# Senate Finance Public Safety Subcommittee Presentation

September 17, 2013

Virginia Department of
Criminal Justice Services
www.dcjs.virginia.gov

# Federal Crime Justice Funding

**Byrne/JAG Grant Program** **43% Decline**

| | |
|---|---|
| 2009 | $6.31M |
| 2010 | $5.93M |
| 2011 | $4.86M |
| 2012 | $3.64M |
| 2013 | $3.58M |

**Victims of Crime Act (VOCA)**

| | |
|---|---|
| 2009 | $ 8.9M |
| 2010 | $10.2M |
| 2011 | $10.7M |
| 2012 | $ 9.5M |
| 2013 | $10.7M |

**Violence Against Women Grant (VSTOP)**

| | |
|---|---|
| 2009 | $2.88M |
| 2010 | $3.19M |
| 2011 | $3.22M |
| 2012 | $3.16M |
| 2013 | $3.01M |

**Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT)** **61% Decline since 2010**

| | |
|---|---|
| 2009 | $250K |
| 2010 | $715K |
| 2011 | $574K |
| 2012 | $213K |
| 2013 | $277K |

**Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG)** **54% Decline**

| | |
|---|---|
| 2009 | $1.09M |
| 2010 | $1.05M |
| 2011 | $828K |
| 2012 | $501K |
| 2013 | *Not Yet Awarded* |

**Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Title II** **58% Decline**

| | |
|---|---|
| 2009 | $1.41M |
| 2010 | $1.36M |
| 2011 | $1.04M |
| 2012 | $582K |
| 2013 | *Net yet Awarded* |

DCJS

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

www.dcjs.virginia.gov

# Federal Crime Justice Funding *continued*

**Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Title V**

| | |
|---|---|
| 2009 | $33.4K |
| 2010 | $84.9K |
| 2011 | $50K |
| *Funding eliminated* | |

**Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grant**

| | |
|---|---|
| 2009 | $404K |
| 2010 | $581K |
| 2011 | $486K |
| 2012 | $185K |
| 2013 | $170K |

- FFY13 awards include the sequester reduction of approximately 5%
- Overall DOJ state and local grant programs have been reduced 40% since 2010
- Sequester impact on FFY14 and beyond is not clear yet
- Impact to Virginia of these reductions is smaller and/or fewer grants to local entities

DCJS

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

www.dcjs.virginia.gov

# Victim Witness and Domestic Violence Victims Funds

## Funding History FY09-13

| Fiscal Year | Victim Witness Special Fund | Domestic Violence Victims Fund |
|---|---|---|
| 2009 | $4.66M | $2.97M |
| 2010 | $4.73M | $3.03M |
| 2011 | $4.75M | $3.04M |
| 2012 | $4.57M | $2.93M |
| 2013 | $4.41M | $2.83M |

DCJS

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

www.dcjs.virginia.gov

# Review of Intelligence-Led Policing Model

"The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall review the application of best practices and the potential for utilizing the intelligence-led policing model in Virginia law enforcement agencies. The review shall include consideration of the feasibility of creating incentives for the development of intelligence-led policing in the allocation of state or federal funds available through the department.

The department shall report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees by October 15, 2013."

DCJS

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

www.dcjs.virginia.gov

# Review of Intelligence-Led Policing Model *continued*

DCJS reviewed the following federal and state sources on ILP:

- *Integrated Intelligence and Crime Analysis: Enhanced Information Management for Law Enforcement Leaders*. Radcliff, J. 2007.
- *Intelligence-Led Policing: The New Intelligence Architecture*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. 2005.
- *Law Enforcement Analytic Standards*. International Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Analysts, Inc. 2012.
- *Law Enforcement Intelligence: A Guide for State, Local, and Tribal Law Enforcement Agencies, 2nd Edition*. U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. 2009.
- *Navigating Your Agency's Path to Intelligence-Led Policing*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance. 2009.
- *New Jersey State Police Practical Guide to Intelligence-led Policing*. New Jersey State Police. 2006.
- *Reducing Crime Through Intelligence-Led Policing*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2009.

# Review of Intelligence-Led Policing Model *continued*

What is Intelligence-Led Policing?

ILP is a policing management philosophy with these common elements:

- "Integrated analysis model" combining information collected by both crime analysis and intelligence units to provide a picture of *what* is happening and *why* it is happening in the criminal environment.
- In many organization, crime analysis and intelligence seen as separate functions.
- ILP is not CompStat or problem-solving policing; although it combines elements of both.
- Enables more effective crime reduction and prevention strategies.

# Review of Intelligence-Led Policing Model *continued*

Issues to Consider for Final Report on ILP

- ILP can provide police executives with a more "holistic picture" of the local crime situation, and suggest more options for developing tactics and deploying resources.
- Combining crime analysis and criminal intelligence resources using ILP can be cheaper in the long run than maintaining separate functions.
- Offenders do not compartmentalize criminal activity, so law enforcement agencies should not compartmentalize analysis and intelligence functions
- ILP will compete for resources with other programs now provided by DCJS.
- Smaller agencies, with fewer resources than larger ones, may find it hard to implement ILP (about 50% of VA law enforcement agencies have 15 or fewer employees).
- Developing training on ILP for agencies would require examining complex constitutional issues concerning sharing information about individuals.
- DCJS may be able to provide assistance on ILP best practices to different sized agencies, tailored to the agencies' level of resources.

# Review of Lethality Assessment Programs

"The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall review the experience of other states in establishing lethality assessment programs to train law enforcement officers in responding to situations involving domestic violence and potential deadly threats. The review shall include an assessment of the costs and benefits of establishing a program in Virginia and potential first steps which could be taken by the department within existing resources.

Copies of the review shall be provided to the Secretary of Public Safety and the Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees by October 1, 2013."

DCJS

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

www.dcjs.virginia.gov

# Review of Lethality Assessment Programs *continued*

DCJS reviewed the following sources of information on LAPs:

- Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence (MNADV) tool called the Lethality Screen for First Responders. Based on the John Hopkins University School of Nursing "Danger Assessment" tool, the Maryland model is generally regarded as the national model for LAP.
- Information obtained from programs in the following states with some form of statewide or local-level LAP: Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Massachusetts (Plymouth Co.), Missouri (Jackson Co.), Oklahoma, and Vermont (Rutland Co.).
- Information obtained from Norfolk, VA, which implemented a program in 2012 as a partnership between the city police department, local DV agency and prosecutor's officer.

# Review of Lethality Assessment Programs *continued*

## What is a Lethality Assessment Program (LAP)?

Program to identify DV victims at high risk of being seriously injured or killed by their intimate partners and immediately connects them to a DV service provider in their area.

- Standard set of screening questions are asked of victim by first responder.
- Victim's responses to questions helps indicate level of danger victim is in.
- Protocol on actions to be taken based on level of risk indicated by screen.
- When screen indicates high risk danger, officer contacts partnering 24-hour domestic violence hotline to speak with a counselor.
- Victim is encouraged to speak with counselor, but is not required to do so.
- Counselor encourages victim to seek services from domestic violence program.
- Advocate may conduct more detailed assessment and develop detailed safety plan based on victim's specific circumstances.

# Review of Lethality Assessment Programs *continued*

Issues to Consider for Final Report on LAP

- Data indicates that LAPs reduces homicides in DV cases.
- Data indicates that LAPs increase victim safety and show victims they have support.
- LAPs increases collaboration and partnerships between police, DV counselors, and other professionals.
- LAP information can help identify serial batterers.
- Impact on law enforcement can include training officers, more time on scene to follow ILP protocol, and providing assessment forms and other LAP materials.
- Impact on victims programs can include increased hotline calls, service requests and follow-up work for DV program agency staff.
- Impact on DCJS could include need for staff to manage and coordinate statewide LAP program.

# Review of Alcohol Monitoring Devices

"The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall review the potential applicability in Virginia of alcohol monitoring devices for persons convicted of a first offense of driving while intoxicated. This amendment provides for a follow-up study related to Senate Bill 1103 of the 2013 Session, which was not approved.

Copies of the review shall be provided to the Secretary of Public Safety and the Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees by October 1, 2013."

DCJS

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

www.dcjs.virginia.gov

# Review of Alcohol Monitoring Devices *continued*

DCJS reviewed the following sources of information on alcohol monitors:

*Evaluating Transdermal Alcohol Measuring Devices, Final Report*, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2007.

*Transdermal Alcohol Monitoring: Case Studies*, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, August 2012.

*Continuous Transdermal Alcohol Monitoring: A Practitioner's Guide,* Traffic Injury Research Foundation, July 2007.

*Effectiveness of the SCRAM Alcohol Monitoring Device: A Preliminary Test*, Flango, Victor E. & Cheesman, Fred L., Drug Court Review, Volume VI, 2.

Interviews with Alcohol Monitoring Systems (AMS), a major Virginia alcohol monitoring services vendor.

Survey of 37 pretrial and community corrections agencies that supervise DUI offenders. (*Not all have responded; still getting responses).*

# Review of Alcohol Monitoring Devices *continued*

What are alcohol monitoring devices?

Devices that detect if a person has consumed alcohol, to record and/or prevent driving a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol. Devices are used to monitor compliance with court conditions for drivers convicted of a DUI offense.

Two types of monitors are used in Virginia:

1. Vehicle ignition interlock: Device attached to vehicle to keep it from starting if it detects alcohol in driver's breath. Now required by law for all convicted DUI drivers if granted a restricted operator's license by the court.
2. Transdermal alcohol monitor: Focus of this review, device attaches to a person's ankle and detects the presence of alcohol in skin perspiration. The device records alcohol use and reports it to a monitoring vendor, which then notifies supervision authorities.

# Review of Alcohol Monitoring Devices *continued*

Issues to Consider for Final Report on Alcohol Monitors

- Evaluations show transdermal monitors are generally reliable.
- Readings from devices have been found admissible in court.
- No cost to court or supervisory program for equipment or monitoring; offender contracts with vendor to pay costs.
- Virginia monitoring vendors report 72% compliance with transdermal monitors.
- Supervisory programs report delays in reporting from vendors on noncompliance can take 24-72 hours.
- Cost of monitoring is barrier for some offenders. Some courts may waive or reduce cost for indigent offenders, but still must pay vendors.
- Judges must be educated on capabilities and limits of monitoring.
- Transdermal monitor detects alcohol use, but doesn't prevent drinking and driving in manner that ignition interlock system can.

# Regional Law Enforcement Training Academies

| FY | GF | SF | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2009 | $1,101,101 | $1,527,050 | $2,628,151 |
| 2010 | $ 352,100 | $1,527,681 | $1,879,781 |
| 2011 | $ 528,240 | $1,410,585 | $1,938,825 |
| 2012 | $ 496,546 | $1,516,652 | $2,013,198 |
| 2013 | $ 496,546 | $1,465,867 | $1,962,413 |

DCJS

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

www.dcjs.virginia.gov

# Regional Law Enforcement Training Academies *continued*

- Ten Regional Law Enforcement Training Academies receive state GF's and Special Fund appropriations.
- In addition there are 28 independent LE training academies that are locally funded.
- Over the years LE agencies have left a regional academy and formed their own.
- DCJS, at the request of the GA, reported in 2011 on the fiscal status of the regional academies.
- Overall the regional academies are meeting their training mandates with current resources.
- However, two notes of caution:
  - Small academies are dependent on a small number of agencies for revenue without which their viability could be in question.
  - Additional training mandates without resources put added pressure on the academies to meet their core responsibilities.

DCJS

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

www.dcjs.virginia.gov