

***THE JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY INCENTIVE BLOCK GRANT
PROGRAM TECHNICAL SUPPORT CENTER***

REPORT OF FIRST YEAR ACTIVITIES

September 1999



The Justice Research and Statistics Association
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Suite 801
Washington, D.C. 20002

Acknowledgments

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the Bureau of Justice Statistics contributed to the coordination and implementation of the Technical Support Center. The Justice Research and Statistics Association would like to thank Gail Olezene, OJJDP, and Sue Lindgren, BJS, for their support and guidance. Ms. Lindgren's statistical experience and expertise were essential in assisting JRSA acquire and manipulate the data used for the JAIBG program. Ms. Lindgren also provided much of the documentation that appears on the JAIBG Technical Support Center Web page. Ms. Olezene's procedural guidance and patience were much appreciated. Without the exceptional working relationship between all parties involved, the Technical Support Center would not have been able to run as smoothly as it did.

JRSA extends a sincere thank-you to all of the JAIBG Designated State Agencies, State Contacts and Program Managers who provided feedback on the information and technical support provided by JRSA. It was a pleasure to work with everyone involved. JRSA would also like to thank the state Statistical Analysis Centers for their information and contributions.

This report was prepared by Lisa Walbolt, Research Analyst, who staffed the Center and prepared the information provided to states and Stan Orchowsky, Research Director, who oversaw the project. Craig Cussimano, Manager of Web Site Development, helped in the design and maintenance of the JAIBG Web site.

Joan C. Weiss
Executive Director

This document was prepared by the Justice Research and Statistics Association, under grant number 98-JB-VX-0100, awarded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and recommendations expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Introduction	1
Overview of Data Requirements of JAIBG	1
JAIBG Technical Support Center Activities.....	2
JRSA JAIBG Program Technical Support Center Web Site	3
Data Provided by JRSA.....	4
Calculations and Awards	10
State Information Provided.....	11
General Information Provided.....	12
Technical Assistance Provided to States	14
Data Used by States for Local Allocations.....	15
Summary of Awards.....	17
SAC Involvement in JAIBG	17
State Feedback.....	18
Conclusion	20
Appendix I. Example of State Information Provided.....	22

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of Local Awards by State	See Link
Table 2. Comparison of Awards After a Waiver of the 75% Pass-Through Percentage...See Link	
Table 3. Top 50 Awards, Including Waivers	See Link
Table 4. Top 5 Awards Per State, Including Waivers	See Link

Introduction

The Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) Program was authorized by Congress in the Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998. The purpose of the JAIBG program is to provide funds to state and local governments to develop programs to promote greater accountability in the juvenile justice system. A total of \$250 million was appropriated for the program, with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) being designated as the agency responsible for administering the program.

The amount of money each state was to receive was calculated using a formula mandated by the Act. The Act requires the state allocation to each local government to be weighted according to the average law enforcement expenditures for the three most recent calendar years for which data are available (given 2/3 weight), and the average annual number of Part I violent offenses for the three most recent years for which data are available (given 1/3 weight).

Overview of Data Requirements of JAIBG

In order to assist the states to collect and use the data necessary for them to calculate the appropriated allocations to local governments, the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA), in conjunction with the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and OJJDP, created the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program Technical Support Center. The Center was created to provide data, information, and technical assistance to the Designated State Agencies (DSAs) responsible for disseminating JAIBG allocations to local units of government.

The need for technical assistance arose in part from the nature of the data available. The

formula mandated by Congress calls for the use of the three most recent years of both crime and expenditure data. While most states have access to data for Part I violent offenses from state Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) programs, very few states have access to expenditure information at the local level. Local expenditure data are available from the Census Bureau, but these files are large and contain a considerable amount of information not needed for the JAIBG formula.

