscal 1996 through State fiscal 2003 and FFY 2003. See additional discussion on the HotSpot initiatives.

Exhibit 4 indicates that the Police Corps grant will no longer provide funds to local police agencies to hire additional police officers who are recent college graduates. The Violent Offenders Truth in Sentencing grant was cancelled to fund Homeland Security. It is likely that other federal grants may be reduced or cut with the increased emphasis on Homeland Security and away from domestic crime issues at the federal level.

## ***Issues***

---

### **1. HotSpot**

The HotSpot initiative began in fiscal 1997 as a GOCCP program to focus on high crime areas on the theory that a few high crime areas or “Hot Spots” in every jurisdiction account for a disproportionate share of total crime. There was also the belief that traditional methods of policing – preventive patrol, quick response, case investigation and arrest – to reduce crime in HotSpot neighborhoods were not working because these neighborhoods were more than crime-prone individuals choosing to congregate. These neighborhoods suffered from a variety of social ills that would require coordinated use of multiple public services as well as new approaches to policing or what commonly became know as community policing. Programmatically, under the HSC initiative, community policing combined with other coordinated public services would be marshaled together for a community-based crime prevention program to fight crime in the community. Under this concept, probation agents, for example, would be assigned 60% of the usual caseload and assigned directly to the neighborhood as part of a neighborhood public safety team.

Thirty-six communities participated in the HotSpot program during the first two years. In the first year, or phase I, each county and Baltimore City had at least one HSC site selected by the jurisdiction with 12 additional sites allocated to jurisdictions proportionally based on their Part I Uniform Crime Statistic counts. In the first year, local HSC teams shared \$10.5 million in State and federal funding. Rather than assign funds on a project-by-project basis, funds were concentrated geographically. Each HSC site was to have a Neighborhood Safety Partnership Team to implement six core elements – community mobilization, community policing, community probation, community maintenance/nuisance abatement, youth prevention, and local coordination. Later each HSC was enhanced with one or more optional elements. The enhanced elements included community prosecution; community juvenile intervention; crime prevention through environmental design; victim outreach and assistance; community supported addiction recovery; and housing and business revitalization.

Since 1997, HSC initiative has expanded to include additional sites. **Appendix 3** indicates that since inception HSC sites received \$18.9 million in federal grants through FFY 2002 and \$13.9 million in State funds through State fiscal 2003 with local matching and in-kind services providing an additional \$13.5 million for a total commitment of \$46.4 million.

### **Does HotSpot Work?**

Three evaluations of the HSC initiatives have been completed. The first report overseen by the University of Maryland, College Park examined recidivism rates in HSC's to determine program effectiveness. The second report prepared by the University of Pennsylvania Jerry Lee Center of Criminology, under a federal funded contract, was provided in response to fiscal 2003 budget bill language in October 2002. The third report, a direct federal funded contract with the Urban Institute, was completed in October 2002. The Urban Institute report, a process evaluation, documents strategies employed by 12 of the 36 original HSC's with more detailed case studies of two of the HSC locations.

### *D15A05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

The report is almost incomprehensible and therefore nearly useless. The Urban Institute report was prepared under a direct National Institute of Justice Contract.

Budget bill language placed in the 2002 budget bill (Chapter 439, Acts of 2002) withheld \$250,000 from the GOCCP fiscal 2003 budget until the two evaluations were completed. The funds were released, with receipt of the two reports, in October 2002,

The more useful report is the University of Pennsylvania evaluation. This study provides a comparative analysis of crime trends within 36 individual HSC's for the period 1996 through 2000. The study documents that the 36 HSC sites enjoyed violent crime reductions 22% greater than the rest of Maryland during the period 1996 through 2000. The study notes that for all serious (Part I) crimes reported to the police in HSCs, the decrease was 18% greater than the State. Part I crimes dropped in Maryland by 17 % from 1996 through 2000. An 18% additional drop in property crime compared to the State for HSCs was also cited by the study, but the decline was not considered statistically significant. While the property offenses declined 36% for the HSCs compared to 18% for all Maryland jurisdictions, the drop occurred in fewer sites (in 22 vs 26 sites for the Part I crimes). Raw data for all 36 sites for Part I crimes and all violent crime is depicted for the 36 sites in **Appendix 4**.

