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SUMMARY

The Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs are among the primary sources of Federal financial assistance for State and local drug law enforcement efforts. The programs were first authorized in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 and in 1988 named to honor a New York City police officer slain in the line of duty. Amendments were approved in 1990 and 1994.

The Byrne Programs consist of two discretionary programs and a block grant program. Program funds must be used to improve criminal justice systems in order to reduce violent crime, the demand for illegal drugs, or the availability of such drugs. For fiscal year 1995 the Congress has appropriated $512 million for the programs. Since the inception of the programs in 1986, $3.3 billion have been appropriated. The programs are authorized through FY2000.

The discretionary funds, awarded on a competitive basis by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, are used to enhance anti-drug educational and training programs, to establish demonstration projects, and to fund correctional options programs. For fiscal year 1995, $62 million has been appropriated for discretionary grants. Most of the money ($450 million in fiscal year 1995) is allocated among the States under the block grant program. Each State must pass through a specified portion of the block grant funds to localities, depending on the share the localities’ criminal justice expenditures represent of all such funds spent in the State. Federal allocations to the fifty States (and the District of Columbia and insular areas) in fiscal year 1995 range from $1.3 million shared by American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands to $47 million to California.

The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-322) amended the Byrne statutory authority by allowing grantees to use funds for gang related projects, to enforce laws related to driving under the influence of alcohol, and by restricting discretionary grant funds to non-Federal entities, among other modifications.
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PROGRAM OVERVIEW AND FUNDING LEVELS

In response to requests for assistance from State and local governments and claims that the Nation's crime and drug abuse problem required coordinated efforts, Congress enacted grant-in-aid authority in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986. The legislation was significantly amended by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 and the programs were renamed the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs. Edward Byrne was a New York City police officer slain in the line of duty while protecting a witness in a narcotics case. Some amendments were added by the omnibus crime control acts of 1990 and 1994 as well. The programs were reauthorized through fiscal year 2000 by the 103rd Congress. The statute authorizes funds for (1) a block

---


3The programs are also commonly referred to as the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant programs. The assassination of the police officer is the focus of: McAlary, Mike. Cop Shot: The Murder of Edward Byrne. New York, Putnam, 1990. 303 p.


In addition to the provisions summarized in this report, the statute was amended in 1992 "to supplement" the Byrne programs by authorizing grants to combat auto theft. P.L. 102-519, the Anti Car Theft Act of 1992, 106 Stat. 3386-87. In each fiscal year, 1993 to 1995, $10 million was authorized.

grant program, under which funds are distributed by designated State officials; and (2) for discretionary grants awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) in the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

Through the discretionary program, funds are distributed to non-Federal public and private organizations undertaking demonstration projects and to non-Federal public agencies and private nonprofit organizations for alternatives to prison (correctional options). The demonstration projects must be activities that can be replicated elsewhere in the Nation. Discretionary funds are distributed through a competitive award process in accordance with priorities established by the Director of the BJA and directives established by the Congress, notably through "earmarks" in appropriations.

Block grant funds are allocated among the States largely on the basis of population levels and may be used for "personnel, equipment, training, technical assistance, and information systems" to improve State and local criminal justice systems. Twenty-four activities specified in the statute are eligible for funding through the block grant program; discretionary program funds are to be targeted toward these activities as well. Grantees and the Department of Justice must evaluate the effectiveness of projects assisted under both programs.

Before fiscal year 1990, the full amount of funds authorized for any fiscal year were neither requested by the Administration nor appropriated by the Congress. From fiscal years 1987 through 1989, no requests for funding were submitted by the Reagan Administration; the Congress appropriated funds over Administration opposition. The Bush Administration requested and received full funding for the program each fiscal year. The Clinton Administration proposed that in fiscal year 1995 the formula program be eliminated, that funding for the discretionary programs be doubled, and that a new "crime control fund initiative" be established. Confronted with considerable opposition to this proposal, the Administration modified its proposal to continue the formula program at a reduced level ($125 million). The 103rd Congress did not agree to this request and instead approved slightly increased funding for both programs. Table 1, below, presents funding information for the program since 1987.
TABLE 1. Authorizations, Requests and Appropriations for the Byrne Memorial Programs, FY1987-1992 (in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$99,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>as needed</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$496,000</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$481,000</td>
<td>$474,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$512,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS

The discretionary element of the Edward Byrne Programs consists of two parts: authorization for the Director of BJA to award grants for demonstration projects and authorization for the Director to fund projects that stimulate the establishment of sanctions for offenders other than prisons. Eligible grantees include non-Federal public or private agencies, institutions, organizations, or individuals.\(^6\)

**Demonstration Projects**

Discretionary funds may be awarded by the Director of the BJA to public or private applicants to assist efforts to carry out drug control plans and to improve criminal justice systems. As set out in the statute,\(^7\) the discretionary grants may be used for the following four purposes:

1. Undertaking educational and training programs for criminal justice personnel;
2. Providing technical assistance to States and local units of government;
3. Undertaking projects which are national or multijurisdictional in scope and which address the purposes specified in section 502 of the Act [regarding approved State programs or projects]; and
4. Providing financial assistance to public agencies and private nonprofit organizations for demonstration programs which, in view of previous research or experience, are likely to be a success in more than one jurisdiction.

Discretionary funds may not be used for the acquisition of land or for construction projects.\(^8\)

Applicants for discretionary awards must meet the requirements set out in the statute as well as those specified in the application guidance materials prepared by the BJA. The statute requires that applications include the following:

---


Grants may be awarded to individual programs or projects for up to four years. The BJA may extend or renew the grants for an additional two years if a program or project has met its goals or "offers the potential for improving the functioning of the criminal justice system," and if the grantee matches the renewed grant on a 50/50 basis.\(^9\)

**Correctional Options**

The Crime Control Act of 1990 revised the discretionary program element of the Byrne program by creating authority for the Director of the BJA to make grants for projects that serve as alternatives to prison.\(^{11}\) Public agencies and nonprofit organizations are eligible for funds to establish or expand prison boot camps (also known as shock incarceration programs), intensive probation programs, electronic monitoring projects, and undertake similar activities with these funds.

The Correctional Options authority establishes three categories of grants. First, up to four grants may be made each fiscal year (with 80 percent of the funds allocated to the correctional options program) to public agencies "that provide alternatives to traditional modes of incarceration and offender release programs . . ." These programs must be oriented toward youthful offenders, provide treatment and rehabilitation services, and meet other specified objectives. Second, grants (10 percent of allocated funds) may be made to private nonprofit organizations for similar purposes and for educational, training and technical assistance projects. Third, grants (the other 10 percent)

---


may be provided to public agencies for the establishment and operation of prison boot camps. Factors to be considered by the Director in selecting grantees are set forth in the statute.

Perhaps the most notable feature of the correctional options authority is the provision that public agencies assisted under the first and third grant categories are eligible to receive, free of charge, real property no longer needed by the military that the Attorney General and the Director of the BJA agree would be appropriate for correctional options projects. Military installations closed or realigned under the first Base Closure Act are exempt and the conveyances are limited to four per fiscal year. The correctional options program was not funded in fiscal year 1991, the first year it was authorized. In fiscal year 1992 $13 million was appropriated for the program, in fiscal year 1993 $9 million was appropriated, and in fiscal years 1994 and 1995 $12 million was appropriated in each year.

---

FORMULA GRANTS

The Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program (the block grant program) provides funds for State and local drug abuse and crime control efforts. The intent of the statute is to help State and local governments improve their criminal justice systems and, as a particular emphasis, to ensure that "a nationwide and multilevel drug control strategy" is implemented. To ensure that projects funded under this program coordinate Federal and State efforts, State and local governments must establish offenses similar to those set forth in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.).

The statute requires that each State develop a strategy for control of drug and violent crime and that projects funded under the block grant program be consistent with that strategy. Each State's application for block grant funds must include a copy of the strategy, which is expected to be consistent with the National Drug Control Strategy.

As in the discretionary program, grant recipients must limit funding for specific projects to a total of four years, except for multijurisdictional drug task force participation, victims assistance programs, or multijurisdictional gang task forces.

Eligible Activities

Twenty-four activities may be undertaken with block grant funds. These activities address demand and supply reduction aspects of anti-drug efforts as well as crime reduction efforts in general. The activities may be grouped under the following broad categories:

- Reduce demand for illegal drugs;
- Enhance law enforcement activities;
- Improve court and prosecutorial systems;
- Support crime prevention programs;

---


• Improve detention facilities and corrections programs; and
• Achieve multi-purpose objectives.

The activities, as specified in the statute and organized according to these categories, are as follows. (Note that these categories are not necessarily exclusive; some activities could be listed under more than one category.) The following text is taken verbatim from the law.

**Demand**

Demand reduction education programs in which law enforcement officers participate; [501(b)(1)]

Programs which identify and meet the treatment needs of adult and juvenile drug-dependent and alcohol-dependent offenders; [501(b)(13)]

**Law Enforcement**

Multijurisdictional task force programs that integrate Federal, State, and local drug law enforcement agencies and prosecutors for the purpose of enhancing interagency coordination and intelligence, and facilitating multijurisdictional investigations; [501(b)(2)]

Programs designed to target the domestic sources of controlled and illegal substances, such as precursor chemicals, diverted pharmaceuticals, clandestine laboratories, and cannabis cultivations; [501(b)(3)]

Disrupting illicit commerce in stolen goods and property; [501(b)(5)]

Improving the operational effectiveness of law enforcement through the use of crime analysis techniques, street sales enforcement, schoolyard violator programs, gang-related and low-income housing drug control programs; [and] developing and implementing antiterrorism plans for deep draft ports, international airports, and other important facilities; [501(b)(7)]

Financial investigation programs that target the identification of money laundering operations and assets obtained through illegal drug trafficking, including the development of proposed model legislation, financial investigative training, and financial information sharing systems; [501(b)(9)]
Addressing the problems of drug trafficking and the illegal manufacture of controlled substances in public housing; 15 [501(b)(17)]

Programs of which the primary goal is to strengthen urban enforcement and prosecution efforts targeted at street drug sales; [501(b)(21)]

Programs for the prosecution of driving while intoxicated charges and the enforcement of other laws relating to alcohol use and the operation of motor vehicles; [501(b)(22)]

**Court and Prosecutorial Systems**

Improving the investigation and prosecution of white-collar crime, organized crime, public corruption crimes, and fraud against the government with priority attention to cases involving drug-related official corruption; [501(b)(6)]

Career criminal prosecution programs including the development of proposed model drug control legislation; [501(b)(8)]

Improving the operational effectiveness of the court process, by expanding prosecutorial, defender, and judicial resources, and implementing court delay reduction programs; [501(b)(10)] 17

Developing and implementing programs which provide assistance to jurors and witnesses, and assistance (other than compensation) to victims of crimes; [501(b)(14)]

Programs that address the need for effective bindover systems for the prosecution of violent 16- and 17-year-old juveniles in courts with jurisdiction over adults for the crimes of—(A) murder in the first degree; (B) murder in the second degree; (C) attempted murder; (D) armed robbery when armed with a firearm; (E) aggravated battery or assault when armed with a firearm; (F) criminal sexual penetration when armed with a firearm; and (G) drive-by shootings as described in section 36 of title 18, United States Code; [501(b)(23)]

---

15 Section 5104 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, P.L. 100-690, 102 Stat. 4301 added this provision and redesignated the succeeding paragraphs in 102 Stat. 4331.

Crime Prevention

Providing community and neighborhood programs that assist citizens in preventing and controlling crime, including special programs that address the problems of crimes committed against the elderly and special programs for rural jurisdictions; [501(b)(4)]

Improving the criminal and juvenile justice system’s response to domestic and family violence, including spouse abuse, child abuse, and abuse of the elderly; [501(b)(18)]

Law enforcement and prevention programs relating to gangs, or to youth who are involved or at risk of involvement in gangs; [501(b)(24)]

Corrections

Programs designed to provide additional public correctional resources and improve the corrections system, including treatment in prisons and jails, intensive supervision programs, and long-range corrections and sentencing strategies; [501(b)(11)]

Providing prison industry projects designed to place inmates in a realistic working and training environment which will enable them to acquire marketable skills and to make financial payments for restitution to their victims, for support of their own families, and for support of themselves in the institution; [501(b)(12)]

Providing alternatives to prevent detention, jail, and prison for persons who pose no danger to the community; [501(b)(20)]

Multi-Purpose Objectives

Developing programs to improve drug control technology, such as pretrial drug testing programs, programs which provide for the identification, assessment, referral to treatment, case management and monitoring of drug dependent offenders, enhancement of State and local forensic laboratories, and criminal and justice information systems to assist law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and corrections organization (including automated fingerprint identification systems); [501(b)(15)]

Innovative programs that demonstrate new and different approaches to enforcement, prosecution, and adjudication of drug offenses and other serious crimes; [501(b)(16)]
Drug control evaluation programs which the State and local units of
government may utilize to evaluate programs and projects directed at
State drug control activities. [501(b)(19)]

Application Procedure and Requirements

The statute requires that applications contain the following information:

- A discussion of the "major drug and violent crime problems" in the
  State and in each county and area of local government within the State
  "with major drug and violent crime problems;"

- An assessment of the criminal justice resources devoted to crime and
drug control programs;

- "Coordination requirements and resource needs;"

- Statewide priorities;

- Analysis of the relationship of State efforts to the national strategy;
  and

- A plan for coordinating programs funded with block grant money with
  "other federally funded programs," including State and local
  programs.\footnote{Section 503(a)(2)-(10) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as

The statute seeks to improve Federal and State coordination and similar
requirements have been imposed upon State and local governments. The statute
requires that States prepare their strategies "after consultation with State and
local officials with emphasis on those whose duty it is to enforce drug and
criminal laws and direct the administration of justice."\footnote{Section 503(a)(1)
of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as amended by P.L. 100-690,
102 Stat. 4331, 42 U.S.C. 3753(a)(1).}

The statute also requires States to provide certifications regarding non-
Federal resource commitments, the review of the application by the State
legislature as well as by the general public, and compliance with auditing
procedures. States must also certify that the demand side of drug abuse has
been considered by enacting penalties or designing law enforcement procedures
which hold "accountable those who unlawfully possess or use such
substances."\footnote{Section 503(a)(1)(A)-(G) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as
amended by P.L. 100-690, 102 Stat. 4331-4332, 42 U.S.C. 3753.}

\footnote{Section 503(a)(1)(A)-(G) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as
amended by P.L. 100-690, 102 Stat. 4331-4332, 42 U.S.C. 3753.}

\footnote{Section 503(a)(1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as amended
by P.L. 100-690, 102 Stat. 4331, 42 U.S.C. 3753(a)(1).}

\footnote{Section 503(a)(2)-(10) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as
At least 5 percent of block grant funds must be dedicated to improving criminal justice records. The Director of BJA may waive this requirement depending on the quality of each State's recordkeeping system. Such improvements must be linked to the firearm purchase system to be established under the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (P.L. 103-159, 107 Stat. 1536-46) and the National Child Protection Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-209, 107 Stat. 2490-95).

Also, the 1994 omnibus crime control act mandated that States that fail to establish registration systems for offenders convicted of crimes against minors or sexually violent offenses would lose 10 percent of their block grant funding. States that have complied within 3 years (or 5 if "good faith efforts" have been made) with guidelines set forth by the Attorney General under the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act\(^2\) will not be penalized.

**Allocation Formula**

The statute requires that formula grant funds be distributed among the States as follows:

1. Of the amount available for the block grant program, 0.25 percent (or $500,000, whichever is greater) is allocated to each State; and

2. The remaining funds are allocated among the States based upon population ratios (the ratio of the population of each State to the population of all of the States).\(^2\)

The Federal Government provides three dollars for each dollar contributed by the State, a 75/25 match.\(^2\) Unused or reallocated funds returned to the BJA are distributed through the discretionary program. If the Director of the BJA

---


\(^2\)Statutory provisions regarding the allocation of funds among the States were set forth in section 506 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as amended by P.L. 100-690 and section 212 of P.L. 101-162, the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 1990, 103 Stat. 1006, 42 U.S.C. 3756.

In addition, the insular areas of American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands are considered to be one State; 67 percent of the resultant allocation is provided to American Samoa and 33 percent to the Northern Mariana Islands. See: 42 U.S.C. 3791(a)(2).

\(^3\)The 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act would have terminated the 75/25 match at the end of fiscal year 1989 and replaced it with a 50/50 ratio for subsequent years. However, the 75/25 ratio was extended from year-to-year and permanently extended in the fiscal year 1992 appropriations Act, P.L. 102-140, Section 109 (105 Stat. 794).
rules that funds cannot or will not be used by a State, those funds are given to "urban, rural, and suburban units of local government or combinations thereof within such State giving priority to those jurisdictions with greatest need." 24 Also, for any fiscal year that begins March 1, 1992 or thereafter, any State that does not have in effect and enforce legislation requiring HIV testing of sex offenders (at the request of a victim) will lose 10 percent of its block grant allocation.25

States must distribute to local governments a percentage of the funds received (the "pass-through" requirement). The amount to be distributed is derived by comparing the combined criminal justice expenditures of all of the units of local government in the State to the total criminal justice budgets of the State and the local governments.26 The statute requires that the States "should give priority to those jurisdictions with the greatest need."27 Funds not passed through to local governments may be used by the State.

Data for the allocation of block grant funds for each State for fiscal year 1995 are presented in Table 2, below. Pass-through percentages were based on fiscal year 1992 data, and roughly approximate those used in the current year.

24Section 506(e), Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 3756.


Note that only the revenues generated by the units of local government are considered in calculating the local pass through amount. For example, Federal grants for related programs, State revenue sharing or Federal or State contract payments are not included in the calculation of local criminal justice expenditures. Information on the calculation of each State’s required pass through share and on trends in State and local government criminal justice expenditures is presented in: Lindgren, Sue A. Justice Variable Passthrough Data, 1988. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1990. 9 p.

TABLE 2. State Allocations, Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program, Fiscal Year 1995  
(Thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>FY1995 allocation</th>
<th>Percent pass-through</th>
<th>Amount of pass-through</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>FY1992 allocation</th>
<th>Percent pass-through</th>
<th>Amount of pass-through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$7,332</td>
<td>50.95</td>
<td>$3,736</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$12,805</td>
<td>57.97</td>
<td>$7,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$2,013</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>$442</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$3,621</td>
<td>42.23</td>
<td>$1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$6,960</td>
<td>61.04</td>
<td>$4,248</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$28,102</td>
<td>63.29</td>
<td>$17,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$4,719</td>
<td>54.87</td>
<td>$2,589</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$11,421</td>
<td>41.36</td>
<td>$4,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$47,394</td>
<td>63.15</td>
<td>$29,929</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$2,066</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>$11,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$8,412</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>$3,772</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$17,567</td>
<td>64.42</td>
<td>$11,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$5,983</td>
<td>36.96</td>
<td>$2,391</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>$5,015</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>$2,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>$2,163</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>$581</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$5,620</td>
<td>46.98</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>$1,982</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$18,986</td>
<td>64.83</td>
<td>$12,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$21,404</td>
<td>61.56</td>
<td>$13,176</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>$2,607</td>
<td>41.76</td>
<td>$1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$11,379</td>
<td>53.39</td>
<td>$6,975</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$6,526</td>
<td>42.53</td>
<td>$2,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$2,862</td>
<td>46.45</td>
<td>$1,329</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$2,185</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td>$1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$2,754</td>
<td>52.41</td>
<td>$1,443</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$8,684</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>$4,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$18,466</td>
<td>64.51</td>
<td>$11,912</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$27,855</td>
<td>65.60</td>
<td>$18,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$9,584</td>
<td>56.78</td>
<td>$5,447</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$3,882</td>
<td>49.76</td>
<td>$1,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$5,297</td>
<td>40.79</td>
<td>$2,161</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>$1,979</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>$497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$4,877</td>
<td>47.49</td>
<td>$2,316</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$10,748</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>$3,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$6,742</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>$2,178</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$8,915</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>$5,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$7,492</td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>$3,890</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$3,823</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>$1,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$8,486</td>
<td>44.47</td>
<td>$3,774</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$8,594</td>
<td>61.98</td>
<td>$5,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$8,486</td>
<td>44.47</td>
<td>$3,774</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$1,822</td>
<td>54.95</td>
<td>$1,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$10,038</td>
<td>36.64</td>
<td>$3,478</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>$6,432</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$15,176</td>
<td>53.10</td>
<td>$7,928</td>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>$1,276</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$7,821</td>
<td>70.29</td>
<td>$5,497</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>$1,322</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$5,043</td>
<td>52.52</td>
<td>$2,649</td>
<td>American Samoa/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$8,884</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>$5,226</td>
<td>No. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>$1,259*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$2,369</td>
<td>58.56</td>
<td>$1,387</td>
<td>(American Samoa)</td>
<td>($843,530)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$3,507</td>
<td>60.34</td>
<td>$2,116</td>
<td>(No. Mariana Is.)</td>
<td>($145,470)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$3,184</td>
<td>62.01</td>
<td>$1,974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$2,798</td>
<td>51.46</td>
<td>$1,437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of State allocations and pass-through percent: Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Source of pass-through amounts: CRS calculations.

* Indicates percent required pass-through under statutory requirements. Many States voluntarily pass-through a greater percentage of funding to localities.

* As specified in the statute (42 U.S.C. 3791(a)(2)) American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands are considered to be one State for the purpose of deriving the total allocation for those areas. From that total, 67 percent are allocated to American Samoa and 33 percent to the Northern Mariana Islands.