

- Tight budget triggers more expenditure reductions
- Staffing level cut by 30% in last two to three years

## Criminal Justice Services, Office of

*Holly Wilson, Budget Analyst*

### ROLE

Prior to fiscal year (FY) 2002, the primary role of the Office of Criminal Justice Services (OCJS) had been to administer federal financial assistance intended to improve state and local criminal and juvenile systems. In addition, the Office's role expanded over time to include coordination and development of the state's Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS), policy development, research and analysis, and program evaluation. Thus, the mission of the Office had evolved from administering federal grant funding to providing leadership in the criminal justice arena by collecting, coordinating, maintaining, analyzing, and disseminating a wide array of information for the purpose of preventing and controlling crime and delinquency in the state of Ohio.

Since the enactment of the FY 2002-2003 biennial operating budget, two notable changes have occurred in the Office's duties and responsibilities. First, administrative control over the state's federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs was transferred to the Department of Youth Services (DYS). Second, administrative control over the federal Family Violence Prevention and Services program was transferred to the Office from the Department of Job and Family Services (JFS).

Agency In Brief					
Number of Employees*	Total Appropriations-All Funds		GRF Appropriations		Appropriation Bill(s)
	2004	2005	2004	2005	
43	\$34.4 million	\$33.1 million	\$2.7 million	\$2.7 million	Am. Sub. H.B. 95

\*Employee head count obtained from the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) payroll reports as of June 28, 2003.

### OVERVIEW

#### ***FY 2002-2003 BIENNIUM GRF EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS***

The Office's total GRF appropriations for FYs 2002 and 2003 were \$3.67 million and \$3.69 million, respectively. Subsequently, the FY 2002 GRF appropriated total was reduced by around \$260,000, or 7.1%, and the FY 2003 GRF appropriated total was reduced by around \$486,000, or 13.2%.

In response to those GRF expenditure reductions instituted over the course of FYs 2002 and 2003, the Director of the Office reviewed and reorganized the Office's operations with the twin goals of cutting annual operating costs and refocusing its mission. The Office managed to cut its annual operating costs by: (1) reducing the number of staff, largely through attrition, and only filling staff positions considered

essential to maintaining core services, and (2) systematically reviewing many of its long-established administrative procedures and processes. To accomplish the latter, many actions were taken, including, but not limited to, streamlining fiscal processes, automating and reducing paperwork, merging several independent sections, minimizing equipment purchases, redesigning guidelines for attending and sponsoring conferences and training, restricting travel, increasing web-based forms and information, and centralizing the ordering of supplies.

### ***FY 2004-2005 BIENNIUM ENACTED BUDGET***

The Office's FY 2004 appropriation for all funds totals \$34.4 million, which is \$2.9 million, or 7.9%, lower than the Office's total actual FY 2003 expenditures of \$37.3 million. The Office's FY 2005 appropriation for all funds totals \$33.1 million, which is \$1.4 million, or 3.9%, lower than its total FY 2004 appropriation for all funds. The bulk of the Office's annual funding, around 90%, is composed of moneys made available to the state through a mix of federal grant programs. This decrease in the Office's all funds budget between FYs 2003 and 2005 largely reflects the phasing out of its involvement in the federal Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) program, administrative control of which was previously transferred to the Department of Youth Services.

Of the Office's total FY 2004-2005 biennial operating budget, GRF funding accounts for \$2.7 million, or 7.8%, in FY 2004 and \$2.7 million, or 8.0%, in FY 2005. Those enacted levels of annual GRF funding are less than what the Office requested for the purpose of maintaining its core mission and essential services by \$832,889 in FY 2004 and by \$946,603 in FY 2005. As a result of this reduced level of GRF funding, the Office continues to cut operating expenditures. Through a layoff effective May 16, 2003, the Office has eliminated two staff positions and reclassified another six staff positions to lower pay ranges. Further cuts in its annual operating expenditures will be realized by relocating to less expensive office space, limiting travel, reducing supply inventory levels, and eliminating unused telephone lines. The Office also plans to focus available resources on the following four essential functions:

1. Grants administration;
2. Research, planning, and development;
3. Family violence prevention; and
4. Justice technology.

Around 20% or so of the annual GRF funding will be used as the required state cash match that allows the Office to utilize a relatively small percentage of certain federal grants to absorb a portion of its annual operating costs. The Office estimates that, in each of FYs 2004 and 2005, around \$558,000 in GRF operating funds will be spent as the required state cash match that will then allow it to utilize around \$2.1 million in federal funds for operating costs as well. The matter of using state GRF funds as the required match in order to use certain federal grant moneys for administrative expenses is discussed in more detail below.