Raw data for a second group of 29 HSCs, added to original 36 sites in calendar 2000, is provided in **Appendix 5**. The second group, using calendar 1999 as the base year, indicates more mixed results than the first group of 36 sites. In 13 of the 29 sites Part I, crime actually increases while 5 of the 29 sites had increases in the overall violent crime total compared to the base year 1999.

Conclusion, the HotSpot program initiative has worked in many locations, but not uniformly.

**It is recommended, that the HotSpot program be continued, but at a reduced level recognizing the State's fiscal problems and that less federal funds may be available for domestic crime prevention as the nation shifts its focus to Homeland Security. It is recommended that State funds be reduced from the \$3,260,000 to \$1,750,000 in recognition of the State's fiscal problems and that eight months into the fiscal 2003 GOCCP has not awarded the fiscal 2003 HotSpot grants.**

## **2. Management Study of GOCCP**

GOCCP might be characterized as an unwieldy octopus with its tentacles into everything. While it might be tempting to simply abolish the agency and start over, it must be recognized that, in addition to distributing grant funds to State and local units, GOCCP administers or has representation on the following:

- State Use Industries Management Council
- Criminal Justice Information Advisory Board
- State Board of Victims Services

*D15A05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

- State Victims of Crime Fund
- Victim and Witness Protection Program
- Law Enforcement Equipment Fund
- Maryland After School Opportunities Fund Program
- Cease Fire Council
- Drug and Alcohol Council
- Community Legacy Advisory Board
- State Committee on Public Safety Technology & Critical Infrastructure

The last responsibility is new. House Bill 1265 enacted in 2002 establishes a 19-member State Commission on Public Safety Technology and Critical Infrastructure to make recommendations to the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals on the compatibility and interoperability of communication and information systems maintained by the Judicial Branch with those maintained by State and local public safety units. GOCCP is required to staff the commission. The Commission is required to submit a report to the Department of Budget and Management and the Governor on December 1 each year. The commission was created November 2002.

This extensive list of GOCCP responsibilities may imply that GOCCP has overreached or become over committed, and lost focus as the Governor's policy office on criminal justice.

It should be noted that this issue with the GOCCP is not new. Public policy and criminal justice has had many marriages and many divorces. In previous administrations, back in the 1970s, there was a similar issue with an office established to administer grants under the Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice Act that tried to administer line functions, distribute LEA grants, and be a policy agency and advisor to the Governor. That agency was abolished, and the GOCCP created years later as its successor.

**It is recommended that the Governor's Office with assistance of the Department of Budget and Management Division of Policy Analysis do a top-down bottom-up management study of GOCCP. The study should address which programs and functions should be transferred out of the Governor's Office to State agencies, which commissions and functions should be abolished and/or responsibilities reassigned within State government, and recommend legislation to effect recommended changes as appropriate. Finally, the study should determine what should be the appropriate focus, staffing and responsibilities of a public policy office on public safety and criminal justice in the Governor's Office.**

### **3. Break the Cycle Report Not Submitted**

Budget bill language added to the fiscal 2003 appropriation required GOCCP to submit a report to the budget committees on the outcome analysis of the Break the Cycle Program. The budget bill language also withheld \$250,000 until GOCCP submitted the report. The required report was not submitted.

Implemented in 1998, Break the Cycle is a proactive community supervision program. The goal of the program is to ensure treatment and recovery for drug addicts on parole or probation through intensified supervision by the Division of Parole and Probation (DPP) within the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services. Until the end of fiscal 2001, Break the Cycle was supported by federal funds.

