HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

	MEMORANDUM		
		By Dale S. Thompson	
		Date_May 24, 1974	

FILE: Governor's Justice Commission

On May 22, THOMAS BERARD of the Governor's Justice Commission furnished the follow general non-technical description of various funds available to the Commission:

1. Title B Planning Funds which have a one-year life.

A maximum of 60% of these funds can be used for SPA operations and supportive services at headquarters and the regions.

At least 40% of these funds must be given to units of local government, or combinations thereof, for local planning related to the annual comprehensive plans. As an example: The regional council staff and expenses are paid out of these funds. Also, these funds are available to cities with populations in excess of 500,000 for planning purposes.

2. Title C Action Funds which have a two-year life.

A minimum of 75% of these funds must be given to units of local government.

Up to 25% of Title C funds may be given to state agencies and non-governmental organizations.

3. Title E Corrections and Probation Funds which have a two-year life.

These funds can be given to both local and state governmental agencies.

These funds are an augmentation to corrections and probation monies contained in Title C Action Funds and become available after the corrections and probation obligations of the state under Title C have been met. In effect, this is bonus money.

Governor's Justice Commission – 2 May 24, 1974

4. LEAA discretionary funds.

These are grants which are awarded directly by LEAA after SPA's review and endorsement. After the award, LEAA assigns the grant to the SPA for administration, similar to awards made directly by SPA.

LEAA furnishes SPA with funds for these grants over and above monies awarded under the annual plan.

5. The SPA also receives a limited amount of general appropriation funds from the state. The state matches about 20% to 23% of federal planning funds received under Title B.

Also, the state must match (5% for 1974) action funds awarded to local government. Also, the units of local government who receive action funds must match them with a 5% contribution in 1974.

6-1

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

MEMORAND	UM
----------	----

By Dale S. Thompson

Date May 31, 1974

FILE: Governor's Justice Commission

Funds Available to the Governor's Justice Commission

In cooperation with personnel at the Governor's Justice Commission, two schedules were prepared and are attached. They are:

1. A schedule showing funds available to the Commission for expenditure as of April 30, 1974. This schedule reflects that during a six-year period the Commission has had available for expenditure \$142,711,964.

Also included on this schedule are refunds made to the State of Pennsylvania and LEAA because of non-expenditure of funds prior to the lapse date. As of this date, the referred to refunds amounted to \$2,178,683.

2. The second schedule refers to awards made of Action and Corrections and Parole Funds. This schedule reflects that \$85,400,322 has been expended through April 30, 1974. This schedule is broken down into expenditures by 10 broad program categories.

It should be noted that none of the fiscal year 1974 funds had been awarded by the Commission as of April 30.

Hovemor's Justice Commission of mos Available and Definds as of april 30, 19974 corrections Lega State & Probation Discretinany Buy-In Total Totals 172938 4 corrections & Profestion Lega sio cretionary Total5 Funds and Pakle Finds available

FUNDING POLICY GUIDELINES

This is to be considered a resource document for GJC staff. It includes:

- A. The policy statements (numbered 1 through 12 and underscored) adopted by the supervisory Board in Executive Session on June 4, 1973; and
- B. additional Comment by Executive Session developed as explanatory and/or interpretive material.

EXPANSION

1. The Covernor's Justice Commission's primary concern is with the funding of new or innovative programs.

COMMENT The Commission feels that the expansion of ongoing functions should be the responsibility of the agency or unit of local government charged with the support of such functions.

2. Only in exceptional cases will the Commission fund to meet an increased workload or rising demand for ongoing functions.

COMMENT It is the intent of the Commission that the possibility exist to make exception to #1 above if the circumstances so warrant. However if such circumstances do exist and are properly documented then all concerned should know that such funding is an exception to a standing policy.

3. Short-term support may be given for improvements of existing services other than those necessitated by an increased workload or a rising demand for services.

COMMENT E.g. if a new saturation police patrol program requires the addition of officers to the force the Commission will consider funding salaries for the new men - as part of the new program. The Commission will not fund new officers simply to provide additional routine patrol coverage.

LONG RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

4. Applicants are required to outline sources of and timetable for local assumption of project costs in future years.

COMMENT Executive Staff will not consider recommending for approval applications that do not explicitly address themselves to a <u>lasting</u> improvement in the system or a permanent reduction in crime. This implies a description of such efforts as have been made to find alternate funding sources.

5. Only in exceptional cases will funding extend beyond the third year.

COMMENT While in rare instances it may be appropriate for the Commission to fund a project beyond the third year, the Commission's general assumption is that three years provides adequate time for a project to both prove itself viable and for the applicant to arrange for a more permanent funding source. A request for funding beyond the third year would require strong justification.

6. Funding of a given application in no way commits the Commission to the refunding of that project.

COMMENT Applicants must understand that the approval of an application commits the Governor's Justice Commission to the funding of a project for the one grant period and no more. Repeated funding will be contingent upon a variety of factors; e.g. assessment of outcome (through monitoring analysis of progress reports or evaluation), the Commission's current priorities and availability of federal funds. Cf also Guideline No. 7.

7. Continuation funding if available, requires the demonstration of value and an increased match by applicant or a complete explanation if such increase is unavailable.

COMMENT Projects will be refunded only if: Funds are available; A given project has demonstrated its value to the satisfaction of the Governor's Justice Commission and the applicant has demonstrated (in a refunding application) his inability to assume a greater portion of the costs in succeeding years than in the original application. If it is impossible to increase the percentage of the applicant's match, the applicant must provide the Commission with a complete explanation of why the percentages cannot be increased and include a description of all efforts made to secure alternate funding.

8. The Commission will consider funding annual portions of multi-year projects (not to exceed three years) only if the proposal contains a sequence of intermediate goals, or "milestones" specifically defined, and the match increases each year. Evaluation of each portion is required prior to funding of ensuing portions of the project.

COMMENT. The Commission encourages work which is to follow a long-range plan of sequential events. On the program as well as on a project level, the Governor's Justice Commission favors the definition of milestones (toward long-range goals and accomplishments).

CONSTRUCTION AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

9. Large capital construction or large equipment purchases are discouraged.

Expenditures for planning and design studies for such purposes are considered appropriate if they contribute to consolidation of services or significant programmatic improvements.