

February 1998

# TRUTH IN SENTENCING

## Availability of Federal Grants Influenced Laws in Some States



---

---

**General Government Division**

B-278066

February 4, 1998

The Honorable William D. Delahunt  
The Honorable Carolyn C. Kilpatrick  
The Honorable Bart Stupak  
The Honorable Robert C. Scott  
The Honorable Vic Fazio  
The Honorable Max Sandlin  
The Honorable Bob Etheridge  
The Honorable Melvin L. Watt  
The Honorable Zoe Lofgren  
House of Representatives

The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, as amended,<sup>1</sup> provides, among other things, incentive grants to states that have, in general, truth-in-sentencing (TIS) laws requiring violent offenders to serve at least 85 percent of their imposed sentences. You asked us to determine (1) the number of states that have enacted TIS laws that meet the federal grant eligibility requirements, (2) whether the availability of federal grants was a factor in these states' decisions to enact TIS laws, and (3) reasons why other states have not enacted TIS laws that meet the federal grant requirements.

In addressing these issues, our work largely consisted of a telephone survey of state officials to obtain testimonial evidence of why states have or have not enacted TIS laws that meet federal grant requirements. Although we requested legislative history and other documentary materials, in some of the states, such materials either were not available or were not readily identifiable by the state officials we contacted. Even if such materials were available, measurement of the influence of federal incentive grants on state legislative action could still be difficult, particularly due to the multiplicity of factors that may be involved in the political and legislative processes.

Nonetheless, in inquiring about how many states have enacted grant-qualifying TIS laws and the factors that led the states to pass these laws, we obtained from the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Corrections Program Office lists of the states that received TIS incentive grants in fiscal years 1996 and 1997. Using these lists, we contacted (by telephone) the grant coordinator in each state—generally a designated position responsible for violent offender incarceration grants as well as TIS grants within an executive branch agency, such as the state's department of

---

<sup>1</sup>Public Law 103-322, Sept. 13, 1994, (the "1994 Crime Act").

---

corrections—for his or her insights and opinions regarding the influence of the federal incentive grants on the state’s decision to enact a TIS law. We followed a similar procedure in contacting those states that had not enacted grant-qualifying TIS legislation as of the time of our review. That is, in each state, we contacted the violent offender incarceration grant<sup>2</sup> coordinator to confirm whether or not the state had a grant-qualifying TIS law, and, if not, the reasons why the state had not enacted one.

To corroborate this testimonial evidence, we asked that each grant coordinator refer us to other knowledgeable officials in the state—including legislative branch officials as well as officials in other executive branch offices or agencies, such as sentencing commissions. Also, in our telephone discussions with the grant coordinators and other officials, we requested a copy of any available legislative history materials (e.g., conference or committee reports) and any other documentary evidence (e.g., cost-benefit analyses or studies regarding the advantages and/or disadvantages of the federal TIS grants).

We performed our work from September 1997 to December 1997 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Appendix I provides further details about our objectives, scope, and methodology.

---

## Background

The 1994 Crime Act, as amended, authorized DOJ to provide TIS incentive grants to eligible states for building or expanding correctional facilities and jails to increase the secure confinement space for persons convicted of Part 1 violent crimes.<sup>3</sup> The federal TIS grants, which are administered by DOJ’s Corrections Program Office, are, in general, to be awarded to states that have a law requiring convicted violent crime offenders to serve at least 85 percent of the sentence imposed.<sup>4</sup> The TIS awards are formula grants, which are to be allocated, in general, to each eligible state on the basis of its share of the average annual number of violent crimes for the preceding 3 years, as reported to the FBI for all eligible states.

---

<sup>2</sup>All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories have received violent offender incarceration grants, which also were authorized by the 1994 Crime Act.

<sup>3</sup>For the purposes of the TIS grant provision, the term “Part 1 violent crimes” means murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault, as reported to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for purposes of the Uniform Crime Reports.

<sup>4</sup>The federal TIS grants are available to the states, the District of Columbia, and the territories (namely, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands). However, in our study, we surveyed only the states and the District of Columbia.