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

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

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

GOCCP initially hired the RAND Corporation to conduct an outcome analysis of Break the Cycle by comparing recidivism rates of offenders in the Break the Cycle program with demographically similar offenders who live in other counties. This analysis is now being performed by the Urban Institute. The evaluation was to be completed in 2002, but the required report was not submitted to the budget Committees.

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

#### **4. Reorganization of Victim Services**

Budget bill language added to the fiscal 2003 appropriation required GOCCP to submit a report on the reorganization of victim services. The budget bill language also withheld \$250,000 until the report was submitted. The required report was not submitted.

The Victim Information and Notification Everyday (VINE) is an automated telephone system that provides crime victims with dial-up information about offender case and custody status. Upon request, a victim can receive automatic updates whenever an offender's case or custody status changes. The allowance includes \$400,000 to an outside vendor that provides the VINE service.

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

## ***Recommended Actions***

---

1. Add the following language:

The Governor's Office with assistance of the Department of Budget and Management Division of Policy Analysis shall do a top-down bottom-up management study of the Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP). The study should address which programs and functions should be transferred out of the Governor's Office to State agencies, which commissions and functions should be abolished and/or responsibilities reassigned within State government, and recommend legislation to effect recommended changes as appropriate. Finally, the study should determine what should be the appropriate focus, staffing, and responsibilities of a public policy office on public safety and criminal justice in the Governor's Office.

**Explanation:** GOCCP has become an unwieldy octopus with its tentacles into everything and has lost its focus as an effective public policy agency and advisor to the Governor on public safety and criminal justice.

- |  | <b><u>Amount<br/>Reduction</u></b> |    |
|--|------------------------------------|----|
| 2. Reduce general funds for HotSpot Communities Program to \$1,750,000 or one-half of the level provided in fiscal 2003. The HotSpot reduction is made to reduce the State budget deficit and because eight months into fiscal 2003 the Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention has not allocated the \$3,500,000 provided in the fiscal 2003 budget to HotSpot grantees. HotSpot is not a mandated program; therefore, the State grant amount is discretionary. | \$ 1,510,000                       | GF |
| 3. Delete general funds for neighborhood grants to reduce the State budget deficit. This is not a mandated program. The program was originally authorized under Article 27 Section 297D as the Maryland Drug and Alcohol Grants Program Fund. This provision sunsetted June 30, 1998, Section 3, Chapter 607, Acts of 1992 as amended by Chapter 15, Acts of 1995.   | 900,000                            | GF |

*D15A05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention*

4. Reduce federal funds to reflect current projection of federal funds for State in fiscal 2004. The allowance assumes the Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP) will receive and obligate \$34,783,352 in fiscal 2004. The most recent estimates project \$28,783,070. The Violent Offender Truth in Sentencing grant (\$7.0 million in fiscal 2003) was terminated. Congress allowed the Program to sunset in federal fiscal 2002. The State expects \$750,000 in additional substance abuse prevention funds and small adjustments in other federal grants.

6,064,282 FF

**Total Reductions** **\$ 8,474,282**

**Total General Fund Reductions** **\$ 2,410,000**

**Total Federal Fund Reductions** **\$ 6,064,282**

## *Current and Prior Year Budgets*

---

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

	<u>General Fund</u>	<u>Special Fund</u>	<u>Federal Fund</u>	<u>Reimb. Fund</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>Fiscal 2002</b>					
Legislative Appropriation	\$7,328	\$1,350	\$36,513	\$0	\$45,191
Deficiency Appropriation	0	0	0	0	0
Budget Amendments	-15	405	7,542	2,000	9,932
Reversions and Cancellations	0	-77	-5,496	-1,581	-7,154
<b>Actual Expenditures</b>	<b>\$7,313</b>	<b>\$1,678</b>	<b>\$38,559</b>	<b>\$419</b>	<b>\$47,969</b>
<b>Fiscal 2003</b>					
Legislative Appropriation	\$7,355	\$1,348	\$36,974	\$0	\$45,677
Budget Amendments	-394	0	-1	0	-395
<b>Working Appropriation</b>	<b>\$6,961</b>	<b>\$1,348</b>	<b>\$36,972</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$45,282</b>

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

---

## **Fiscal 2002 Adjustments**

### **General Fund Adjustments**

There were \$15,000 in cost containment reductions taken in fiscal 2002.