States faced two main hurdles in utilizing crime and expenditure data: their inability to easily access the data in a format they could use to compute the allocations, and the difficulty in obtaining documentation for the data and the JAIBG formula calculations. The complexity of the Census Bureau's expenditure data and the unfamiliarity of most state analysts with these data, the need to match data from different files to combine the crime and expenditure data for each locality, and the issues involved in calculating the actual allocation formulas all made it infeasible for states to utilize these data on their own. Additionally, the states needed documentation for all of this information in order to accurately assess the desirability of using the data. State analysts needed nontechnical explanations of how the data were collected, how the matching was performed, how the summary spreadsheets were developed, which localities were included in the expenditure data, and how to calculate the actual formulas.

JAIBG Technical Support Center Activities

To make the information provided by JRSA as easily accessible as possible, the JRSA JAIBG Program Technical Support Center was established. A research analyst was available

during normal business hours to answer states' questions about the JAIBG allocation procedures and to provide technical assistance to states in calculating local fund allocations. Technical questions were resolved by the Center with support as needed from BJS. Policy questions were referred to OJJDP for response. The JAIBG Technical Support Center provided technical assistance to the states in their development of allocation schemes for local units of government. The Center provided feedback on questions about JAIBG allocation procedures and technical assistance to states in calculating local fund allocations.

JRSA JAIBG Program Technical Support Center Web Site

The Technical Support Center established a password-protected area on the JRSA Web site for the JAIBG program. The Web site was used to disseminate information and to allow states to request information and assistance online. All documentation was available for viewing or downloading via the Technical Support Center Web page, located at <http://www.jrsa.org/jaibg>. This process eliminated the time lapse between preparing the information and getting it out to states. It also allowed JRSA to make information accessible as it became available rather than waiting to send entire packets of information to the states.

The Web site also provided information on how to obtain additional technical assistance. Contact information for the State Relations and Assistance Division of OJJDP was provided, as well as a link to the national technical assistance grantee, the Development Services Group, Inc. States could also link to OJJDP to download the JAIBG Guidance Manual, along with links to the OJJDP and BJS Web sites for general information.

Despite the technological capabilities of most agencies, JRSA recognized that not all states are able to access the Internet to retrieve the information provided. The information on the Web site was also made available to states on a diskette or in a binder, upon request. One binder of information was provided to Rhode Island, while diskettes were sent to Indiana, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Vermont.

Data Provided by JRSA

The formula mandated by Congress required the use of “the 3 most recent calendar years for which such data are available” for both law enforcement expenditure data and Part I violent crime data. However, expenditure data for all localities are collected only every 5 years by the Census Bureau, with a sample survey being conducted every year. As a result, JRSA, OJJDP, and BJS decided to use the data from the 1992 Census of Governments survey, corresponding to the government fiscal year from July 1, 1991 through June 30, 1992, for most units of government, in the formula calculations. The Census Bureau asked each local unit of government in the country, not including Tribal Nations, to provide financial information related to revenue, expenditure, assets, and debt. Three methods for obtaining this information were used by the Census Bureau, depending on the size of the government. On-site data collection was used for the largest and most complex local governments, consolidated data submissions on computer tapes were used for states with a collecting state agency, and mailed surveys were used to collect data from the rest of local governments. This process resulted in expenditure data for 22,364 eligible general-purpose county, municipal, and township governments. Special district governments (hospitals,

commissions, etc.) and independent school district governments are not eligible for JAIBG funding and were not included in the data set.

Since the mandated formula required all law enforcement expenditures associated with police, prosecutorial, legal and judicial services, and corrections, three categories of expenditures collected by the Census Bureau were included: police expenditures, judicial/legal expenditures, and corrections expenditures. Only 3,101 local units of government reported expenditures in all three categories in the 1992 survey.

In addition, only direct current operating expenditures for these three categories were used in the formula. Direct current operating expenditures include salaries, wages, fees, commissions, and the purchase of supplies, materials, and contractual services. Excluded from the formula were capital outlays such as construction, the purchase of land and existing structures, and the purchase of equipment with a life expectancy of more than five years. Also excluded were intergovernmental expenditures such as grants-in-aid and payments from one government to another for boarding prisoners. These two categories of expenditures were excluded because (1) construction costs can cause wide swings in total justice expenditures from year to year for a given jurisdiction (due to jail construction, for example); (2) it is not possible to separate equipment purchases from costs for the purchase of land and existing structures on a consistent basis for all governments; and (3) intergovernmental expenditures comprise less than three-tenths of one percent (0.3%) of total local justice expenditures and would be “double counted” in local totals – once when the intergovernmental payment is made and once when the recipient government uses the money to pay for goods and services. Given these considerations, it

was deemed fair to use only direct current operating expenditures for all governments.