---

According to DOJ's grant application guidelines, in calculating time served, a state may include only the actual time an offender is committed to the care and custody of the correctional agency. Thus, any administrative or statutory time credits—such as reductions for good behavior, earned time, meritorious conduct, or population control releases—should not be included in the time-served calculations. Further, any probation and parole time should not be included in the calculations. However, jail time served can be included in the calculations, as can be the time served in community and reintegration placements.

---

## Results in Brief

At the time of our review, based upon determinations made by DOJ, 27 states had TIS laws that met the requirements for receiving federal TIS grants.<sup>5</sup> For each of these 27 states, we contacted state officials to determine whether the availability of such grants was a factor in the respective state's decision to enact a TIS law. Based on the responses to our telephone survey, the states can be grouped into three categories—TIS grants not a factor (12 states), TIS grants a partial factor (11 states), and TIS grants a key factor (4 states).

The other 23 states and the District of Columbia did not receive federal TIS grants in fiscal year 1997. In our telephone survey, we confirmed these jurisdictions did not have TIS laws that met federal grant requirements. For these 23 states and the District of Columbia, we contacted state and District officials to determine why the respective jurisdiction had not enacted TIS legislation that meets federal grant eligibility requirements. The reasons given in response to our telephone survey can be grouped into three categories—(1) prison construction and/or operation costs would be too high, even with the federal grant money (16 states); (2) current sentencing practices appear to be working well (5 states); and (3) various other reasons (2 states and the District of Columbia).

---

## Number of States With TIS Laws That Meet Federal Grant Requirements

As table 1 shows, for fiscal year 1996, DOJ determined that 25 states met the eligibility requirements for federal TIS grants. For that year, a total of 30 states applied for TIS grants, but DOJ determined that 5 applicant states did not meet the eligibility requirements. To the 25 eligible states in fiscal year 1996, DOJ awarded a total of \$195.8 million in TIS grants, ranging from \$76,322 for North Dakota to about \$45.8 million for California.

---

<sup>5</sup>All 27 of these states received TIS grants in fiscal year 1997.

For fiscal year 1997, DOJ determined that 24 of the 25 states that received grants in fiscal year 1996 were eligible for TIS grants, along with 3 new applicant states (Maine, New Jersey, and Oklahoma). Thus, to the 27 eligible states in fiscal year 1997, DOJ awarded a total of \$234.9 million in TIS grants, ranging from \$100,433 for North Dakota to about \$55.7 million for California.

**Table 1: States With TIS Laws That Met Federal Grant Eligibility Requirements (Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997)**

<b>States</b>	<b>Amount awarded 1996</b>	<b>Amount awarded 1997</b>
Arizona	\$4,144,752	\$5,379,028
California	45,789,751	55,740,321
Connecticut	2,058,686	2,586,755
Delaware	665,908	868,724
Florida	22,739,227	28,726,509
Georgia	6,889,904	8,770,736
Illinois <sup>a</sup>	16,362,634	0
Iowa	1,342,501	1,659,781
Kansas	1,697,302	2,088,064
Louisiana	6,282,717	7,849,531
Maine <sup>b</sup>	0	297,453
Michigan	10,181,903	12,368,459
Minnesota	2,270,145	3,014,541
Mississippi	1,822,374	2,481,235
Missouri	5,416,082	6,590,986
New Jersey <sup>c</sup>	0	8,601,321
New York	24,970,018	28,555,605
North Carolina	6,677,873	8,429,425
North Dakota	76,322	100,433
Ohio	7,806,005	9,654,038
Oklahoma <sup>d</sup>	0	3,889,841
Oregon	2,276,727	2,934,952
Pennsylvania	7,312,870	9,624,634
South Carolina	5,299,787	6,867,037
Tennessee	5,643,092	7,470,690
Utah	850,225	1,170,147
Virginia	3,411,490	4,351,063
Washington	3,847,430	4,806,020
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$195,835,725</b>	<b>\$234,877,329</b>

(Table notes on next page)

---

<sup>a</sup>According to an Illinois official, Illinois law requiring violent offenders to serve at least 85 percent of the imposed sentence applies only to violent crimes involving bodily harm. The Illinois official told us that, in 1996, the state was awarded TIS grant funds with the understanding that the state must change its law to include other violent crimes as defined in the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports to receive grant money in subsequent years. The Illinois official said that the state did not change its definition to meet the federal eligibility requirements and, thus, did not apply for grant money in 1997.

<sup>b</sup>Maine did not apply in fiscal year 1996.

<sup>c</sup>New Jersey applied in fiscal year 1996, but its application was not approved due to state law parole provisions. New Jersey changed its law in 1997.

<sup>d</sup>Oklahoma did not apply in fiscal year 1996.

Source: DOJ, Office of Justice Programs, Corrections Program Office.

---

## **Some States Say That the Availability of Federal TIS Grants Influenced Enactment of Laws**

For each of the 27 states that received federal grants in fiscal year 1997, we contacted state officials to determine whether the availability of such grants was a factor in the respective state's decision to enact a TIS law. On the basis of responses to our telephone survey, we grouped the 27 states into the 3 categories shown in figure 1—(1) TIS grants not a factor, (2) TIS grants a partial factor, and (3) TIS grants a key factor.

**Figure 1: Influence of Federal TIS Grants on State Laws**

State	Year passed	Date effective	Influence of federal TIS grants on state laws		
			Grants not a factor	Grants a partial factor	Grants a key factor
Arizona	1993	1/01/94	•		
California	1994	9/21/94	•		
Delaware	1989	6/30/90	•		
Georgia	1994	1/01/95	•		
Michigan	1994	6/27/94	•		
Minnesota	1992	8/01/93	•		
North Carolina	1993	10/01/94	•		
Ohio	1995	7/01/96	•		
Oregon	1995	4/01/95	•		
Pennsylvania	1911	1911	•		
Utah	1985	12/01/85	•		
Washington	1990	7/01/90	•		
Connecticut	1995	7/01/96		•	
Florida	1995	10/01/95		•	
Iowa	1996	7/01/96		•	
Kansas	1992 <sup>a</sup>	7/01/93		•	
Mississippi	1995	7/01/95		•	
Missouri	1994	8/28/94		•	
New Jersey	1997	6/09/97		•	
North Dakota	1995	8/01/95		•	
South Dakota	1995	1/01/96		•	
Tennessee	1995	7/01/95		•	
Virginia	1994	1/01/95		•	
Louisiana	1996	1/01/97			•
Maine	1995	10/01/95			•
New York	1995	10/01/95			•
Oklahoma	1997	7/01/98			•

<sup>a</sup>Kansas amended its law in 1995 to conform to the federal TIS eligibility requirements.

Source: GAO summary of information provided by the states, including opinions of state officials.



---

## TIS Grants Not a Factor

As figure 1 indicates, state officials in 12 states told us that their respective state’s legislation was not influenced at all by the availability of the federal grants. In several of these states, for example, TIS legislation was enacted long before the 1994 Crime Act. The clearest illustration is Pennsylvania, which, according to a state official, enacted its legislation in 1911.

Some states, such as Georgia and California, enacted TIS laws at approximately the same time that the 1994 Crime Act was passed. Officials in these states told us that the federal grants authorized by the 1994 Crime Act did not influence the respective state’s TIS legislation. California was one of the few states where we were able to corroborate such testimonial evidence by obtaining and reviewing legislative history materials. For example, we did not find mention of the federal grants in any of the legislative history. Rather, among other things, the legislative history reflected concern that violent offenders were eligible for generous sentence reductions (based upon work credits), whereas “victims often serve a lifetime sentence.”

Figure 1 also shows that Ohio is 1 of the 12 states included in the not-a-factor category. According to Ohio officials, the state passed its TIS law in 1995, which is later than the enactment date of the 1994 Crime Act. However, the officials told us the state law was based on a July 1993 report by the Ohio Sentencing Commission. Thus, according to the state officials, the availability of federal grants did not influence the state’s decision to pass TIS legislation. Rather, according to Ohio officials, a widespread concern about early release of violent crime offenders was a major factor in the state’s decision to pass TIS legislation.

---

## TIS Grants a Partial Factor

Figure 1 shows that 11 of the 27 grant-recipient states are included in the partial-factor category. Officials in these 11 states told us that the federal grants played a role, although not necessarily a major or decisive one, in the passage of the respective state’s TIS legislation. Generally, the officials told us that the major factors were the respective state’s get-tough-on-crime initiatives, which they said were begun independently of the 1994 Crime Act.

Mississippi is one of the states included in the partial-factor category. A Mississippi official told us that, in addition to the availability of federal grants, various other factors—particularly the state’s get-tough-on-crime initiatives and dissatisfaction with the parole system—led to the passage of Mississippi’s TIS law. This official estimated that the federal grants were

---

perhaps a “25-percent” factor in influencing enactment of the state’s TIS law.

---

### TIS Grants a Key Factor

Finally, figure 1 shows that 4 of the 27 grant-recipient states are included in the key-factor category. That is, in these four states, officials told us that the availability of the federal grants was a key factor in the respective state’s decision to enact tougher sentencing laws. For example, of the four states included in the key-factor category, Oklahoma has the most recent TIS law enactment. Officials in Oklahoma told us that, initially, the state was considering a TIS law requiring offenders to serve 75 percent of the court-imposed sentences. The officials noted, however, that state legislators changed to an 85-percent requirement in order to qualify for the federal grants.

---

### Reasons Why Some States Say That They Do Not Have TIS Laws That Meet Federal Grant Requirements

As discussed above, at the time of our review, DOJ had determined that 27 states had TIS laws that met federal grant requirements in fiscal year 1997. The other 23 states and the District of Columbia did not receive federal TIS grants in fiscal year 1997. These jurisdictions did not have TIS laws that met federal grant requirements.

For the 23 states and the District of Columbia that did not receive federal TIS grants in fiscal year 1997, we contacted state and District of Columbia officials to determine the reasons why the respective jurisdiction had not enacted TIS legislation that meets federal eligibility requirements. On the basis of responses to our telephone survey, we grouped the reasons given by the states and the District of Columbia into the three categories shown in figure 2—(1) prison construction and/or operation costs would be too high, even with the grant money; (2) current sentencing practices appear to be working well; and (3) various other reasons.

**Figure 2: Reasons Why Some Jurisdictions Have Not Enacted TIS Laws That Meet Federal Grant Eligibility Requirements** (as of November 1997)

Jurisdiction	Reasons TIS law not enacted			
	Prison construction and/or operation costs would be too high	Current sentencing practices appear to be working well	Other reason: grant applied for, but existing TIS law did not meet federal requirements	Other reason: considering a TIS bill at the time of our review
Alabama	•			
Arkansas	•			
Colorado	•			
Hawaii	•			
Illinois <sup>a</sup>	•			
Indiana	•			
Kentucky	•			
Maryland	•			
Montana	•			
Nebraska	•			
New Mexico	•			
Rhode Island	•			
South Dakota	•			
Vermont	•			
West Virginia	•			
Wyoming	•			
Idaho		•		
Massachusetts		•		
Nevada		•		
New Hampshire		•		
Texas		•		
Alaska			•	
District of Columbia			•	
Wisconsin				•

<sup>a</sup>Illinois received a federal TIS grant in 1996 but not in 1997 (see figure 1, note a).

Source: GAO summary of opinions of state and District of Columbia officials.

**Construction and/or Operation Costs Too High**

As figure 2 shows, officials in 16 states identified costs as the main impediment to passing TIS legislation. Various officials commented that the

---

federal grant money would cover only a small percentage of a state's prison construction and operation costs. For example, an official in Vermont told us that implementing a TIS law meeting the federal requirements would cost Vermont several million dollars, whereas the state would receive only about \$80,000 in federal TIS grants.

---

**Current Sentencing Practices Are Satisfactory**

Officials in five states (Idaho, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Hampshire, and Texas) told us that the current sentencing practices in the respective state appear to be working well. Thus, according to these officials, the respective state is satisfied with its current sentencing practices and is not pursuing TIS legislation that would meet the federal grant eligibility requirements.

---

**Other Reasons**

As figure 2 shows, one state (Alaska) and the District of Columbia applied for federal TIS grants. However, DOJ determined that the TIS laws in these two jurisdictions did not meet the federal grant eligibility requirements.

Also, at the time of our review, another state, Wisconsin, was considering a TIS bill. A Wisconsin official told us, however, that there has been considerable debate whether the TIS funding is important enough to change the state's current legislation.

---

**Agency Comments and Our Evaluation**

We sent a draft of this report to the Attorney General for comments. On January 6, 1998, we received written comments from DOJ's Corrections Program Office. DOJ generally agreed with the content of the report and provided technical comments and clarifications. We have incorporated these comments and clarifications where appropriate in this report.

---

As agreed with your office, unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report until 5 days from the date of this letter. At that time, we will send copies of this report to the Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees; the Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members of the House and Senate Appropriations' Subcommittees on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies; the Attorney General; the Director, Office of Justice Programs; the Director, Corrections Program Office; the Director, Office of Management and Budget; and officials we

---

contacted in each state. We will also make copies available to others on request.

Major contributors to this report are listed in appendix II. If you have any questions about this report, please call me on (202) 512-8777.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Norman Rabkin". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Norman J. Rabkin  
Director, Administration  
of Justice Issues

---

# Contents

---

Letter		1
Appendix I Objectives, Scope, and Methodology		14
Appendix II Major Contributors to This Report		20
Tables	Table 1: States With TIS Laws That Met Federal Grant Eligibility Requirements	4
	Table I.1: List of Organizations and Officials Contacted by GAO	16
Figures	Figure 1: Influence of Federal TIS Grants on State Laws	6
	Figure 2: Reasons Why Some Jurisdictions Have Not Enacted TIS Laws That Meet Federal Grant Eligibility Requirements	9

---

## Abbreviations

DOJ	Department of Justice
TIS	truth in sentencing
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation

---

---

---

# Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

---

In a letter dated July 9, 1997, nine Congressmen requested that we review the impact on state sentencing practices of the truth-in-sentencing (TIS) incentive grants established under title II of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-322). As agreed with the requesters, we conducted work in the states and the District of Columbia to address the following questions:

- How many states have enacted TIS laws that meet the federal grant eligibility requirements?
- Of the states that have enacted TIS laws that meet the federal grant eligibility requirements, was the availability of these grants a factor in their decision to do so?
- Of the states that have not enacted TIS laws that meet the federal grant eligibility requirements, what are the reasons for their not doing so?

To determine how many states have enacted grant-qualifying TIS laws and the factors that led the states to pass these laws, we focused on states that received federal incentive grants in fiscal years 1996 and 1997. The Department of Justice's Corrections Program Office, which administers the federal TIS grants, provided us lists of these recipient states. We confirmed this list by interviewing appropriate officials (by telephone) in the states. For each state that received a federal grant, we contacted the respective state's TIS grant coordinator—generally a designated position within an executive branch agency, such as the state's department of corrections. For the other 23 states (i.e., those that did not receive a TIS grant in either year) and the District of Columbia, we contacted the respective jurisdiction's violent offender incarceration grant<sup>6</sup> coordinator to verify that these jurisdictions did not have relevant TIS laws.

For each TIS state, we contacted the grant coordinator to obtain information regarding the state's TIS law, such as the enactment date, the effective date, and whether any amendments have been made. We did not independently verify the information provided to us by the states. Further, in each TIS state, we asked the grant coordinator for his or her insights and opinions regarding the influence of the federal incentive grants on the state's decision to enact a TIS law. To corroborate this testimonial evidence, we asked that each grant coordinator refer us to other knowledgeable officials in the state—including legislative branch officials as well as officials in other executive branch offices or agencies such as sentencing commissions.

---

<sup>6</sup>All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories have received violent offender incarceration grants, which also were authorized by the 1994 Crime Act.



In our telephone discussions with these officials in each TIS state—discussions that focused on trying to determine whether the federal incentive grants were a factor in the state’s decision to pass TIS legislation—we requested a copy of any available legislative history materials, such as conference reports, committee reports, or records of pertinent hearings. Also, if available, we requested a copy of any cost-benefit analyses and/or other state studies regarding the advantages and/or disadvantages of the federal TIS grants.

Legislative history and other documentary materials generally are sources of evidence to help ascertain whether the federal grants were or were not a factor in a state’s decision to pass TIS legislation. However, in some of the states, such materials either were not available or were not readily identifiable by the grant coordinators and other officials we contacted. Even if such materials were available, measurement of the influence of federal incentive grants on state legislative action could still be difficult, particularly due to the multiplicity of factors that may be involved in the political and legislative processes.

We followed a similar procedure in contacting those states and the District of Columbia that have not enacted grant-qualifying TIS legislation. As we did with the states with qualifying legislation, we contacted the violent offender incarceration grant coordinator to obtain his or her opinions on why the state did not pursue enacting legislation that would qualify it for the TIS grant. In addition, to corroborate this testimonial evidence, we likewise asked the grant coordinators to refer us to other knowledgeable executive and legislative branch individuals to discuss reasons why the jurisdiction had not enacted a TIS law that meets the federal grant eligibility requirements. Also, in our telephone discussions with these individuals, we requested a copy of any available documentary materials (e.g., state studies or analyses, legislative reports, etc.) regarding this issue.

Table I.1 lists the organizations and officials we contacted in each of the states and the District of Columbia.

**Appendix I  
Objectives, Scope, and Methodology**

**Table I.1: List of Organizations and Officials Contacted by GAO**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Organizations and officials contacted</b>
Alabama	Department of Economic and Community Affairs: —Program Manager, Law Enforcement Traffic Safety Division  Department of Corrections: —Director, Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit
Alaska	Department of Law and Corrections: —Assistant Attorney General
Arizona	Department of Corrections: —Grant Manager —Legislative Liaison —Manager, Research Unit, Policy and Research Bureau
Arkansas	Department of Finance and Administration: —Administrator, Office of Intergovernmental Services  Sentencing Commission: —Director
California	Youth and Adult Correctional Agency: —Deputy Secretary, Fiscal Programs  Department of Corrections: —Fiscal Analyst, Planning and Construction Division —Senior Staff Counsel, Legal Affairs Division
Colorado	Department of Public Safety: —Planning and Grants Specialist for Violent Offender and Residential Substances Treatment Program, Division of Criminal Justice
Connecticut	Office of Policy and Management: —Planning Specialist, Policy Development and Planning Division
Delaware	Department of Corrections: —Deputy Principal Assistant to the Commissioner
District of Columbia	Office of the Chief Financial Officer: —Program Manager, Office of Grants Management and Development
Florida	Department of Community Affairs: —Community Program Administrator  Executive Office of the Governor: —Senior Policy Analyst for Public Safety Issues
Georgia	Criminal Justice Coordinating Council: —Chief of Staff

(continued)

**Appendix I**  
**Objectives, Scope, and Methodology**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Organizations and officials contacted</b>
Hawaii	Department of Public Safety: —Administrative Assistant to the Director
Idaho	Department of Juvenile Corrections: —Quality Assurance Manager  Department of Corrections: —Administrator, Field and Community Services Division  Supreme Court: —Administrative Director of the Courts
Illinois	Criminal Justice Information Authority: —Senior Administrator, Federal and State Grant Unit
Indiana	Department of Corrections: —Director, Planning Division
Iowa	Department of Corrections: —Executive Officer
Kansas	Department of Corrections: —Assistant to the Secretary of Corrections  Kansas Legislature: —Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary —Staff, Legislative Research Office
Kentucky	Justice Cabinet: —Grants Manager
Louisiana	Department of Public Safety and Corrections: —Executive Officer to the Under Secretary
Maine	Department of Public Safety: —Senior Planner/Justice Assistance Program Administrator  Department of Corrections: —Correctional Planning Specialist
Maryland	Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention: —Criminal Justice Grants Manager  Office of the Lieutenant Governor: —Policy Director
Massachusetts	Executive Office of Public Safety: —Deputy Director, Committee on Criminal Justice
Michigan	Department of Corrections: —Acting Administrator, Office of Planning, Research, and Management Information Services
Minnesota	Department of Corrections: —Project Manager/Prison Warden