### **Special Fund Adjustments**

Additional revenue of \$405,000 for the Victims of Crime Fund was recorded, and \$77,077 in unspent revenue was rolled over into fiscal 2003.

### **Federal Fund Adjustments**

Additional Federal funds of \$7,542,366 were received from federal grant awards and from prior year carry-forward funds. Federal funds of \$5,495,768 that were not spent were rolled forward into fiscal 2003.

### **Reimbursable Funds**

The Maryland State Police made \$419,180 available to GOCCP.

D15A05.16 - Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention

Appendix 2

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

<u>Object/Fund</u>	<u>FY 02 Actual</u>	<u>FY 03 Working Appropriation</u>	<u>FY 04 Allowance</u>	<u>FY 03 – FY 04 Amount Change</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>
<b>Positions</b>					
01 Regular	38.00	37.00	34.00	-3.00	-8.1%
02 Contractual	10.90	10.90	8.90	-2.00	-18.3%
<b>Total Positions</b>	<b>48.90</b>	<b>47.90</b>	<b>42.90</b>	<b>-5.00</b>	<b>-10.4%</b>
<b>Objects</b>					
01 Salaries and Wages	\$ 2,489,868	\$ 2,507,699	\$ 2,285,112	-\$ 222,587	-8.9%
02 Technical & Spec Fees	775,229	434,834	296,931	-137,903	-31.7%
03 Communication	115,379	79,459	63,286	-16,173	-20.4%
04 Travel	198,352	86,250	119,400	33,150	38.4%
07 Motor Vehicles	26,415	16,780	16,912	132	0.8%
08 Contractual Services	692,659	207,675	213,711	6,036	2.9%
09 Supplies & Materials	62,467	73,628	76,546	2,918	4.0%
10 Equip – Replacement	13,629	36,800	7,500	-29,300	-79.6%
11 Equip – Additional	113,969	0	0	0	0.0%
12 Grants, Subsidies, Contr	42,573,058	41,824,091	39,856,047	-1,968,044	-4.7%
13 Fixed Charges	907,709	408,774	519,606	110,832	27.1%
<b>Total Objects</b>	<b>\$ 47,968,734</b>	<b>\$ 45,675,990</b>	<b>\$ 43,455,051</b>	<b>-\$ 2,220,939</b>	<b>-4.9%</b>
<b>Funds</b>					
01 General Fund	\$ 7,312,566	\$ 7,354,709	\$ 7,087,503	-\$ 267,206	-3.6%
03 Special Fund	1,677,719	1,347,733	1,584,196	236,463	17.5%
05 Federal Fund	38,559,269	36,973,548	34,783,352	-2,190,196	-5.9%
09 Reimbursable Fund	419,180	0	0	0	0.0%
<b>Total Funds</b>	<b>\$ 47,968,734</b>	<b>\$ 45,675,990</b>	<b>\$ 43,455,051</b>	<b>-\$ 2,220,939</b>	<b>-4.9%</b>

Note: Fiscal 2003 appropriations and fiscal 2004 allowance do not include cost containment and contingent reductions.