## **BUDGET ISSUES**

### ***STATE GRF MATCHING FUNDS FOR FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE MONEYS***

Historically, the Office has used some of its annual GRF appropriations as the required cash match that permits the state to use a portion of certain federal grants to finance some of the Office's administrative expenses, including staff salaries and fringe benefits. For example, in the typical fiscal scenario, if the

Office has \$100,000 in administrative costs that it generates in relation to a particular federal grant, it must spend \$25,000 in state funds (a 25% match), and in turn, the remainder of those costs, \$75,000, can be charged against the federal grant.

Table 1 immediately below displays: (1) the six federal grants that the Office plans to tap for its annual administrative expenses in each of FYs 2004 and 2005, (2) the amount of each of those federal grants that is currently projected to be used for annual administrative expenses in each of FYs 2004 and 2005, and (3) the currently projected amount of GRF funds that would be required as the state match necessary to use the projected amount of federal administrative funds in each of FYs 2004 and 2005.

<b>Federal Grant</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>		<b>FY 2005</b>	
	<b>Federal Amount</b>	<b>State GRF Match</b>	<b>Federal Amount</b>	<b>State GRF Match</b>
Byrne Memorial	\$1,422,408	\$401,624	\$1,422,408	\$401,624
National Criminal History	\$ 252,670	\$ 31,600	\$ 252,670	\$ 31,600
Violence Against Women	\$ 163,514	\$ 54,505	\$ 163,514	\$ 54,505
Family Violence Prevention	\$ 140,294	\$ 35,074	\$ 140,294	\$ 35,074
Residential Substance Abuse	\$ 104,024	\$ 32,251	\$ 104,024	\$ 32,251
Local Law Enforcement	\$ 33,440	\$ 3,716	\$ 33,440	\$ 3,716
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$2,116,350</b>	<b>\$558,770</b>	<b>\$2,116,350</b>	<b>\$558,770</b>

## ***FEDERAL COMPLIANCE***

The federal government had ordered Ohio and 13 other states to amend their Sex Offender Registration and Notification (SORN) laws to comply with federal requirements by October 2001 or risk reductions in certain federal grant moneys. In June 2001, the federal Bureau of Justice Assistance stated that non-complying states, such as Ohio, would have 10% of certain grant moneys withheld each year if that state failed to be in compliance by October 2, 2001. That compliance deadline was extended for Ohio to October 1, 2002 for a portion of the federal requirements. The state also failed to bring Ohio's SORN Law into compliance with other federal requirements that did not require state compliance until mid-November 2002.

The specific federal grants that were affected by Ohio's failure to comply with federal requirements include the Byrne Memorial Criminal Justice Block Grant (CFDA #16.579) and the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant (CFDA #16.592). Between the two federal block grant programs, the state receives roughly \$18.9 million a year. These moneys are handled by the state's Office of Criminal Justice Services and are deposited in federal Fund 3L5, Justice Programs.

As Ohio failed to comply with federal law, the federal government withheld 10% of the aforementioned federal grant moneys in FY 2003. This amounts to around \$1.89 million. Most of the moneys associated with these fund grant programs are distributed to local governments. According to the Office, the withholding of these federal moneys caused the loss or reduction of funding for some programs on both the state and local level, especially if those affected state and local agencies did not find alternate revenue streams.

As of this writing, it appears that the state is being viewed by the federal government as having brought Ohio's SORN Law into compliance with these requirements. Thus, the portion of certain federal grant moneys that would in all likelihood have been withheld in FY 2004 and annually thereafter until the state reached compliance, will instead be awarded to Ohio. Apparently, however, the state will not recover the roughly \$1.89 million in federal moneys that were withheld in FY 2003.

### ***STAFFING LEVELS***

The Office has noticeably reduced its level of staffing, as measured by the number of full-time equivalents (FTEs), in a relatively short period of time. As a reference point, the Office maintained a staffing level of around 62 FTEs over the course of the FY 2000-2001 biennium. Since that time, around 12 or so FTEs have been eliminated largely as a function of two factors. First, control of the state's federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs was transferred to the Department of Youth Services, along with six existing full-time staff effective July 1, 2001 (the start of FY 2002). Second, as a result of reduced levels of GRF funding, the Office has eliminated staff, largely through attrition, and only filled staff positions considered essential to maintaining core services. It seems likely that the level of funding appropriated for the FY 2004-2005 biennium will require the Office to eliminate another four or more FTEs. This means that, over the course of approximately two to three years, the Office's level of staffing will have declined by around 30%.

### ***FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION CENTER***

The Family Violence Prevention Center provides public awareness, education, and training programs and services to organizations and individuals who work to prevent family violence and provide assistance to victims. The amount of annual GRF funding requested by the Office to operate the Center – \$182,647 in FY 2004 and \$186,172 in FY 2005 – reflected the future cost of maintaining the Center's FY 2003 level of services, including the cost of 1.5 FTEs. The enacted amount of annual GRF funding explicitly appropriated for the Center's operation – \$20,000 in each of FYs 2004 and 2005 – was noticeably lower than what was requested by the Office.

In response to that reduced level of annual GRF funding available to cover the Center's operating costs, the Office plans to:

- Allocate \$60,000 in each fiscal year from its annual federal Byrne Memorial Criminal Justice Block Grant to assist the Center, the first time that federal moneys will have been used to help fund the Center;
- Cut one FTE; and
- Decrease certain services or activities, e.g., workshops and presentations, publications, and product development and dissemination. 

**FY 2004 - 2005 Final Appropriation Amounts**

**All Fund Group**

**Line Item Detail by Agency**

**FY 2001:      FY 2002:      FY 2003:      FY 2004      % Change      FY 2005      % Change**  
**Appropriations:      Appropriations:      Appropriations:      Appropriations:      2003 to 2004:      Appropriations:      2004 to 2005:**

**Report For: Main Operating Appropriations Bill**

**Version: Enacted**

**CJS Criminal Justice Services, Office of**

GRF	196-401	Criminal Justice Information System	\$ 688,833	\$ 1,406,237	\$472,457	\$ 534,570	13.15%	\$ 520,503	-2.63%
GRF	196-403	Center for Violence Prevention	\$ 496,647	\$ 199,346	\$148,080	\$ 20,000	-86.49%	\$ 20,000	0.00%
GRF	196-405	Violence Prevention Subsidy	----	\$ 763,375	\$677,278	\$ 707,076	4.40%	\$ 688,469	-2.63%
GRF	196-424	Operating Expenses	\$ 974,226	\$ 1,590,067	\$1,666,290	\$ 1,431,371	-14.10%	\$ 1,427,971	-0.24%
GRF	196-499	State Match	\$ 750,653	\$ 28,372	\$0	\$ 0	N/A	\$ 0	N/A
GRF	196-502	Lucasville Disturbance Costs	\$ 92,349	\$ 56,070	\$41,114	\$ 0	-100.00%	\$ 0	N/A
GRF	196-505	SOCF Judicial & Defense Costs	----	----	\$19,679	\$ 0	-100.00%	\$ 0	N/A
<b>General Revenue Fund Total</b>			<b>\$ 3,002,708</b>	<b>\$ 4,043,467</b>	<b>\$ 3,024,898</b>	<b>\$ 2,693,017</b>	<b>-10.97%</b>	<b>\$ 2,656,943</b>	<b>-1.34%</b>
4P6	196-601	General Services	\$ 33,636	\$ 24,081	\$44,532	\$ 135,450	204.16%	\$ 86,500	-36.14%
<b>General Services Fund Group Total</b>			<b>\$ 33,636</b>	<b>\$ 24,081</b>	<b>\$ 44,532</b>	<b>\$ 135,450</b>	<b>204.16%</b>	<b>\$ 86,500</b>	<b>-36.14%</b>
3U1	196-602	Criminal Justice Federal Programs	\$ 5,267,376	\$ 2,222,252	\$31,886	\$ 1,000,000	3,036.17%	\$ 0	-100.00%
3L5	196-604	Justice Programs	\$ 32,441,368	\$ 32,494,085	\$31,572,348	\$ 30,334,908	-3.92%	\$ 30,311,870	-0.08%
3V8	196-605	Federal Program Purposes FFY 01	----	----	\$2,673,981	\$ 250,000	-90.65%	\$ 0	-100.00%
<b>Federal Special Revenue Fund Group Total</b>			<b>\$ 37,708,744</b>	<b>\$ 34,716,338</b>	<b>\$ 34,278,215</b>	<b>\$ 31,584,908</b>	<b>-7.86%</b>	<b>\$ 30,311,870</b>	<b>-4.03%</b>
<b>Criminal Justice Services, Office of Total</b>			<b>\$ 40,745,089</b>	<b>\$ 38,783,885</b>	<b>\$ 37,347,645</b>	<b>\$ 34,413,375</b>	<b>-7.86%</b>	<b>\$ 33,055,313</b>	<b>-3.95%</b>