

# OVERSIGHT OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE GRANT PROGRAMS

---

---

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME, TERRORISM,  
HOMELAND SECURITY, AND INVESTIGATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—————  
JUNE 8, 2017  
—————

**Serial No. 115–18**

—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://judiciary.house.gov>

—————  
U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

27-070

WASHINGTON : 2017

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia, *Chairman*

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Wisconsin	JOHN CONYERS, JR., Michigan
LAMAR SMITH, Texas	JERROLD NADLER, New York
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio	ZOE LOFGREN, California
DARRELL E. ISSA, California	SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
STEVE KING, Iowa	STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona	HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
LOUIE GOHMERT, Texas	THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida
JIM JORDAN, Ohio	LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ, Illinois
TED POE, Texas	KAREN BASS, California
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah	CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania	HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES, New York
TREY GOWDY, South Carolina	DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island
RAUL LABRADOR, Idaho	ERIC SWALWELL, California
BLAKE FARENTHOLD, Texas	TED LIEU, California
DOUG COLLINS, Georgia	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland
RON DeSANTIS, Florida	PRAMILA JAYAPAL, Washington
KEN BUCK, Colorado	BRAD SCHNEIDER, Illinois
JOHN RATCLIFFE, Texas	
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama	
MATT GAETZ, Florida	
MIKE JOHNSON, Louisiana	
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	

SHELLEY HUSBAND, *Chief of Staff and General Counsel*  
PERRY APELBAUM, *Minority Staff Director and Chief Counsel*

---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME, TERRORISM, HOMELAND SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIONS

TREY GOWDY, South Carolina, *Chairman*  
LOUIE GOHMERT, Texas, *Vice-Chairman*

JIM SENSENBRENNER, JR., Wisconsin	SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio	TED DEUTCH, Florida
TED POE, Texas	KAREN BASS, California
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah	CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
JOHN RATCLIFFE, Texas	HAKEEM JEFFRIES, New York
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama	TED LIEU, California
MIKE JOHNSON, Louisiana	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland

# CONTENTS

JUNE 8, 2017

## OPENING STATEMENTS

	Page
The Honorable Louie Gohmert, Texas, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations; Committee on the Judiciary .....	1
The Honorable Sheila Jackson Lee, Texas, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations; Committee on the Judiciary** .....	3
The Honorable Bob Goodlatte, Virginia, Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary .....	5
The Honorable John Conyers, Jr., Michigan, Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary .....	6

## WITNESSES

Mr. Alan Hanson, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Grant Programs, Department of Justice .....	8
Oral Statement .....	

## ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Material submitted by the Honorable John Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary. This material is available at the Committee and can be accessed on the committee repository at:

*<http://docs.house.gov/meetings/JU/JU08/20170608/106070/HHRG-115-JU08-20170608-SD002.pdf>*



## **OVERSIGHT OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE GRANT PROGRAMS**

**THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2017**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME, TERRORISM, HOMELAND SECURITY, AND  
INVESTIGATIONS

*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Louie Gohmert [vice chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Gohmert, Goodlatte, Sensenbrenner, Chabot, Ratcliffe, Roby, Johnson of Louisiana, Jackson Lee, Conyers, Jeffries, and Lieu.

Staff Present: Margaret Barr, Counsel; Stephanie Gadbois, Counsel; Scott Johnson, Clerk, and Joe Graupensperger, Minority Counsel.

Mr. GOHMERT. The Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland security, and Investigations will come to order. Without objection, the chair is authorized to declare recess of the subcommittee at any time. We welcome you to today's hearing.

This is the hearing that will not be disappointing to all of the country. This is the hearing that has not been overhyped and we expect to get some substance out today, Mr. Hanson. So, we are actually looking forward to this. This is entitled Oversight of the Department of Justice Grant Programs. And I recognize myself for an opening statement.

Thank you to all of those in attendance to today's hearing, as well as our distinguished witness, Mr. Alan Hanson, testifying on behalf of the Department of Justice. This morning's hearing is the fourth in a series of hearings held by this committee, examining Department of Justice components, programs, and activities. The ultimate goal of these hearings is to reform and reauthorize, in some cases authorize for the very first time, important components of the Department of Justice.

Grants administered by the DOJ help communities across the United States fight crime, address domestic violence and sexual assault, and provide their officers with the tools and skills they need to do their job. Approximately \$2 billion is appropriated by Congress each year to fund DOJ State and local law enforcement activities. As with any government service, Congress must periodi-

cally review these grants to ensure they are working as intended and use taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently.

Today, this subcommittee will examine DOJ grant programs administered by the Office of Justice Programs, the Office of Violence Against Women, and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

The Office of Justice Programs, or OJP, administers grants that provide leadership support to Federal, State, local, and tribal justice systems by sharing the latest knowledge and practices with these agencies and communities. Grants administered address areas of need and research statistics, law enforcement assistance at the State and local level, and support for juvenile justice programs. The Office for Victims of Crime, which is tasked with administering the Crimes Victim Fund, is also a part of OJP.

The Office of Violence Against Women administers programs authorized by the Violence Against Women Act. Approximately twenty five grant programs are authorized by that legislation with the goal of strengthening services to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault while holding offenders accountable.

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, or COPS Office, provides information and grant resources to State, local, territorial, and tribal law enforcement agencies throughout the Nation.

Some of the work supported by the COPS Office grants include developing innovative crime-fighting and policing strategies, providing training and technical assistance to both law enforcement and community members, and assisting in the hiring of community policing professionals.

During my time as judge, I have worked with thousands of police officials with a variety of background and experience. The overwhelming majority of them embrace the idea of building good relationships in high crime communities to address the underlying conditions that contribute to the crimes.

Two programs worthy of note include Anti-Heroin Task Force, the AHTF program, and the COPS Anti-Gang Initiative. The Nation is facing an epidemic amount of opioid and drug abuse, including heroin, the way it has come back, that has been indiscriminate in its effect and devastation. Americans from all walks of life and social status have been directly affected by the epidemic, whether personally became addicted or had friends or family members who have lost their lives.

The Anti-Heroin Task Force has worked to advance public safety by getting these toxic drugs off our streets and out of our communities. Anti-Gang Initiative works hand in hand with these efforts by prosecuting the gangs that pedal these drugs. While many of these grant programs help create a positive impact in our communities on a daily basis, not all of the DOJ's spending is as efficient as it should be.

Recent GAO investigations have targeted the mismanagement of Federal resources and identified multiple programs that include duplication and overlap of these DOJ grant programs. For example, in 2012, GAO reviewed all 253 grant award announcements that OJP, OVW, and the COPS Office published on their websites for

fiscal year 2010 and identified instances of overlap across the components.