Fiscal Summary  
Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention

<u>Unit/Program</u>	FY 02		FY 03		FY 03		FY 02 - FY 03		FY 04	
	<u>Actual</u>		<u>Legislative Appropriation</u>	<u>Working Appropriation</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>		<u>% Change</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Allowance</u>	<u>% Change</u>
0000 Unknown Title	\$ 47,968,734		\$ 44,292,490	\$ 44,282,490			-7.7%		\$ 42,037,879	-5.1%
9990 Unknown Title	0		1,383,500	1,393,500					1,417,172	1.7%
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 47,968,734</b>		<b>\$ 45,675,990</b>	<b>\$ 45,675,990</b>			<b>-4.8%</b>		<b>\$ 43,455,051</b>	<b>-4.9%</b>
General Fund	\$ 7,312,566		\$ 7,354,709	\$ 7,354,709			0.6%		\$ 7,087,503	-3.6%
Special Fund	1,677,719		1,347,733	1,347,733			-19.7%		1,584,196	17.5%
Federal Fund	38,559,269		36,973,548	36,973,548			-4.1%		34,783,352	-5.9%
<b>Total Appropriations</b>	<b>\$ 47,549,554</b>		<b>\$ 45,675,990</b>	<b>\$ 45,675,990</b>			<b>-3.9%</b>		<b>\$ 43,455,051</b>	<b>-4.9%</b>
Reimbursable Fund	\$ 419,180		\$ 0	\$ 0			-100.0%		\$ 0	0.0%
<b>Total Funds</b>	<b>\$ 47,968,734</b>		<b>\$ 45,675,990</b>	<b>\$ 45,675,990</b>			<b>-4.8%</b>		<b>\$ 43,455,051</b>	<b>-4.9%</b>

Note: Fiscal 2003 appropriations and fiscal 2004 allowance do not include cost containment and contingent reductions.



	Matching Funds State Fiscal									
	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003		
Other State Funds	0	0	0	0	7,523	2,500	17,931	0	27,954	
Local Funds	0	0	750	53,756	989,017	1,431,471	315,251	2,099,487	4,889,732	
Private Funds	0	0	0	0	30,657	53,113	82,355	42,029	208,154	
Other In-kind Contributions	0	0	26,437	5,000	33,070	1,749,366	153,356	6,432,001	8,399,230	
<b>Total Matching Funds</b>	0	0	27,187	58,756	1,060,267	3,236,450	568,893	8,573,517	13,525,070	
<b>Grand Total All Funds</b>	<b>\$194,928</b>	<b>\$3,694,469</b>	<b>\$3,880,075</b>	<b>\$4,161,466</b>	<b>\$7,803,545</b>	<b>\$6,603,624</b>	<b>\$7,667,397</b>	<b>\$12,360,505</b>	<b>\$46,366,009</b>	