As with most data, limitations were associated with the data provided by the Census Bureau. The most notable of these limitations was the failure of some of the local units of government to respond to the survey. The response rate for counties was 80% and for municipalities and townships, 90%. The Census Bureau used an imputation procedure to estimate the missing governments' data. Census staff searched through past data to find the most recent response from the nonresponding government, and this response was updated to a 1992 figure using average growth rates established from responding units from the same state, type of government, and similar size stratum as the nonresponding government. For governments for which no prior year data were available, the Census Bureau randomly selected a government in the same state, type of government, and size class and multiplied its per capita data by the nonrespondent's population to estimate data for the nonresponding government. As a result of this procedure, about 200 to 300 nonresponding localities that are now known to have police protection functions and to be reporting Uniform Crime Reporting data did not have expenditure data reported by the Census Bureau, presumably because their data was imputed from a locality that did not have a criminal justice function.

It was also possible that new local units of government have been formed since 1992. In these cases, states were encouraged to collect this information and add it to the data provided. In other cases, localities had changed names or consolidated since 1992. JRSA made every attempt to work with states in updating the information and consolidating data when needed.

The three most recent years of Part I violent crime data available were 1994, 1995, and

1996 for most states, and were obtained from the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) UCR program. Part I violent crimes include murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

There were also limitations associated with the data provided by the FBI. Some states' statutes are not consistent with FBI definitions, or a state may be unable to comply with UCR reporting procedures. If this is the case, the state's data are not available through the FBI, although the state UCR program may have the data available for use by other state agencies.

In addition, not all police departments report Part I violent crimes to the FBI. Many smaller counties and cities have no serious crime or have no police department; some localities that do have violent crime do not participate in the UCR program for various reasons. For the years 1994 through 1996, data were available for 11,637 localities.

Another situation affecting the availability of data from the UCR program arises with the implementation of the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) in recent years. Some states that have switched to the new NIBRS system were unable to report data according to the UCR program specifications and hence are not included in the UCR files. After analyzing data availability over the past several years, BJS selected the three most complete years of UCR data for use in calculating the JAIBG allocations. Consequently, the data years 1990 through 1992 were used for Illinois and data years 1992 through 1994 were used for Kansas. The data years 1993 through 1995 were used for Montana and for Kentucky due to damage to 1996 KY data before they could be computerized.

While using the FBI's UCR data for the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program

(LLEBG), BJS discovered that some jurisdictions believed that they had reported their data to their state-level UCR program, but these data were not in the FBI's files. The extent of missing data varied considerably by state, with the FBI files containing 90% or more of most states' estimated totals. However, some of the files for some states were as much as 80% incomplete, due to NIBRS conversion, late reporting, and other factors. In 1997, BJS decided to correct missing data problems. Twenty-eight states with state-level UCR programs and less than 100% coverage in the data files were invited to supplement 1993 through 1995 UCR data. Of the 11 responding states, 1 (North Carolina) was satisfied with the data available and 10 (California, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Montana, New York, South Dakota, and Utah) submitted data. These data were integrated into the existing data.

Moreover, in the UCR data sets, there were 188 local governments in which more than one agency had reported UCR Part I violent crime for the three-year period used in the JAIBG formula. There are three instances in which a single local government may have more than one reporting agency in the UCR program: (1) a county may have both a sheriff's office and a police department, both reporting to the UCR program; (2) a consolidated city-county government may retain separate police agencies; and (3) a municipal or county government may have its own police department reporting to the UCR program, plus a special police force, such as transit police, also reporting. In these situations, BJS developed eight rules which were used to combine data from agencies within a locality:

- (1) If the "UCR reporting agency name" had a city name in it, then the data were coded to the city.
- (2) If the "UCR reporting agency name" had a county name in it, then the data were coded to the county.