When GAO participated in the Judiciary Committee's DOJ oversight hearing March 21st of this year, Director Maurer testified the DOJ had implemented most of GAO's recommendations to improve grant administration and management. However, a cursory review of the long list of programs currently being administered by DOJ suggests that more streamlining is likely warranted. DOJ budget requests a \$6 million increase to support the grants management system 2.0 initiative. So, we are interested in hearing about potential improvements of efficiency, transparency of DOJ's grant making sections.

President Trump has made clear that reducing violent crime in our communities is a top priority for his administration. Attorney General Sessions has already taken important steps toward reaching that goal. It is contended DOJ grant programs are an important tool in fighting crime. If so, it is vital they work as efficiently as possible. And with that in mind, I am looking forward to hearing the testimony today. The chair now recognizes the ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee, Ms. Jackson Lee of Texas, for an opening statement.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the chairman. Good morning. As well as thank the witness, Mr. Hanson, for your service to the Nation, and also let me pleasantly recognize the ranking member of the full committee, recognize the chairman of the full committee, and appreciate that the ranking member will be in place for me.

And I thank him for his extended courtesies because I have a conflicting hearing. Mr. Chairman, I think that we have many opportunities to work together on this committee, and we have done so over the years. And I am delighted that you have mentioned, certainly, some of the issues that we all have concern with.

And I think we do have concern with the efficient operation of the Department of Justice that I have always called the anchor and the source of assistance for the vulnerable, but also for upholding the law of the land and protecting the American citizens. But then, when they need justice and they need fairness and relief from those who would undermine them, the Justice Department is there for them in a myriad of ways.

Each of us on this panel, regardless of party, are committed to eliminating wasteful spending, unnecessary duplication in funding pursuant to Federal grant programs. However, as I indicated, there are many programs that may have the perception as such, but are vital to many constituents across the Nation. Given that the Department administers grants that award recipients with \$5 billion per year without exception, accountability is paramount to ensure the grants are not being used for fraudulent purposes. That is why we have auditing requirements and reviews by the Office of the Inspector General. And as acting assistant attorney general of the OJP, it is Mr. Hanson's responsibility to oversee compliance with these goals. I assume you work hard every day.

As we consider today the findings of the DOJ's OIG with respect to various Justice Department grant programs, there are several factors we should keep in mind.

First of all, though I am disappointed to learn that OJP's Tribal Justice System Infrastructure failed to meet various auditing standards due to deficiencies between OJP and BJA, resulting in significant waste, I am heartened that it has undertaken proposed remedial actions to address these findings. That program is well-needed and is often heard by our Native American friends of the status that they hold and the belief that they do not hold the same respect and dignity of all other Americans.

Specifically, OJP has agreed with all of OIG's 12 recommendations made in its auditing. Identifying these deficiencies and detecting fraud, we hope that we will be moving forward.

Second, the recent semi-annual report to Congress indicates that OIG audited additional programs, such as D.C.'s Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants and Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma, which support investigation and prosecution of child sexual abuse. OIG did not identify any significant concerns, and we hope these programs are on schedule. Several other programs fell into these criteria, and therefore, we hope that many of these grant programs that are vital to the success of the criminal justice system do, in fact, work, are effective, and I would like to make sure that they are in place.

Let's take, for example, Houston. I am pleased that my constituents and those of Ranking Member Conyers were the first to be awarded the National Institute of Justice research grants to address untested Sexual assault kits. SAK, also known as rape kits, used in Texas, received \$176,000 in fiscal year 2010, which remained in place for a number of years.

These are vital grants to be able to stop the terrible results of untested rape kits and leaving many women across America without justice. Those rape kits recognize and represent criminal justice. Therefore, it is critical that we examine cautiously the beneficial impact these grant programs have on the lives of the American people and the adverse effect that it will trigger.

We arbitrarily cut much-needed programs due to deficiencies. Although OIG did not find evidence of endemic fraud or rampant non-compliance across the spectrum, 29 percent cut is proposed in the President's new budget for the Office of Justice Programs. And the vast majority of the recipients of grants administered through the Office of Justice Programs, such as the Bureau of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency, just to name a few.

And, of course, the essential grants are administered through the Office of Violence Against Women. These are needed. Mr. Hanson, it was also indicated in your testimony, and we agree that the Nation's overall rate of violent crime remains historically low. However, the fiscal year 2018 budget release shows a substantial increase for prosecution and support for robust law enforcement.

Finally, I must remind my colleagues, that efforts to ensure that grant recipients are accountable stewards of taxpayer subsidy should not be used to eliminate these crucial programs. Now, I believe that we are helping so many different people across the Nation, and I want us to continue to be in this August room where justice is rendered.

This has been a tumultuous couple of months. This is a justice committee, and I would hope that, as we proceed with a number



of hearings and investigations that are proceeding in the United States Senate and in the House, that we would find it upon ourselves that there would be a courageous effort to begin to assess what kind of end route we should be making on any number of questions from public trust to use of power to the issues that have gathered around the question of obstruction of justice.

I think that we are courageous Republicans and Democrats to do the right thing for the American people. And I hope that we will do the right thing for the American people. It is time that we begin an inquiry on all of these issues that are involving the executive and administration. With that, I yield back.

Mr. GOHMERT. At this time, the chair will now recognize the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Goodlatte of Virginia, for his opening statement.

Chairman GOODLATTE. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. This hearing is the fourth hearing in the Judiciary Committee's series of hearings to review Department of Justice components, programs, and activities and identify matters at the Department of Justice that are in need of reform and reauthorization. It is my hope that this hearing also underscores the importance of having distinct and detailed authority in place for each DOJ grant program funded by Congress.

Congress appropriates roughly \$2 billion annually to the Department of Justice for its grant programs. In addition, in recent years, DOJ has administered an additional \$2 to \$3 billion annually in grant funding through the Crime Victims Fund. The valuable Crime Victims Fund resources are available to provide victim compensation assistance and other services that improve community's responsiveness to the needs of victims.

Many of DOJ's grant programs support critical efforts to prevent, investigate, and prosecute crime. For example, funding Congress provides for economic, high technology, and white-collar crime prevention grants has helped the National White Collar Crime Center in Richmond, Virginia deliver training in computer forensics, cyber, and financial crime investigations, and intelligence analysis to law enforcement agencies to all 50 States. Such efforts provide critical national leadership and strengthen the Nation's law enforcement networks as a whole.

Another success story is the funding Congress has provided for regional information sharing activities like the RISS program. RISS offers secure information sharing and communications capabilities, analytical and investigative support services, and event deconfliction services to enhance officer safety.