Note: CFDA= Code of Federal Domestic Assistance

Source: Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention

**Phase I HotSpot  
HotSpot Communities Program – Part 1 Crimes by HotSpot**

County	Name of Hot Spot Community	Year 5: CY 01			Year 4: CY 00			Year 3: CY 99			Year 2: CY 98			Year 1: CY 97			Baseline Year: CY 96			% Change CY 96-01	
		Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime
	South																				
Allegany	Cumberland	676	65	538	64	550	59	517	79	485	79	485	79	520	99	30.00%	-34.34%				
Anne Arundel	Pioneer Drive	126	68	105	48	88	42	128	49	106	28	146	44	44	-13.70%	54.55%					
Anne Arundel	Annapolis (Eastport)	110	45	98	45	139	46	184	80	211	124	187	70	70	-41.18%	-35.71%					
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	East Baltimore North	1,328	564	1,661	740	1,785	757	2,289	920	2,552	1,038	3,233	1,226	1,226	-58.92%	-54.00%					
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	East Baltimore South	980	429	1,137	499	1,260	494	1,249	510	1,463	519	1,762	562	562	-44.38%	-23.67%					
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	Park Heights	810	260	814	311	1,079	485	1,192	487	1,397	529	1,527	507	507	-46.95%	-48.72%					
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	Cherry Hill	969	308	784	263	865	277	930	290	1,171	363	1,313	364	364	-26.20%	-15.38%					
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	Western	1,555	477	1,422	462	1,549	547	1,826	710	2,063	667	2,318	761	761	-32.92%	-37.32%					
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	Southwest	1,716	613	1,659	590	1,851	777	1,930	789	2,391	908	2,609	859	859	-34.23%	-28.64%					
Baltimore County	Deep Creek	484	145	430	127	464	117	526	137	656	174	613	180	180	-21.04%	-19.44%					
Baltimore County	Riverview	296	92	302	76	327	104	307	96	323	86	322	100	100	-8.07%	-8.00%					
Baltimore County	Greater Hillendale	423	115	436	160	402	108	448	124	568	158	580	145	145	-27.07%	-20.69%					
Calvert County	Cheas. Ranch Estates	71	11	76	14	95	22	121	13	142	8	96	10	10	-26.04%	10.00%					
Caroline County	Denton	134	12	101	5	126	35	84	14	92	19	112	17	17	19.64%	-29.41%					
Carroll County	Taneytown	110	4	139	7	144	13	143	17	139	34	148	19	19	-25.68%	-78.95%					
Cecil County	Fletcherwood	60	0	69	3	38	2	40	12	47	16	64	8	8	-6.25%	-100.00%					
Charles County	Smallwood Village	835	146	926	142	873	127	918	133	891	137	961	139	139	-13.11%	5.04%					
Dorchester County	Greenwood Ave.	46	12	58	13	56	20	51	18	81	25	68	14	14	-32.35%	-14.29%					
Frederick	Hanson/Taney Apts.	62	34	60	31	58	27	50	17	50	34	68	40	40	-8.82%	-15.00%					
Garrett County	Grantsville	8	0	13	5	28	6	9	3	7	2	22	1	1	-63.64%	-100.00%					
Harford County	Edgewood	153	23	308	32	460	45	414	71	504	62	483	60	60	-36.23%	-46.67%					
Howard County	Long Reach	51	14	33	13	16	6	102	13	131	14	148	25	25	3.38%	-8.00%					
Kent County	Vicker's Park	51	14	33	13	16	3	46	10	27	7	31	9	9	64.52%	55.56%					
Montgomery County	Silver Spring	1,314	95	1,512	104	1,481	86	1,700	146	1,661	154	1,950	152	152	-32.62%	-37.50%					

County	Name of Hot Spot Community	Year 5: CY 01		Year 4: CY 00		Year 3: CY 99		Year 2: CY 98		Year 1: CY 97		Baseline Year: CY 96		% Change CY 96-01	
		Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime
Montgomery County	Ger mantown	363	27	291	35	278	28	259	26	309	21	376	18	-3.46%	50.00%
Prince George's County	Suitland	374	117	296	87	345	80	316	91	405	87	379	111	-1.32%	5.41%
Prince George's County	Mt. Rainer			230	63	173	66	223	96	196	73	479	96	-51.98%	-34.38%
Prince George's County	Palmer Park	657	143	548	121	557	128	462	119	533	102	596	137	10.23%	4.38%
Prince George's County	Glassmanor Project	1,377	249	1,115	237	1,138	196	1,172	241	1,015	219	1,216	260	13.24%	-4.23%
Queen Anne's County	Grasonville <sup>3</sup>			173	34	134	7	101	4	193	5	***	***	-10.36%	580.00%
Somerset County	Crisfield	169	76	142	19	233	95	186	61	197	57	204	76	-17.16%	0.00%
St. Mary's County	Lexington Park					413	72	581	70	550	66	760	122	-45.66%	-40.98%
Talbot County	Easton	64	7	90	17	97	22	83	21	104	28	101	31	-36.63%	-77.42%
Washington County	Jonathan St.	540	107	544	116	493	83	568	104	558	121	650	98	-16.92%	9.18%

County	Name of Hot Spot Community	Year 5: CY 01		Year 4: CY 00		Year 3: CY 99		Year 2: CY 98		Year 1: CY 97		Baseline Year: CY 96		% Change CY 96-01	
		Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part 1 Crime	Violent Crime
County															
Wicomico County	Church St./Salisbury		380	102		356	114		387	91	435	164	497	162	-23.54%
Worcester County	Pocomoke	129	95	43	27	91	27	141	45	156	65	69	217	69	-40.55%
<b>Total</b>		15,990	16,697	4,644	5,123	18,155	5,123	19,683	5,707	21,809	6,193	24,756	6,591	-32.55%	-29.54%

<sup>1</sup> All percent changes are calculated based upon the most recent available data.