- (3) If the “UCR reporting agency name” appeared to be regional or multicounty (and was reporting under a single reporting agency number), then the data were coded to the state government. If such a regional or multicounty agency was reporting under a number of geographically-based reporting agency numbers, those agency numbers were coded as described in 1 and 2 above.
- (4) If the “UCR reporting agency name” indicated that it was a community college, then the data were coded to the county.
- (5) If the “UCR reporting agency name” indicated that it was a state college or university police, then the data were coded to the state government and did not appear in the JAIBG data, which are limited to local governments.
- (6) If the “UCR reporting agency name” indicated that it was a police agency for a public or private school in a large city, then the data were coded to the city.
- (7) If the “UCR reporting agency name” indicated that it was an airport police, the data were coded to the county even if the airport’s name included the city name. The rationale here is that even though the city is named, airports are usually outside the city limits and are more likely to be aligned with the county’s criminal justice system than the city’s.
- (8) If none of the above conditions were met and more information was not available, then the data were coded to the county.

Since BJS used the same datasets needed for JAIBG to test alternative Local Law Enforcement Block Grant formulas, BJS had already acquired the expenditure data from the Government Accounting Agency (GAO) and the crime data from the FBI. Both of the datasets used in the formula were checked, corrected, and matched by BJS and sent to JRSA for use in the JAIBG formula calculations. These files were again checked by JRSA, and mismatches and errors were resolved with the help of BJS.

However, problems still existed in attempting to locate data for the Tribal Nations. Neither the Census Bureau nor the FBI require reporting by tribes. Although some of the Tribal Nations have elected to report crime information to the FBI, the vast majority do not. As a result, JRSA was unable to include tribal data in the data and spreadsheets provided to states. States were encouraged to procure tribal data themselves and include Tribal Nations in their state

allocations.

After the data and allocation amounts were released to states, funding information for Tribal Nations was obtained from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). These data represented BIA grants to Indian tribes for law enforcement purposes. The BIA funding data could have been used by the states in the JAIBG allocation process to improve the probability of tribal awards in the absence of Census Bureau expenditure data. However, states were informed that the funding data provided were not audited by BIA to determine if they were actually used for law enforcement and that the amounts do not represent all potential sources of revenue. Also, some tribes may have justice functions other than law enforcement – for example, tribal courts and jails – that may not be reflected in the data that have been provided by BIA.

Calculations and Awards

Once the data were prepared, local allocations could be determined based on the formula established in the legislation. Initial awards were calculated based on the mandated 75% pass-through amount of state funds to local units of government and on the expenditure data (2/3) and the crime data (1/3) of each locality.

Once awards were calculated for each locality with data, spreadsheets were created for states. However, since the needs of each DSA differed, JRSA created a variety of spreadsheets, each differing in the amount of information provided. All of the spreadsheets were made available to states on the Web site.

State Information Provided

Most states were provided with a total of 16 spreadsheets of information; for states with additional data years used in the formula and states with tribal nations, this number was higher. For an example of the state spreadsheets provided, please see Appendix I. The first spreadsheet listed all of the local units of government, as provided by the Census Bureau, for each individual state. With this spreadsheet is the definition of “local unit of government,” as defined by HR3, along with a description of the information available in the provided spreadsheet.

States were then provided with a spreadsheet with the state allocation information, including the amount allocated to the state, the pass-through percentage, and the amount of money to be dispersed based on crime and the amount to be dispersed based on expenditures. This spreadsheet listed alphabetically each local unit of government with its proportion of state crime and award based on this proportion, its proportion of state expenditures and award based on this proportion, and the total award. This spreadsheet also summed the number of awards under \$5,000 so that states could see the amount of money to be retained by the state to be used on the localities not receiving awards. Since not all states were using the mandated 75% pass-through, the spreadsheet was interactive in that it allowed the user to reenter a different pass-through percentage, and the entire spreadsheet recalculated based on the new percentage. To assist states in using this spreadsheet, a description of the terms and instructions on how to recalculate the formula were also provided.