It supports efforts to defeat organized and violent crime, drug activity, violent extremism, human trafficking, and other national scourges across jurisdictions and regions. While there are many Federal programs with laudable goals, the truth is that the Federal government simply cannot sustain its current path of deficit spending. As such, Congress must take tough decisions among priorities at all agencies.

Just 7 years ago, Congress appropriated 50 percent more funding for DOJ grants than it did in the fiscal year 2017 omnibus appropriations bill enacted in early May of this year. In order to make the necessary priorities, we must have a full picture of all the

grant spending. Complicating the picture for DOJ grants is a lack of specific authorization for much of the grant funding. Of the approximately 90 distinct appropriations for grant programs in fiscal year 2017, roughly 70 percent are not currently authorized by the Judiciary Committee.

Of those, approximately 42 percent have never been authorized by the Judiciary Committee. It is imperative that Congress be apprised of the fundamental parameters of these programs. We need to learn who is eligible, what the grant awards look like, what percentage of appropriated funding is actually distributed to grantees, and what DOJ permits the funds to be spent on.

Last but not least, we need to understand the purpose of these unauthorized programs, determine whether they are achieving the established goals, and assess whether the Department's goals align with the Judiciary Committee's priorities. Once the committee evaluates these programs, I intend to oversee the advancement of congressional authority for the most worthy programs.

This hearing may also review the use of the Crime Victims Fund. The Crime Victims Fund was established in 1984 by the Victims of Crime Act, also known as VOCA, to provide funding for State victim compensation and assistance programs. The Crime Victims Fund does not receive appropriated funding. Rather, deposits to the Crime Victims Fund come from a number of sources, including criminal fines, forfeited bail bonds, penalties, and special assessments. For fiscal year 2018, \$610 million, more than 30 percent of the nearly \$2 billion allotted under DOJ's budget submission for discretionary grants, is proposed to be supported by a transfer of mandatory budget authority from the Crime Victims Fund. I look forward to hearing DOJ's justification for this request, which is the continuation of an effort that began under the past administration.

In the course of the Judiciary Committee's comprehensive review of DOJ programs and components, it will be appropriate to consider whether the Crime Victims Fund's annual allocation formula should be updated. In the meantime, I will expect DOJ to consult with the Appropriations Committees on when and if it is ever appropriate to subvert the Crime Victims Fund allocation formula in order to make up for discretionary appropriation shortfalls. I thank all of you for joining us today. I especially thank Mr. Hanson, and I look forward to your testimony.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thanks, Chairman. At this time, the chair recognizes Judiciary Committee ranking member and recognize you to give an opening statement.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you, Judge Chairman, and to our chairman of the full committee, Mr. Goodlatte; it is a pleasure for us to come here today to listen to the acting assistant attorney general, Mr. Alan Hanson, of the Office of Justice Programs. We welcome you to this discussion today, and we want to examine the grant programs administered by the Department of Justice.

Certainly, it is appropriate that we conduct regular oversight of the various programs, their administration, and their implementation, both because of the amount of funding involved and because of the important role they play in helping to make us all safer from crime.

In total, the Department administers grants that award more than \$5 billion per year. These grants are critical to the ability of recipients, including State, local, and tribal governments, to engage in the full range of activities necessary to prevent crime and to investigate crimes that do take place and to hold offenders accountable and to reduce recidivism and, most importantly, prepare ex-offenders for reentry into their communities after they have served their sentences.

Grant funding also helps provide some measure of assistance to crime victims who need and deserve help after being harmed. I will mention just a few of these programs to illustrate the range of their impact.

Grant funding under the Violence Against Women Act established in 1994 has been critical to improving our Nation's response to intimate partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Then there is the COPS Hiring Program also established in 1994, which has helped over 13,000 State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies hire over 129 police officers and deputy sheriffs.

In my district in Michigan, the Department's grants include funding from the Sexual Assault Kit Initiative, and they have helped Detroit address its backlog of untested sexual assault kits and match samples with offenders whose DNA is contained in the FBI's database. The Second Chance Act, a bipartisan program enacted more than a decade ago, has helped State and local governments focus resources on programs that have been proven to reduce recidivism and make us safer by helping ex-offenders successfully reintegrate into society after incarceration, most important. In fact, just today, the Justice Center of the Council of State Governments is issuing a report entitled "Reducing Recidivism: States Deliver Results." And I ask unanimous consent that this report be entered into the hearing record.

[This material is available at the Committee and can be accessed on the committee repository at: <http://docs.house.gov/meetings/JU/JU08/20170608/106070/HHRG-115-JU08-20170608-SD002.pdf>]

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you. The report highlights the results in seven States in which recidivism has decreased according to several different measures. These States, including my State of Michigan, have all received significant Second Chance Act funding. Clearly, this program works, and we must continue to support it.

And just last year, this committee worked in a bipartisan manner to enact the comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act programs that will target funding to help prevent and address our heroin and opioid drug crisis.

Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues that are here, our State, local, and tribal governments need our help. And our work to give it to them has been successful. For more than 25 years, the tide of crime and violence has receded. While yearly statistics can vary and some cities may not always experience the same success as the national trend during a given period of time, overall, crime is about half of what it was at its peak in 1991.

Violent crime has plummeted by 51 percent. And property crime has fallen by 43 percent, and homicides are down 54 percent. Providing an array of grants, some that are more general in scope and others that are more focused on particular techniques or problems,

has been critical to a multifaceted, successful strategy to fight crime.

And so, that is why we conduct oversight here today. Going forward, we have the opportunity to both maintain and improve our grant programs. And I look forward to the continued success. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back if there is any time remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the ranking member. At this time, we will begin by swearing in our witness. So, if you would, Mr. Hanson, please rise.

Raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

You may be seated. Let the record reflect the witness responded in the affirmative.

Our witness, Mr. Alan Hanson, who currently serves as the acting assistant attorney general for the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs. Prior to the Department of Justice, Mr. Hanson worked in a variety of roles on Capitol Hill. Most recently, Mr. Hanson worked for Senator Richard Shelby, where he served as general counsel and chief of staff. Mr. Hanson also gained congressional policy and political experience in his previous roles as a legislative director for not only Senator Shelby, but Senator Jeff Sessions, a name that rings a bell, and Congresswoman Anne Northrup.

Mr. Hanson received a bachelor's degree from Vanderbilt University, part of the Southeastern Conference, and earned his J.D. degree from Georgetown University.

The witness' statement will be entered into the record in its entirety. We just ask that the witness summarizes his testimony in 5 minutes or less. To help you stay within that time, there is a light in front of you. And with 1 minute to go, it moves to yellow to alert you there is a minute left. And when the light turns red, that is the indication that the time is expired.