(continued)

**Appendix I**  
**Objectives, Scope, and Methodology**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Organizations and officials contacted</b>
Mississippi	Department of Corrections: —Deputy Commissioner for Institutions
Missouri	Department of Corrections: —Director of Planning, Research, and Evaluation —Legislative Liaison
Montana	Department of Corrections: —Grants Coordinator
Nebraska	Department of Corrections: —Manager, Planning and Research Division
Nevada	Department of Motor Vehicle and Public Safety: —Administrator, Office of Criminal Justice Assistance
New Hampshire	Office of the Attorney General: —Director of Administration, Department of Justice
New Jersey	Department of Law and Public Safety: —Grants Coordinator, Division of Criminal Justice —Deputy Director, Division of Criminal Justice
New Mexico	Department of Corrections: —Planner, Administrative Services Division
New York	Department of Criminal Justice: —Director, Criminal Justice Services Division, Office of Funding and Program Assistance —Deputy Commissioner and General Counsel
North Carolina	Department of Corrections: —Special Assistant to the Secretary of Corrections
North Dakota	Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation: —Program Coordinator (Special Projects Officer)
Ohio	Department of Rehabilitation and Correction: —Chief, Office of Grants Management  Sentencing Commission: —Director
Oklahoma	Department of Corrections: —Assistant Director for Community Sentencing —Policy Advisor, Chief of Staff Office
Oregon	Department of Police: —Grant Coordinator, Criminal Justice Services Division  Oregon Criminal Justice Commission: —Executive Director

(continued)

**Appendix I**  
**Objectives, Scope, and Methodology**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Organizations and officials contacted</b>
Pennsylvania	Commission on Crime and Delinquency: —Director, Bureau of Program Development
Rhode Island	Department of Corrections: —Associate Director of Financial Resources —Associate Director of Planning and Research
South Carolina	Department of Corrections: —Chief of Financial Accounting
South Dakota	Department of Corrections: —Director, Juvenile Services Division —Director, Program and Planning Division
Tennessee	Department of Corrections: —Assistant to the Commissioner
Texas	Office of the Governor: —Criminal Justice Policy Director
Utah	Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice: —Director  Sentencing Commission: —Director
Vermont	Department of Corrections: —Director of Planning
Virginia	Department of Corrections: —Capital Outlay Analyst, Administrative Division
Washington	Department of Corrections: —Assistant to the Secretary for Federal Relations —Director of Research and Planning
West Virginia	Department of Military Affairs and Public Safety: —Justice Programs Administrator, Justice Programs Section, Criminal Justice and Highway Safety Division
Wisconsin	Department of Corrections: —Budget and Policy Analyst, Bureau of Budget
Wyoming	Department of Corrections: —Management Services Administrator

# Major Contributors to This Report

---

**General Government  
Division, Washington,  
D.C.**

Danny R. Burton, Assistant Director, Administration of Justice Issues  
Anthony L. Hill, Evaluator-in-Charge  
David P. Alexander, Senior Social Science Analyst

---

**Office of the General  
Counsel, Washington,  
D.C.**

Rachel DeMarcus, Assistant General Counsel  
Geoffrey R. Hamilton, Senior Attorney

---

**Dallas Field Office**

Donna B. Svoboda, Evaluator

---

## Ordering Information

The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. VISA and MasterCard credit cards are accepted, also. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

### Orders by mail:

U.S. General Accounting Office  
P.O. Box 37050  
Washington, DC 20013

### or visit:

Room 1100  
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)  
U.S. General Accounting Office  
Washington, DC

Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000 or by using fax number (202) 512-6061, or TDD (202) 512-2537.

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (202) 512-6000 using a touchtone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.

For information on how to access GAO reports on the INTERNET, send an e-mail message with "info" in the body to:

[info@www.gao.gov](mailto:info@www.gao.gov)

or visit GAO's World Wide Web Home Page at:

<http://www.gao.gov>

---

**United States  
General Accounting Office  
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001**

**Bulk Rate  
Postage & Fees Paid  
GAO  
Permit No. G100**

**Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

**Address Correction Requested**

---