Since some states wanted simply a listing of localities receiving awards, two spreadsheets provided just this information, with one listing in order of locality name and one by award

amount. Following the list of localities receiving awards was a list of all localities that fell below the \$5,000 qualifying amount. These sheets were not interactive, but were recalculated based on waiver amounts upon request.

JRSA acknowledged the gaps that existed in the data used (16,826 localities were missing data or had no criminal justice functions) and encouraged states to attempt to fill these gaps with data available in the state. To assist states in examining these gaps, a spreadsheet was provided that listed the localities that were missing either or both of the two data elements.

For states that wished to examine the data or compute the formula themselves, JRSA provided the data files, along with a combined data file linking the two sets of data for each locality in the state. For most states, the 1994, 1995, and 1996 UCR data were provided; for states for which alternative data were used, these additional files were also provided.

Even though the formula computed by JRSA included only 1992 Census of Governments expenditure data as provided by the Census Bureau, sample data from the 1993 and 1994 Public Finance Survey were also made available to the states. To enable states to better analyze the data provided, JRSA provided a list of governments for each state for which imputed data were used.

Finally, for each state with federally-recognized Indian tribes, contact information for each tribe was provided. A larger list of all federally-recognized tribes in the country was also provided.

General Information Provided

In addition to supplying states with information relevant to their state JAIBG programs,

JRSA provided general program information as well. An overview of the formula and how it was calculated, with examples, was posted for states to review. The Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on the JAIBG Program, supplied by OJJDP, were also made available. This section provided a general overview of the program, including eligibility criteria, the 12 purpose areas for funding, and a discussion of the requirements of the program.

FAQs on the crime data and expenditure data used in the formula explained how the data were collected, cleaned, and used. These FAQs provided the definitions in the legislation and the implications for states and presented an overview of the data used in the formula. The FAQs also discussed the methodology used by each agency supplying data. The 1992 Census of Governments methodology used by the Census Bureau was provided, along with supplemental information to help states interpret the documentation. To complement the Census Bureau's discussion of county-level governments and their eligibility for JAIBG funds, JRSA listed county-type areas without county governments. An explanation of how governments with more than one agency reporting crime were treated was also included, as well as a list of such governments. An explanation of how crime data from special districts and school districts were coded for the purposes of JAIBG was also provided. Finally, state contact information was provided to allow states to see who in the state reports data to the Census Bureau.

The FBI's UCR methodology included definitions and contact information, so this information was not supplied separately by JRSA. The use of supplemental data was also discussed, as well as the process used by states that submitted data. A list of the states given the opportunity to resubmit data was made available to states.

Due to the lack of Tribal data mentioned earlier, the Tribal data that were gathered were made available to states separately from their allocation spreadsheets. Accompanying these data was a FAQ section about tribal data, which discussed both crime and expenditure data collected from tribes as well as other federal sources of data.

Technical Assistance Provided to States

Assistance was provided to states which had questions or concerns regarding the data provided by JRSA. Policy questions were referred to the OJJDP State Relations and Assistance Division (SRAD) and technical assistance requests regarding the 12 purpose areas were referred to Development Services Group, Inc. (DSG). JRSA responded to over 170 e-mails and over 100 phone calls received from states, for a total of almost 280 requests for assistance. Requests for information varied, from simple requests on accessing the information on the Web site to requests for technical information regarding the specifics of the data used and requests to rerun spreadsheets to account for waivers. JRSA also spoke at OJJDP's JAIBG Preconference Workshop at the 1998 OJJDP National Conference, presenting an overview of the data used in the formula and a demonstration of the JAIBG Technical Support Center Web site.

State contacts were sent updates as information was made available on the Web site. States with e-mail capacity received a simple e-mail announcing the new information, while states without e-mail capacity received a fax with the same information.

Data Used by States for Local Allocations

Although JRSA computed allocation amounts in addition to providing the raw data used for the formula, states were not required to use this information. If states had more recent or complete data, they were encouraged to use them. There are a number of reasons why the FBI may not have complete data. Small localities may not report crime data to the FBI, for example; small localities may not provide their own criminal justice functions, and these data may be subsumed under the county; or the localities may be new since 1992. However, 43 states, not including the District of Columbia, used the allocations calculated by JRSA. One state (Illinois) used only the expenditure data provided by JRSA, one state (Minnesota) used only the crime data provided by JRSA, and five states (Maryland, Montana, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Wisconsin) used neither.

A questionnaire was sent to the states that did not use the data provided by JRSA to try to determine what data they used to calculate final allocations. Illinois used 1995 through 1997 state UCR data collected by the State Police, with the exception that criminal sexual assault was used as part of the Part I offenses rather than forcible rape. Minnesota used 1993 through 1995 state expenditure data collected by the Minnesota State Auditor. Similar to JRSA data, Minnesota excluded capital expenses, focusing only on direct noncapital expenditures in the categories of police/sheriff, court (prosecutors)/corrections, and public safety expenditures.

Maryland polled county executives to obtain expenditure data from 1995 to 1997; however, specific information about which expenditures were included in its survey was not provided to JRSA. Maryland also used 1995 through 1997 state UCR data collected by the State Police.

Montana collected final expended budgets from 1995 through 1997, submitted by localities. The categories of expenditures included city police protection, county sheriff protection, corrections, county attorneys, city attorneys, district courts, and justice courts. In all, only direct operations expenditures, including personnel and operating expenditures, were used. Crime data from the same years, as collected by the Montana Statistical Bureau, were also used.

Pennsylvania used 1994 through 1996 data for county judicial and corrections expenditure data and 1995 through 1996 data for municipal police expenditure data, as collected in the Annual Audit and Financial Report from the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development. These data included direct current operations expenditures for law enforcement, corrections (including jails, probation, and juvenile facilities), clerk costs, courts, police, and prosecutors/public defenders. Pennsylvania used 1994 through 1996 UCR data as collected by the State Police.

South Carolina sent letters to mayors and county commissioners in an effort to collect their expenditure data. The data used included capital expenditures for all law enforcement categories only. South Carolina used the 1995 through 1997 UCR data collected in the state. Wisconsin used 1994 through 1996 expenditure data collected by the state Department of Revenue. These included total expenditures with capital expenditures for five categories: judicial, legal, law enforcement, 911 costs, and corrections. Wisconsin also used the same years of crime data, as reported to their state UCR collection agency.

Summary of Awards

States were allowed to request a waiver of the mandated 75% pass-through of state funds to local units of government. As of September 1, 1999, OJJDP had approved waivers to 22 states, ranging from 50% to 0% pass-through. One state has a waiver request pending, leaving only 27 states passing the mandated 75% of funds to localities. The District of Columbia did not request a waiver as there are no eligible local units of government within the District. Table 1 provides a summary of the local awards made by the states in the first year of the JAIBG program.

Before waivers, a total of \$153,026,589 was allocated to 4,207 local units of government. As a result of waivers, including the one pending approval, the total amount of money passed on to local units of government decreased by \$40,283,055 (from \$153,026,589 to \$112,743,534) and the number of localities receiving money decreased by 1,108 (from 4,207 to 3,099). Table 2 presents a comparison of awards before and after waivers.

Based on this award information, New York City received the largest award, at \$5,777,558. The next four awards went to Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles County, and Los Angeles. For a listing of the top 50 awards, see Table 3. For a listing of top awards by state, see Table 4.

SAC Involvement in JAIBG

A questionnaire was sent to all state Statistical Analysis Centers (SACs) to assess their involvement in JAIBG or in JAIBG-related programs. Nineteen SACs (out of 44 that responded) report being directly involved in JAIBG, with roles ranging from helping with planning or helping with the waiver to gathering the data and calculating the awards. Nine states have already

received or are planning to apply for State Justice Statistics (SJS) program funds from BJS; however, not all were under the specific auspices of JAIBG, but rather applied to program areas subsumed under the JAIBG purpose areas. The planned SJS projects include evaluations of the JAIBG program, an analysis of violent offender processing, a study of juvenile detentions, an analysis of setting up a juvenile justice information network, a study of family courts, an assessment of training needs, and a study of the youthful offender law.

State Feedback

Midway through the allocation phase of JAIBG, JRSA distributed a questionnaire to all designated state agencies. This questionnaire was designed to get information from states on their plans to request a waiver, the methods and data used in determining allocations, Technical Support Center Web site use, and satisfaction with the assistance provided. All but three states (48) responded to this survey. Since state waivers and allocation methods have already been discussed, this section will focus on the other elements of the survey.

According to the survey, all but four states have visited the Web site. State suggestions for improvements to the Web site included issues concerning the tribal data; the need for increased guidance on the planning of the program; requests for a Q&A forum; and the need for information from other states regarding program areas and projects, waiver requests, and general implementation of the program. Most of the comments regarding the technical assistance provided by JRSA were positive; only one negative comment was received. Examples of comments received include:

- “It [the Web site] took care of what we needed. We couldn’t have gotten through without that data.”
- “You have been very helpful and responsive to all of our requests and questions. It has really made a difference in us getting JAIBG started.”
- “I was very pleased with JRSA data and would have used it if it was available a few weeks earlier. It was very close to the data we used and it was very easy to access.”
- “Data was easy to access, download, and utilize.”

The results of this survey were posted on the Web site.

Several states requested that information from other states be made available to serve as examples of how states were administering and handling the JAIBG program. As a result, JRSA dedicated a page on the Web site to presenting examples of documentation and procedures used by various states in their JAIBG programs. Seven states (Colorado, Iowa, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah, and Washington) submitted information to share, including state plans, a methodology for computing the formula, an orientation agenda, letters to localities, a JAIBG information sheet, applications for localities, progress and financial reports, and waiver requests.

One of the questions on the DSA and SAC questionnaire asked for feedback regarding the data and technical support provided by JRSA. One central concern was the lack of tribal data and few supporting policy guidelines on how to handle tribal allocations. One state reported: “It is of concern that there is no tribal data available and that OJJDP has not furnished states with guidelines or solutions to address this significant issue.” Other recommendations were for answers to specific problems experienced in the states, like how to distribute the money retained

at the state level. Another state requested a clearinghouse for questions received by OJJDP with responses.

Only a couple of states reported problems with the JAIBG program. One issue, for example, was the delay in getting data out to the states. Another issue was the time lag in having specific policy questions answered by OJJDP.

The SACs were also asked for general recommendations regarding the JAIBG program. SAC recommendations included: increased availability of funds for JAIBG program evaluations; tracking and information-sharing between states; a solution for states without county systems, such as Massachusetts, where the counties are considered state agencies; increased targeting of available data; and information on training needs assessments and evaluations in other states.

Conclusion

The JRSA JAIBG Technical Support Center achieved all the goals planned before the program's initiation. Data were provided to the states, along with numerous spreadsheets and all available documentation. Support Center staff interacted with many of the state administrators, providing support and information whenever possible.

In general, states were happy with the data and information provided, but would have liked the data sooner. Since this was the first year of funding for JAIBG, most of the issues mentioned by states were policy issues; most wanted clearer, better defined guidance on how to use and distribute the money provided. The other frequently mentioned issue was the lack of Tribal data.

As the states now begin their second year of funding under the JAIBG program, most of the concerns raised in the first year should be resolved by experience. JRSA hopes to make available better tribal data by using the expenditure and violent crime data collected by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The issue that is more difficult to address is that of providing data more rapidly. During the first year, data were made available as soon as possible, but because JRSA is not willing to compromise the quality of its calculations by providing data that have not been thoroughly checked, the data were posted later than some states would have liked. This situation, a reflection of the difficulty in weighing the need for certainty against the desire for timeliness, is not likely to change in the second year.

Appendix I. Example of State Information Provided