I now recognize our first and only witness, Mr. Hanson. I am going to have to step out for a moment, and Mr. Johnson is going to temporarily chair. But I have reviewed your written statement, and I look forward to hearing from you further. Mr. Hanson, you are recognized for 5 minutes.

**STATEMENT OF ALAN HANSON, ACTING ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

Mr. HANSON. Thank you, Congressman Gohmert. Thank you to Ranking Member Jackson Lee; thank you to Chairman Goodlatte, and to Ranking Member Conyers, and other members of the subcommittee for having me here to testify this morning. It is a privilege to be here to discuss the work of my office, the Office of Justice Programs, as well as the work of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, and the Office on Violence Against Women.

Let me say, first of all, I am very pleased to see some of my former colleagues here today. Before taking my current position as head of OJP, I spent more than 17 years working for members of Congress in both the House and the Senate. I fully appreciate that

magnitude of your responsibility, and I share your commitment to ensuring that federally-funded programs are well managed and responsive to local needs.

Under the leadership of Attorney General Sessions, the Department of Justice is working diligently to fulfill its original core mission, which is to uphold the rule of law and ensure that justice is administered fairly and effectively. As you are aware, OJP, OVW, and the COPS Office award a wide range of grants and cooperative agreements to support local, State, and tribal law enforcement, criminal and juvenile justice agencies, and victim service programs. These funds have proven to be critical to ensuring public safety in America.

But we do much more. We provide training and technical assistance; we fund research; we develop technology; we gather statistics; and we distribute information to help justice system professionals do their jobs better. Using all the resources Congress has given us, we are working hard to reduce crime and violence and protect our communities.

Empowered by an executive order from President Trump, the Attorney General established a task force on crime reduction and public safety to address the law and order challenges facing our country. Each of the Department's grant-making offices is playing a key role.

Later this month, under the auspices of this task force, we will host a National Crime Reduction Summit where we bring in law enforcement experts, victim assistance organizations, community groups, and researchers who share information about local crime-fighting efforts and to map out strategies for reducing crime. The President's budget request for fiscal year 2018 offers another clear signal of this administration's commitment to public safety.

His request includes \$70 million for a block grants program for Project Safe Neighborhoods, which would create Federal, State, local, and tribal partnerships to reduce gang and gun crime. Another \$5 million would go to a DOJ-wide program targeting cities with high rates of violence.

We are also working to fight the threat imposed by illicit drugs, especially opioids. We know the dangers they pose both to our citizens and to our law enforcement professionals. That is why the President's budget asks for \$20 million for a new, comprehensive opioid abuse program, another \$80 million to support drug courts and other substance abuse programs. Of course, the safety of our communities is utterly dependent on the skill, commitment, and, not least, the well-being of our law enforcement officers.

These officers put their lives on the line every day. They deserve to know we have their back. The President has made his commitment to America's public safety officers very clear. One of his earliest actions was to sign an executive order directing the Justice Department to develop a strategy to reduce violence against law enforcement.

His budget request proposes substantial investments in our Bulletproof Vest Partnership program and in resilience training available through our Bauer Initiative. We are also demonstrating a solid commitment to officer wellness research and the Body Armor Standards and Testing Program managed by our National Institute

of Justice. The COPS Office is, of course, central to the Department's officer safety and violent crime reduction efforts. COPS programs have supported more than 13,000 of the Nation's 18,000 law enforcement agencies. Up to \$27 million under the COPS Hiring Program will be available this year to help jurisdictions fight violent crime and address other high-priority local concerns. And \$157 million is proposed in the President's fiscal year 2018 budget for law enforcement hiring.

Finally, as we deal with the scourge of gun, gang, and drug violence, we are also fighting to reduce domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. Our Office on Violence Against Women funds hundreds of law enforcement officers and prosecutors who enforce protection orders, try sexual assault cases, and bring perpetrators or these crimes to justice. And OVW's grant-funded program serves some 650,000 victims every year.

We propose to build on this record of success. The President's budget request for OVW includes \$480 million to reduce crime, help victims, reach all affected communities, and promote evidence-based practices. Between the Department's three grant-making offices, we are helping to lead an aggressive, preemptive attack on the crime and violence creeping into too many of our neighborhoods while guarding against waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars.

I have given a brief, but I hope compelling, account of the Justice Department's work to fight crime, serve victims, and protect our Nation's law enforcement officers. With your support, we will fight hard to secure an America where criminals find no haven and law-abiding citizens do not have to look over their shoulders. This is my pledge to you. Thank you for inviting me to testify before the subcommittee today. I will be happy to take any questions you may have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Thank you, Mr. Hanson, for your testimony. We will now proceed under the 5 minute rule for questions, and I will begin by recognizing myself for 5 minutes.

I am really grateful for the information you provided us today. Your written statement was very helpful. The summary today is very helpful as well. And I was particularly grateful for you bringing up efforts that are being taken to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse through the Department's grant-making programs. There is a lot of attention being paid to that these days, and I think it is appropriate and necessary.

And as you have noted, the Department needs to take steps to increase internal oversight because we have got nearly \$10 billion in OJP programs and active grants. So, the first question I had today is something you mentioned in your testimony about a thorough pre-award risk analysis that is done before any grant is awarded. And I imagine that the pre-award risk analysis goes directly to just the initial grant recipient. Is that right?

Mr. HANSON. That is correct, Congressman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. So, is there any pre-award risk analysis of the sub-recipients of those grants? Because I know that is a common practice.

Mr. HANSON. Typically, there is not pre-award assessment of the sub-grantees because it is not always clear who those would be. However, we do have several measures in place where, of course,

as you pointed out, we do assess the risk they may pose. We give them quite a bit of training with regard to how to monitor; we have certain monitoring requirements from them during the course of their grant project performance. And then, we do provide our own oversight, depending on what we see on the ground and through our program managers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. So, in your view, is all that working out pretty well? I mean, is that a sufficient buffer for abuses at the sub-recipient level, you think?

Mr. HANSON. Sub-recipient grantees are a challenge. I think we have the structure in place, and a lot of times, it is a matter of working more closely with our grantees to properly monitor them. I think those efforts could be enhanced. I think we are continually learning from, perhaps, past problems and enhancing our efforts to monitor those more closely. But, again, misbehavior is often just a lack of appropriate knowledge or understanding. And really working with the grantees and to the extent necessary the sub-grantees to make sure they understand what is expected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I appreciate that. Does the Office of Justice Programs provide grants for overseas projects? I think I have read where some of that is going overseas. And if so, is it possible for us to get a comprehensive list of all of those?

Mr. HANSON. We will be happy to get you a comprehensive list in follow up. I can tell you it is very rare. The only examples I am aware of would be some grants into Mexico and potentially into Canada. But I would want to look into my answer to that. We will follow up with you and get you a comprehensive list.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I could be wrong. I think I read somewhere about seminars or programs in Bulgaria and maybe Western Europe. I am a little hazy on it, but that is why I was asking for the summary. So, that would be helpful.

Mr. HANSON. Absolutely. We would be happy to provide that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. So, when those grants or those funds are being used overseas or sent to programs like that, how does DOJ ensure that grants are being carried out in accordance with our law and our values? I mean, is there any safeguards in place for that that you know of?

Mr. HANSON. Yes, it would be the same safeguards that I had outlined previously. We closely monitor our grantees. We require them to monitor their sub-grantees. We have program managers who oversee the programs who also have our financial office who provides quite a bit of oversight. We also work very closely with the Office of the Inspector General and, at times, with the GAO to monitor those.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. All right. So, the Department's conducting these routine reviews of the grant recipient's finances and progress. You are ensuring that the rigid parameters of every grant are continuously met. Let's say that you uncovered a discrepancy or, Heaven forbid, some sort of intentional fraud or something. At what point would the Department require a grantee to pay back an award when waste or fraud or abuse is detected?

Mr. HANSON. That is a potential remedy. We always try to work with our grantees so that money is not called back or recaptured. It happens on occasion. It begins, first, with, if we discover there

is a problem, the first thing we do is consult with our grantee on how to correct those. We will typically or commonly go ahead and freeze the funds at that time until we are satisfied that those corrections have been made. It would be rare, but it has happened, even in my short time at OJP, where we have had to call back some funding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I am running out of time quickly here, but just as a follow up to that: are there whistleblower provisions that apply to all of this? So, if someone is out in the field, so to speak, and they see waste or fraud or abuse and they report it, is that part of the program?

Mr. HANSON. It is. Whistleblower protections, certainly, within the Department and within the office, yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Got it. Well, I am out of time. So, I will recognize the ranking member, Mr. Conyers, for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you very much and thank you for your testimony. It has been helpful to us, and we want to stay in contact as we continue to work through what we are drawing out of the hearings today. With reference to the Community Oriented Police Services and about police militarization, what is the status of the interagency working group on lending Federal military equipment?

Mr. HANSON. As you mentioned, we have a permanent working group on law enforcement equipment. In the past couple of years, they made some recommendations that were implemented under the prior administration. We have heard some level of concern from stakeholders in that regard, and we have recently reconvened that permanent working group to sort of reassess and look at sort of the parameters of what that equipment's desired to be used for, and what equipment may be proper to supply to given law enforcement agencies.

Mr. CONYERS. Now, does the interagency working group prescribe policies and practices for State and local law enforcement use of federally-resourced military weapons and equipment?

Mr. HANSON. The working group does set policies and parameters for the appropriate use, yes, Congressman.

Mr. CONYERS. And is it operating fairly well or okay? How would you describe what is happening there?

Mr. HANSON. I think we feel like it is working well. However, like I said, there have been some stakeholder concerns expressed in the past couple years. And so, that permanent working group continues to assess, particularly in light of the new administration, how best that law enforcement equipment can be supplied.

Mr. CONYERS. Does the interagency working group prohibit certain federally-resourced military weapons and equipment for use by State and local law enforcement, if you know?

Mr. HANSON. That is correct. There are certain limitations on the use of that equipment, yes.

Mr. CONYERS. Do any come to mind that you would like us to know about?

Mr. HANSON. The only one that I remember, because I said it on the initial part of one meeting, was essentially a tracked armored vehicle, so essentially a tank. I know there is some limitations on that. Others, I would have to check and get back to you.



Mr. CONYERS. Well, make the check, and if there is, please add it to our record.

Mr. HANSON. Be happy to do so.

Mr. CONYERS. And finally, what is the status of the implementation of the Death in Custody Reporting Act?

Mr. HANSON. DCRA was enacted relatively recently. And now we have, since the year 2000, been compiling death and custody statistics through the FBI and Bureau of Justice Statistics. However, DCRA has changed the parameters of how that information is collected, required to be collected from the States. We have been working on that since the enactment. The Federal plan for doing so is still being developed. And then, of course, we will have to work with our partners in the State to collect that information.

Mr. CONYERS. And finally, which office within the Office of Justice Programs is overseeing DCRA implementation?

Mr. HANSON. Yes, that has been part of the ongoing planning for compliance with DCRA. However, currently, plans are pointing to the Bureau of Justice Assistance for doing so.

Mr. CONYERS. Finally, how is DCRA implementation being coordinated with other Department of Justice data collection efforts around police community encounters, including the FBI Use-of-Force Database and the Community Oriented Policing Services, which was formerly in the White House Police Data Initiative?

Mr. HANSON. As we continue to compile and set forth our efforts in collecting that data, I do know that we are leveraging all the statistical resources within the Department. So, FBI, Bureau of Justice Statistics do that now, and the Bureau of Justice Statistics is, as of now, expected to head up that effort.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you very much. And, Mr. Chairman, Judge, I yield back.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. It is still hard not to call you Mr. Chairman, you were for so long. But thank you. At this time, we will recognize the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Chabot, for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for being here, Mr. Hanson. Just a few questions. First of all, we obviously see far too many officers killed across the country in the line of duty every year. What steps is the Department taking to prioritize the safety of our law enforcement officers all across the country?

Mr. HANSON. Well, in addition to the executive order that the President issued very early in his term calling for our efforts to protect law enforcement, I think those priorities are reflected in the budget request for fiscal year 2018.

As I also mentioned, the Attorney General has created a task force of crime reduction. And within that task force, there is a sub-committee specifically devoted to, as we call it, back the blue. And that is particularly to protecting and promoting the safety and wellness of law enforcement officers. Within the numerous programs that we have within OJP and COPS and OVW, to a lesser extent, to protect the police, one, in particular, highlight is the Bauer Initiative.

And that is a five-part program looking at a variety of areas that we can assist law enforcement officers. Providing office safety and wellness training, active shooter response training, de-escalations training and technical assistance, officer safety and wellness pro-

grams to hopefully drive police fatalities to zero, and also a research and evaluation program.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you. As a long time member of this committee, 20-plus years now, I want to commend the President on the emphasis that he is putting on keeping our brave men and women in uniform across the country to be as safe as possible. It is a very dangerous job. We have had far too many killed over the years. I have been to far too many of the candlelight ceremonies here in Washington and also too many funerals back in my district in the city of Cincinnati over the years, too. So, I want to commend him for that and urge him to keep his attention on this issue.

Let me move on to a couple of other things really quickly. During the last hearing, I had asked about the body-worn cameras and the pros and cons associated with officers wearing such devices. What are the eligible uses for grant awards in support of body-worn cameras?

Mr. HANSON. Within our body-worn camera program, that could also be funded with Bureau of Justice Assistance Grant Program as well. We provide for, obviously, acquisition of equipment, so actual body cameras, as well as policies and procedures for their use, implementation, and technology associated with that.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you. When I first came here, again, a long time ago, President Clinton was in office and he had pushed the COPS program, which a number of Republicans, including myself, had taken a look at in general support of, although we had some concerns.

One of the concerns we had was that it put some cities in the position where they would hire folks for a couple of years with Federal dollars. And then, unfortunately the dollars went away after a couple of years, and the cities could not necessarily afford to keep them on; people got laid off. Would you want to comment on that? And have we done anything to address that issue?

Mr. HANSON. I believe so. I mean, as I am sure you know, the program is designed such that we do provide Federal resources for the first few years, with the understanding and requirement that the local jurisdiction maintains, does not simply lay off. Obviously, there are challenges, fiscally and otherwise, in local jurisdictions. And I would not be able to speak authoritatively, but I do know we try to work with local jurisdictions to ensure they are complying with the requirements of the program.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you. The President has been outspoken on making sure that our local communities are complying with Federal law with respect to enforcing our immigration laws, and it has been a fairly controversial topic in some cities and States across the country. Would you want to comment on if communities declare themselves sanctuary cities, what impact that might have on Federal funding?

Mr. HANSON. Yes, particularly within the Department of Justice. So, simply declaring that they are a sanctuary jurisdiction in of itself might trigger suspicion, but it would not immediately trigger action on our part. In accordance with the Attorney General's grant funding memo of May 22nd, we are looking particularly at three grant programs administered through the Department of Justice. That is the COPS program, the Byrne JAG Program, as well as

Scat Payments, particularly where we are going to require jurisdictions to certify that they are in compliance with 8 U.S.C. 1373 as a condition of receiving any grant funding under those programs.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you. And as my time is wrapping up, let me just comment on one final thing. The opioid addiction and deaths as a result has been a tragedy all across the country, including my State and Cincinnati. And I saw a figure the other day that said that, back in 1980, I think, there were about 10,000 deaths nationwide due to overdose on drugs. And that has gone from 10,000 to almost 60,000 last year. Would you want to comment? And Mr. Chairman, if you will give me an additional 30 seconds, I would greatly appreciate it.

Mr. GOHMERT. Without objection.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you very much.

Mr. HANSON. That is a priority of this administration and this Attorney General. Under the comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, we have created the Opioid Addiction Program. Significant resources are being devoted in fiscal year 2017 and requested for fiscal year 2018, in addition to other resources of well over a total of over \$100 million devoted particularly to addressing that crisis and hopefully creating an environment where folks either choose not to become addicted to opioids or assist them in becoming free of that scourge.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you, Mr. Hanson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. The gentleman from New York, Mr. Jeffries, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished chair as well as the witness for your presence and your testimony here today. I want to pick up where my distinguished colleague from the great State of Ohio left off on the sanctuary cities conversation. Mr. Hanson, I assume you are familiar with President Trump's executive order entitled "Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States?"

Mr. HANSON. I am.

Mr. JEFFRIES. And section 9(a) orders the Attorney General and the secretary to ensure that jurisdictions that willfully refuse to comply with 8 U.S.C. 1373, so-called sanctuary jurisdictions, are not eligible to receive Federal grants. Is that right?

Mr. HANSON. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Now, in the previous fiscal year, New York City, so-called sanctuary jurisdiction, received \$4.3 million in Byrne Justice Assistance Grant funding that it could lose under this order. Is that right?

Mr. HANSON. That is correct.

Mr. JEFFRIES. And on Friday the 21st, as I believe you just testified, the Department of Justice sent a letter to New York City and maybe other cities asking New York City to demonstrate its compliance with section 1373. Is that right?

Mr. HANSON. That is right. That was April 21. That was a reminder letter of the requirements to do so, yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay, but are you aware that Federal courts have found that policies that limit or prohibit compliance with immigration holds and requests for relief do not violate section 1373?

Mr. HANSON. I am aware of ongoing litigation surrounding the sanctuary cities issue. I am not sure if I understand that particular limitation you described.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay, well, let's go through some of the jurisprudence that exists. According to the United States district court, northern district of California, in the Stanley v. City and County of San Francisco case, section 1373 only prohibits the enactment of certain policies about sharing immigration status information. It does not command the States or cities to administer or enforce Federal law. Was that the holding of that decision?

Mr. HANSON. I will be honest. I did not read the entire decision, but that is my understanding of it, yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay, and the Third Circuit, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, I believe the Virgin Islands, in the Galarza decision, I believe, held immigration detainers do not and cannot compel a State and local law enforcement agency to detain suspected undocumented individuals subject to removal and courts holding; electing not to respond to them is entirely in the discretion of local law enforcement. Is that your understanding of the Third Circuit's decision?

Mr. HANSON. Again, I have not read that opinion, but that is my understanding.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay, now, are you familiar with the Supreme Court's case in Arizona v. the United States?

Mr. HANSON. If you mean from a few years back, I am.

Mr. JEFFRIES. That is correct. And that decision held nothing in Federal law requires localities to enforce immigration laws and regulations. Correct?

Mr. HANSON. Yes, that is my understanding.

Mr. JEFFRIES. And I assume you are familiar with the 10th Amendment?

Mr. HANSON. Yes, also yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. And the 10th Amendment precludes the Federal Government from coercing State or local governments to use their resources to enforce Federal laws or regulations like immigration. Is that correct?

Mr. HANSON. That is certainly a fair interpretation of that, yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. And that is a concept known as the anti-commandeering doctrine, correct?

Mr. HANSON. Yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. And the Supreme Court has continuously upheld the anti-commandeering doctrine, correct?

Mr. HANSON. I believe that is correct, yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. In fact, Justice Scalia, may he rest in peace, who was, obviously, a conservative—I am a progressive, but had great respect for his legal mind. When he struck down, in Prince v. United States, key provisions of the Brady Bill, stated, "It is an essential attribute of the States' retained sovereignty that they remain independent and autonomous within their proper sphere and that they should not be," his words, "dragooned"—very creative—"dragooned into administering Federal law." Are you familiar with that decision?

Mr. HANSON. Yes. Yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Chief Justice Roberts, again, conservative, I am a progressive Democrat, Supreme Court decision in *NFIB v. Sebelius*, which struck down a few provisions of the Affordable Care Act, noted that, "If you forbid funding conditions that are so coercive they amount to a gun to the head of the State or local government and that is inconsistent with Federal law or the Constitution." Correct?

Mr. HANSON. Yes, I recall that ruling.

Mr. JEFFRIES. And so, I guess, in closing, my time has expired, I cannot understand why the Department of Justice, which is the entity that should administer the law, faithfully execute, as well as the Constitution, can conduct themselves in this fashion.

Notwithstanding clear judicial precedent from the Article III branch of the government to the contrary, including decisions written by some of the greatest conservative, legal scholars ever to exist in this great Republic. And I would hope, not that you would listen to the voices of those of us on this side of the aisle, but listen to those who have consistently articulated decisions anchored in the valued precedent of federalism in this great country. I yield back.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentlemen and especially the shout-out to federalism. At this time, I recognize the gentlelady for Alabama, Mrs. Roby.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you very much. Hello, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON. Hello, Congresswoman. Pleasure.

Mrs. ROBY. Good to see you here. Congratulations on your new position as acting assistant attorney general for the Office of Justice Programs. So, thank you for being here today. Two things I wanted to talk about: missing and exploited children programs. Congress has provided an average of \$70 million a year for the past 3 years for these programs. And I wanted to just hear from you maybe a breakdown of how the Department of Justice intends or has allocated this funding. This is something very important to me.

When I joined this committee and this Congress, I made it clear that I wanted to focus a lot of my energy and attention to missing and exploited children's programs, as well as human and sex trafficking issues across the board. We have recently passed the Global Child Protection Act and some other really important pieces of legislation that we have worked directly with DOJ on, so that we can continue to advocate and fight for the victims of these horrific crimes. And so, if you could just talk a little bit about that funding and anything you want to add as it relates to funding in the fiscal year 2018 as well.

Mr. HANSON. Sure. Well, thank you for that question. Exploitation of children is a very serious issue for all of us and certainly for our Attorney General. The Department, as you pointed out, has committed significant resources over the years and that commitment continues on our fiscal year 2018 budget request. And a large portion of that funding will go to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children for a variety of programs that it runs to both help children who have been exploited or abducted in some way and also to prevent that.

We have a number of other programs looking at internet crimes against children and other grant programs. So, very significant

funding to help not only, hopefully, prevent those crimes, but then also assist them if they are victims of them. I do not have it with me, but a comprehensive breakdown of that spending, we would be happy to get it to you.

Mrs. ROBY. Well, I appreciate that. And please know that you have very willing partners here. There are horrible abuses that are taking place not just globally, but right in our own backyard. And I know you are aware, but even in our State of Alabama, it has been brought to our attention about the corridor between Birmingham and Atlanta and what is going on right there. And I think the more we talk about it, as hard as it is to talk about these terrible things that are being done to children, we need to make sure that we are doing our part to educate others about what is going on right here in our own country as well.

So, please know that I look forward to continuing to work with the Department on these issues and looking for opportunities to combat these horrible crimes.

I want to go back to what the gentleman from Ohio was talking about with opioid abuse. This, too, has become an epidemic. It is an epidemic in our country. The more I read and learn about what is going on, we have to continue to do all that we can as members of Congress to make sure that the resources are available. We did so, as you mentioned with the Comprehensive Addiction Recovery Act, CARA. But I just wanted to know the conversations that you are having in the Department with stakeholders, who those stakeholders might be.

And then, also the issue of pilfering. There was some grants that were to be made available to deal with this issue on the locking mechanism of the pills that may be in a cabinet where a child or anyone would have access to. So, if you could just maybe expand a little bit on that issue; that would be great.

Mr. HANSON. Sure. So, as I mentioned to Congressman Chabot, we are proposing in fiscal year 2018 \$20 million or so particularly to a number of grants. Looking to help local communities to develop systems, processes, ways of assisting addicts as well as, of course, a number of other resources with drug courts, intervention counseling that can be leveraged for that purpose as well. You talked about the, I think, the secure pill bottle program. That is something that could be funded. We do not have a solicitation specific to that, but that is something that could be funded through one of our co-op grants. And I suspect we would see some proposals to that effect, and we will certainly give them very serious consideration.

Mrs. ROBY. Sure. And I appreciate that as well. And I mean, of course, that is just one example amongst many that these very precious dollars could be used to help combat, again, this epidemic, this very serious epidemic in our country. Thank you again for your service. Glad to see you here today, and I yield back.

Mr. HANSON. Thank you.

Mr. GOHMERT. At this time, I will go ahead and recognize myself for 5 minutes and try not to duplicate anything else because one of the things we are hoping that is going to be done by the DOJ is cut out a lot of the duplication that has occurred over the years.

And I, probably more than most, recognize the difficulties this DOJ will have because of what has gone on before us.

I have been down on the Texas-Mexico border all hours, many nights. And our Border Patrol open up and talk a bit in the middle of the night. And what I have seen over and over in talking to them is, as was shared one night, I was asked, "Do you know what the drug cartels call Homeland Security?" "No. What?" "They call us logistics, like the commercial. The drug cartels say all we have to do is get our future employees across the border, and then Homeland Security ships them wherever we want them to go."

I have been there numerous times when, as the officers go through their questions, they add a question that many of them want to know. "How much did you pay the gangs, the drug cartels to get here?" And it was often 5, 6, 7,000–8,000. "You do not have that money. Where did you come up with that money?" And this was usually in Spanish, and I would have somebody helping me. But the response would be, "Oh, we got \$1,500, \$2,000 from friends in America, \$1,000 here and \$1,000 there." "Well, what are you doing for the rest of it?" "They are going to let me work it off when I get to the city where I am going."

They had employees paying the drug cartels to let them be employees for free in cities all over America. So, while we are spending millions of dollars through DOJ trying to help local law enforcement, at the same time, we were using Homeland Security money to ship future criminal agents and some of them in desperate situations, whether it was sex trafficking or drugs.

So, it seems like some of the money DOJ is now going to be spending is going to be having to help communities deal with what we did to them in recent years. So, let me ask you: can you tell a little more about the National Summit on Crime Reduction and Public Safety? How is that going to help these situations?

Mr. HANSON. Well, the upcoming summit, which is being conducted in the auspices of the National Crime Reduction Task Force created by the Attorney General, is going to bring together a large group of stakeholders, community groups, crime groups, law enforcement, and prosecutors throughout the country.

And the idea is to bring them together and talk about different strategies and things they are doing to combat crime in their area and, hopefully, sort of share best practices with each other, so that each jurisdiction and different group can learn from the other and combine their knowledge and, hopefully, create strategies that we can disseminate nationally to fight crime, including the sorts of problems that you have described.

Mr. GOHMERT. And have you worked personally, directly with any law enforcement in States and local governments?

Mr. HANSON. I have not had occasion to interact with a number of them. I have not. Of course, I have only been on board about four and a half months. But I have had the opportunity to talk to many law enforcement officers, and I can tell you that what we are hearing is across the board just the breath of fresh air they feel coming from this Attorney General and this administration about getting tough on crime in their jurisdiction and the things they are dealing with.

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes. And hopefully not shipping any more people to their locales that they are going to end up having to deal with.

Mr. HANSON. I can tell you that you have got an Attorney General that is absolutely committed to ending illegality at the border and stopping those people there, prosecuting them there, and then sending them back.

Mr. GOHMERT. And I hope you know you do not have to tell me. I consider Jeff Sessions to be a dear friend and just a wonderful person. Well, one of the things that Mr. Jeffries has expressed as a concern, and it is certainly a concern of mine. I know it was a concern of Senator Jeff Sessions, and I am sure yourself. We do. We send out money and often over the years it has been, so we can put strings on it and dictate local control.

Now, I know Attorney General, I was so pleased that he ended some of the consent decrees, which appeared, to me, to be a take-over of local law enforcement by the feds; or as Mark Levin says, "federalizing local law enforcement." Can you tell us any more about that working relationship with communities that have perhaps had problems, consent decree has been removed? Are we working with them to help them with money to get their systems up and working appropriately as law enforcement?

Mr. HANSON. We are. It is our job, particularly in the grantmaking components of the Department, to get this money to law enforcement officers and agencies, so they can use it to reduce crime, promote public safety, and, of course, protect the well-being and safety of their officers. We always work with jurisdictions to make sure they are in compliance with whatever grant conditions may exist. It is not our job to deny them funding. It is to make sure that they fulfill the requirements to receive it.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, my time has expired. I am going to see, did the gentleman from Louisiana or the gentlelady from Alabama have any further questions? All right.

Then, Mr. Hanson, we do not always get an opportunity to do this, but you are the sole witness today, and you have had great questions from both sides of the aisle. Sometimes you do not completely respond or think of other things that you might wish to say maybe to expand on comments that were already made. What would you say is the most important takeaway that this committee should have from this hearing today?

Mr. HANSON. I just want you to know that we are here to work with you, our authorizers and Congress, to combat crime, to promote public safety, and protect our law enforcement officers. And, as has been pointed out in a number of the statements today, sometimes there is duplication in programs; some different programs become outdated and need for flexibility.

We are here to work with you and to get your thoughts on the best way forward to, again, pursue those policy priority areas set out by the A.G. and the President. And I would also say that there is no need or concern about commandeering local law enforcement officers. We are here to work with them as a partner and not to direct them or tell them what to do.

Mr. GOHMERT. Anything further from prior answers that you wish to expand on or you thought of since that you wanted to add?



Mr. HANSON. Well, I will just add just a little bit to my exchange with Congressman Jeffries. The way forward on the sanctuary grant funding determination in accordance with the Attorney General's memo from May 22nd is just to look at three grant programs. They were actually identified last year with regard to 1373 compliance. All jurisdictions were placed on notice in fiscal year 16 and agreed that compliance with 8 U.S.C. 1373 would be a condition of receiving that grant. And so, we are simply carrying that policy forward. There is no attempt to commandeer or otherwise deny grant funding except that, as a grant condition, jurisdictions must comply with all applicable Federal laws and are on notice that 8 U.S.C. 1371 is one of those applicable laws.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. Of course, one of the concerns that is expressed in local jurisdictions. Yeah, we award this grant money and people hear the total amount, you know, whether it is \$70 million, whatever it happens to be for a particular program. And yet, normally, it is not pointed out that salaries usually come out of that amount at DOJ to implement the money that goes to the local jurisdictions.

And in a different committee yesterday, we were hearing from part of the Department of Interior that they were running about 25 percent as administrative costs. And as I pointed out to them, if they were in the private sector, they would be fired and never be allowed to touch money again. But being they are in the government, 25 percent may be deemed not that unreasonable; I think it is. But, what do you see the Department of Justice doing to minimize the amount of money necessary to pay for salaries and administrative costs at DOJ, so that more can go to the locales that actually need it?

Mr. HANSON. It is a priority of ours to concentrate the resources Congress makes available to us to the State and local law enforcement agencies who are our partners. As such, we try to minimize the overhead, for lack of a better term, that is taken out of us. We do not receive at OJP any direct appropriation for management or administration.

Therefore, we do have to take the funding salaries and other costs out of the grants. However, we consistently keep that below 8 percent. And I believe we proposed for fiscal year 2018 about 7.7 that is drawn across the board from most, but not all of the grant programs. So, not even all the programs we administer to we take that 7.7 percent drawdown from them.

Mr. GOHMERT. Our hearing is basically coming to a conclusion. But I wanted to take a point of personal privilege and point out that I do not know of anybody else in our committee during the years that President Bush was in office and the person he chose as the Director of the FBI, Robert Mueller, was the FBI Director. But I had numerous exchanges with Director Mueller. He had his 5-year up-or-out program.

For most people that have dealt with Federal law enforcement, they know from a local standpoint that it normally takes 5 years for a State and local law enforcement group to feel comfortable with a Federal agent. As they come in or they come in and they are in a special agent in charge supervisory position, often the feeling is, "Okay, is this going to be one of those guys that takes all

our work and runs and does the press conference? Or are they actually going to be a partner?"

Five years, you know what you have got. You know you have got partners. And we had incredible, experienced FBI agents all over the country doing phenomenal work. In his 5-year up-or-out program, when you are a supervisor for 5 years, you either got to get out or come to Washington. And so, many of them thought, "I am not coming to Washington and being a yes-man, you know, a minion. I would rather stay here. I can make more money. I wish I could stay in the FBI and continue to work, even though a lesser salary."

And as, I think the Wall Street Journal pointed out, we lost thousands and thousands of years of experience in the FBI. I felt like Director Mueller basically gutted the FBI of so much experience. And if you are looking for a bunch of yes-men, then the less experienced the better.

But I would just encourage you and our Attorney General, you know, use those assets. Let's build it back from what Director Mueller brought it down to. We got a lot of work to do. And I am grateful for the people that are still there with experience, but it is going to make your job harder. So, I appreciate your being here today. I know it is not fun testifying except for the bonus check you get for coming.

And not everybody in government appreciates sarcasm, but the witness is not receiving any remuneration for testifying. But without objection, all members will have 5 legislative days to submit additional written questions for the witness or additional materials for the record. Hearing nothing further, our meeting is adjourned. Thank you, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON. Thank you.