<sup>2</sup> 1996-1998 Baltimore City data were adjusted using formulas developed by the FBI during their 1999 audit/review.

<sup>3</sup> Grasonville did not become a Hot Spot until July 1998, as a result their baseline year is 1997.

<sup>4</sup> An adjustment was made for Baltimore City data for the years 1996 – 1998 due to their 1999 audit that resulted in the reclassification of recorded UCR crimes for 1999. Consequently, “adjusted” data reflects these reclassifications.

Source: Governor’s Office of Crime Control and Prevention

**Phase II HotSpot Communities Program**

Jurisdiction	Community	Year 2: CY 01		Year 1: CY 00		Baseline Year: CY 99		% Change CY 99-01	
		Total Part I Crime in	Violent Crime	Total Part I Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part I Crime	Violent Crime	Total Part I Crime	Violent Crime
Allegany	Frostburg	163	40	118	19	127	23	28.35%	73.91%
Anne Arundel	Brooklyn Heights	220	34	197	48	200	27	10.00%	25.93%
Anne Arundel	Parole/(Annapolis)	242	35	210	33	286	36	-15.38%	-2.78%
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	E. Baltimore Midway	650	221	723	272	797	285	-18.44%	-22.46%
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	Highlandtown	1,046	312	1,051	305	1,093	316	-4.30%	-1.27%
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	Coldstream/Chums	814	248	761	254	976	377	-16.60%	-34.22%
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	Washington Village	1,084	245	1,109	262	1,176	293	-7.82%	-16.38%
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	Harlem Park	590	239	537	229	562	252	4.98%	-5.16%
Baltimore City <sup>2</sup>	Govans/Gems	818	213	841	266	1,092	325	-25.09%	-34.46%
Baltimore County	Scotts Branch	237	66	230	66	251	57	-5.58%	15.79%
Baltimore County	Woodmoor	425	131	394	123	434	138	-2.07%	-5.07%
Baltimore County	Yorkway	255	74	215	71	239	60	6.69%	23.33%
Caroline	Federalsburg	167	26	180	38	252	50	-33.73%	-48.00%
Charles	Westlake	987	71	930	83	944	80	4.56%	-11.25%
Garrett County	Grantsville	20	1	39	5				
Harford	Aberdeen	162	30	151	19	156	18	3.85%	66.67%
Howard	Harper's Choice	215	28	233	26	191	34	12.57%	-17.65%
Kent	Chestertown	10	1	27	6	16	6	-37.50%	-83.33%
Montgomery	Wheaton Cbd	862	70	880	61	982	77	-12.22%	-9.09%
Montgomery	Tacoma Park	1,196	323	1,111	289	908	218	31.72%	48.17%
Prince George's	Seat Pleasant			484	96	471	99	2.76%	-3.03%
Prince George's	New Carrollton	427	49	489	84	422	69	1.18%	-28.99%
Queen Anne's	Stevensville								
Somerset	Princess Anne	63	18	70	22	103	18	-38.83%	0.00%
St. Mary's	Lexington Park								
Talbot	Bay Hundred			54	23	53	25	1.89%	-8.00%
Washington	Hagerstown	99	16	83	10	110	14	-10.00%	14.29%
Wicomico	Westside	389	156	593	236	508	255	-23.43%	-38.82%
Worcester	Berlin	206	62	188	43	152	64	35.53%	-3.13%
<b>Hotspot</b>		<b>11,347</b>	<b>2,709</b>	<b>11,898</b>	<b>2,989</b>	<b>12,501</b>	<b>3,216</b>	<b>-4.82%</b>	<b>-7.06%</b>

<sup>1</sup>All percent changes are calculated based upon the most recent available data.

<sup>2</sup>Baltimore City baseline data were adjusted using formulas developed by the FBI during their 1999 audit/review.

Source: Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention