



State of Wisconsin \ LEGISLATIVE AUDIT BUREAU

JANICE MUELLER
STATE AUDITOR

22 E. MIFFLIN ST., STE. 500
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53703
(608) 266-2818
FAX (608) 267-0410
Leg.Audit.Info@legis.state.wi.us

April 4, 2003

Senator Carol A. Roessler and
Representative Suzanne Jeskewitz, Co-chairpersons
Joint Legislative Audit Committee
State Capitol
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Dear Senator Roessler and Representative Jeskewitz:

We have completed a review of the Office of Justice Assistance's (OJA's) administration of the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program at the request of several legislators, including Representative David Cullen, who first requested it. The purpose of the program is to assist states and localities in making delinquent juveniles accountable for the crimes they commit. From the program's inception in 1998 through September 2001, the State received \$17.3 million in federal grant funds, and an additional \$1.1 million in interest earnings from these funds.

We found serious deficiencies in OJA's management of the program, which resulted from a noncompetitive grant award process, inadequate oversight by the 27-member Juvenile Justice Commission, and the significant discretion allowed OJA's former Executive Director. We question a total of \$279,033 in expenditures that were funded primarily by the program and are either inconsistent with its purpose or excessive for a state agency. This amount includes \$149,784 in expenditures incurred during fiscal year 2001-02, which are reported in our 2001-02 single audit report (report 03-5).

From federal fiscal year 1997-98 through federal fiscal year 2001-02, the Department of Corrections was awarded \$3.7 million in Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants funds without consideration of statewide priorities, which had not been developed. We include a recommendation for OJA to establish a competitive process for distributing all program funds to local governments and state agencies.

We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to us by OJA staff during our review.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Janice Mueller".

Janice Mueller
State Auditor

JM/BN/bm

OFFICE OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

The Office of Justice Assistance (OJA), which is attached to the Department of Administration for administrative purposes, administers federally funded justice programs for both juvenile and adult offenders and develops statistical crime data for the State. Oversight of OJA programs is provided by two commissions: the 27-member Governor's Juvenile Justice Commission oversees juvenile programs, and the 18-member Governor's Local Law Enforcement Commission oversees adult programs. Commission members are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Governor; members are not confirmed by the Senate. OJA's Executive Director, who also serves at the pleasure of the Governor, directs an authorized staff of 22.0 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.

During fiscal year (FY) 2001-02, OJA spent \$30.8 million: \$24.4 million in federal grants; \$4.7 million from penalty assessments and other sources; and \$1.7 million in general purpose revenue. OJA budgeted a total of \$31.6 million for its programs in FY 2002-03.

OJA administers two federal grant programs related to juveniles: the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program, for which the State received \$4.3 million in FY 2001-02, and the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Grant program, for which the State received \$1.6 million during the same year.

In 2002, the Audit Bureau received a number of inquiries from legislators and others about OJA's operations, and particularly the management of the Juvenile Accountability grants program. Consequently, we reviewed its administration of this program, including:

- procedures used to notify local grant participants of the availability of program funding;
- procedures used to award grants;
- the appropriateness of grant program expenditures; and
- the Juvenile Justice Commission's oversight.

In completing our audit, we interviewed OJA staff and members of the Juvenile Justice Commission. The Commission includes representatives of police departments, sheriffs, prosecutors, juvenile courts, schools, businesses, nonprofit organizations, the Department of Corrections, the Department of Health and Family Services, and the State Public Defender's Office. We also examined available written procedures on program operations, reviewed selected grant award files, and tested expenditures for compliance with grant requirements.

Juvenile Accountability Grants Program Funding

The federal government established the Juvenile Accountability grants program in 1997, and OJA began administering the program in June 1998. The program provides funds to programs designed to hold juveniles accountable for their actions and to reduce the likelihood that they will commit crimes in the future. Federal rules require that funds be spent in 12 broadly defined

areas, including constructing juvenile correctional facilities, hiring additional prosecutors, and providing alternatives to incarceration for first-time juvenile offenders. At least 75 percent of the award is intended to be distributed to local units of government; 15 percent is allocated to the State for juvenile justice initiatives; and up to 10 percent is allowed for state administration. The federal government provides funding for 90 percent of program expenditures, while state and local governments must provide matching funding for the remaining 10 percent.

From June 1998 through September 2001, grant revenues and interest earnings totaled \$18.4 million, as shown in Table 1. The State is required to distribute 75 percent of the program funding to local governments through a federally mandated formula that is based on local law enforcement expenditures and juvenile crime statistics. The State has discretion in distributing the remaining funds, including interest earnings, to local governments or state agencies. However, use of the funds is subject to federal restrictions.

Table 1

**Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program
Federal Funding through Federal Fiscal Year 2000-01**

<u>Recipient</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Local Governments	\$12,956,250
State Agencies	2,591,250
Administrative Allocation	<u>1,727,500</u>
Subtotal	17,275,000
Interest Earnings*	<u>1,090,332</u>
Total	\$18,365,332

* Represents interest earnings through May 2002.

Grant Expenditure Review

As shown in Table 2, \$11.0 million in Juvenile Accountability grants program funding was distributed through the federally mandated formula. Appendix 1 summarizes the local governments that received funding through the federally mandated formula. All of these funds appear to have been spent in compliance with federal regulations.

Table 2

Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program
Summary of Funds Available
FY 1997-98 through FY 2001-02

<u>Award Portion</u>	<u>Available</u>
Formula Awards	\$11,025,908
Discretionary Awards	5,611,924
Administrative Funding	<u>1,727,500</u>
Total	\$18,365,332

However, we question \$152,628 in grant awards that were made by the former Executive Director from the \$5.6 million discretionary awards portion of the program. Further, we question \$126,405 in administrative expenditures that were either unallowable or inappropriate under federal regulations. Most of these administrative expenditures were funded by the \$1.7 million in administrative funding allowed under the program.

Discretionary Funding

The \$5.6 million in discretionary awards consisted of \$2.6 million targeted for statewide juvenile justice priorities, \$1.9 million targeted for local governments, and \$1.1 million generated through interest earnings on grant funds. Although the State has considerable discretion in spending these funds, federal regulations require that the funds be spent in a manner consistent with the program's purpose of holding juvenile offenders accountable for their actions. This requirement restricts expenditures to services for juveniles who have already been in contact with the criminal justice system. We question the six awards shown in Table 3 because they were used for activities unrelated or not directly related to the program's objectives, or because they were used for juvenile crime prevention rather than for juveniles who have already been in contact with the criminal justice system, as is required.

Table 3

Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program
Summary of Questioned Discretionary Awards
 FY 1997-98 through FY 2001-02

<u>Recipient</u>	<u>Use</u>	<u>Award Amount</u>
Waukesha County	Defibrillators	\$ 15,000
Fox Valley Technical College	Evaluation projects	66,755
Waupun Correctional Facility	Training equipment for school personnel	10,873
City of Clintonville	At-risk program	20,000
Brown County	At-risk program	25,000
City of Sparta	At-risk program	<u>15,000</u>
Total		\$152,628

Specifically:

- \$15,000 awarded to Waukesha County to purchase defibrillators for three of its high schools had no direct connection to juvenile offenders;
- \$66,755 awarded to Fox Valley Technical College was used to support one evaluation project for the Juvenile Accountability grants program but was also used to evaluate programs other than the Juvenile Accountability grants program;
- \$10,873 awarded to the adult Waupun correctional facility to support the purchase of equipment for training school personnel, including lap-top computers, projectors, a scanner, a digital camera, and a video recorder, because it had no direct tie to juvenile offenders; and
- program materials suggest that \$20,000 awarded to the City of Clintonville, \$25,000 awarded to Brown County, and \$15,000 awarded to the City of Sparta to support at-risk programs were to be used for prevention among at-risk groups rather than limited to programs for juvenile offenders.

OJA maintains that all of the awards we question except the award to Fox Valley Technical College were allowable based on its interpretation of federal grant requirements that allow funding for accountability-based programs to protect students and school personnel from drug, gang, and youth violence. However, we do not believe the questioned awards hold juvenile

offenders accountable for their actions in any direct, documented way, and the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention has confirmed that the Juvenile Accountability grants program is not meant to provide funding for preventative programs.

We are also concerned about the process by which program funds were awarded to Brown County. Including its \$25,000 award to support at-risk programs, Brown County received a total of \$103,948 in discretionary grant funds.

In November 2000, media attention focused on a \$72,239 award to Brown County to fund a teen court, which provides an alternative to the criminal justice system for first-time juvenile offenders. Brown County staff announced their receipt of the award during a November 2 press conference attended by state and local officials. However, at that time, Brown County had not yet submitted an application for this funding. In fact, Brown County's application was not received until December 15, 2000, six weeks after its receipt of the teen court grant had been announced. OJA concedes that it announced the award before receiving an application but denies the award and ceremony were inappropriate. OJA notes that the Brown County program had been funded for the previous two years by another federal program.

While we do not question the expenditure of funds for Brown County's teen court, which is consistent with the purpose of the Juvenile Accountability grants program, we are concerned that OJA announced an award before an application had been received. Such a practice raises questions about favoritism and calls into question the integrity of the award process. Therefore, based on the questioned costs we identified and in order to ensure that discretionary funds are used in the best interests of the State, *we recommend the Office of Justice Assistance develop a strategy for distributing discretionary funding that includes establishing a competitive process for accepting and evaluating applications for Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program awards.*

Administrative Funding

Federal guidelines allow states to spend up to 10 percent of their annual federal award for administration. OJA has consistently claimed the maximum administrative costs allowable under federal guidelines. Its federal funding for administration has averaged approximately \$430,000 annually and, as was shown in Table 2, totaled \$1.7 million since the inception of the Juvenile Accountability grants program. Actual administrative expenditures were greater because OJA matches federally funded administrative costs with administrative costs funded from penalty assessment funds, which are charges imposed under state statute for certain violations by individuals and organizations.

If OJA had chosen to limit administrative expenditures, it could have made more program funds available for units of local government or for other purposes. Administrative funding decisions were made by the former Executive Director and were not approved or reviewed by the Juvenile Justice Commission.

Table 4 shows \$126,405 in administrative expenditures that we found questionable. Most of these expenditures were funded by the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program.

Table 4

Questionable Administrative Expenditures
 FY 1997-98 through FY 2001-02

<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Equipment purchases for local governments and schools	\$ 79,405
Puerto Rico conference	10,254
Executive Director's vehicle	5,934
Other unallowable costs	<u>2,345</u>
Subtotal	97,938
La Crosse office:	
Agency Liaison's vehicle costs	9,558
Corrections expenditures	9,591
Travel*	5,760
Equipment	<u>3,558</u>
Subtotal	<u>28,467</u>
Total	\$126,405

* Estimated

The largest expenditure we question is \$79,405 in equipment purchases for local governments and schools, which includes defibrillators, digital cameras, and breathalyzers. In fall 2001, the Executive Director chose to purchase this equipment. Recipients were required to submit one-page applications indicating how this equipment would be used to hold juveniles accountable for their actions. For three days before the application period expired, the former Executive Director and the Agency Liaison, who promotes OJA's federal programs, delivered the equipment—which was presented as gifts with attached bows—to local governments and schools throughout the state.

The purchase of defibrillators is clearly an unallowable expenditure for the Juvenile Accountability grants program. We also question OJA's decision to purchase digital cameras and breathalyzers. In total, the equipment purchased in FY 2001-02 represented 19 percent of administrative funding for that year.

A conference in Puerto Rico, for which expenditures were estimated at \$10,254, occurred in December 2000, and six individuals attended: OJA's former Executive Director and two staff,

two staff from the Department of Corrections, and one member of the Juvenile Justice Commission. The conference, titled “Counseling and Treating People of Colour: An International Perspective,” dealt with some issues affecting juveniles, but the level of commitment shown to it by OJA was greater than what might have been expected for a state program dedicated to helping local governments hold juveniles accountable for their actions. Therefore, we question the entire cost.

We also question OJA’s expenditures for vehicle leases. OJA spent a total of \$15,492 to lease vehicles for the former Executive Director and Agency Liaison. Of particular concern was:

- \$5,934 to lease a 2002 Chevrolet Trailblazer used by the Executive Director; and
- \$6,994 to lease a 2001 Jeep Grand Cherokee used by the Agency Liaison, which is included in the Agency Liaison’s vehicle costs.

Department of Administration staff are typically responsible for authorizing car leases, but they permitted OJA to make its own determination that sport utility vehicles were necessary for the efficient and effective operation of the office. OJA was unable to provide documentation of an analysis to support its decision to lease sport utility vehicles instead of less-costly alternatives.

We also question the creation of OJA’s only satellite office, which was located in La Crosse in space rented by the Department of Corrections. The satellite office was established in October 1999 as working space for a project employee. The decision to open the satellite office came after the employee, who had been employed by OJA for the previous seven months, had moved to the La Crosse area. Opening the satellite allowed this employee to continue her employment. As was shown in Table 4, we question \$28,467 in expenditures for this office that were funded primarily by the Juvenile Accountability grants program. Additional costs may have been incurred for materials and supplies, but OJA did not separately track costs for its satellite office.

The former Executive Director maintained that the satellite office was opened to increase the participation of surrounding localities in the federal programs administered by OJA. In addition, OJA anticipated that the satellite would be a base from which to promote all of the programs it administered around the entire state. However, the former Executive Director did not consider locating a satellite in the Milwaukee area or in any other area of the state, even though it could be argued that other areas, and the Milwaukee area in particular, have a greater need for juvenile justice services. OJA staff indicated that no location other than La Crosse was considered because the La Crosse office space was provided by the Department of Corrections at no charge. While we agree that OJA incurred no direct rental charges for the space, we identified \$9,591 in expenditures for equipment and other purchases that were charged to the Juvenile Accountability grants program and provided to the Department of Corrections in lieu of rent. These expenditures included computers, a printer, defibrillators, file cabinets and a sound masking system.

Based on documents we reviewed, it appears the former Executive Director made a commitment to evaluate the effectiveness of the satellite office every six months. There is no evidence that such evaluations were completed, although internal communications from 2001 indicate that the program manager in the Madison office did not believe that the satellite office was entirely successful.

It is unclear whether the benefits of the satellite office outweighed the costs since the satellite office was never formally evaluated. In fact, the satellite office was cited in a May 2001 federal Department of Justice review which identified deficiencies in OJA's administration of the program. For example, the federal review observed "a notable lack of communication between staff involved with the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act programs and those responsible for the [Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants] program. This issue may be further magnified when considering all OJA staff work in Madison except one, who is based in the La Crosse satellite office." While OJA staff have indicated that the satellite office was closed in February 2003, we are concerned that OJA's establishment of the satellite office was unnecessary and federal funding, which supported the office, could have been used more appropriately for other juvenile justice priorities.

Table 4 identifies \$2,345 in other questionable expenditures including travel expenditures that were inconsistent with state travel guidelines, such as a hotel expenditure for the former Executive Director to stay overnight in Madison rather than return to his home in nearby Sun Prairie in inclement weather. Also included in this amount is the cost of a digital camera for the former Executive Director that was not used for the Juvenile Accountability grants program, and several allocation errors that resulted in unsupported charges to the program.

To address the questioned expenditures we identified, and to ensure that the State maximizes federal funding received under the grant program, we recommend the Office of Justice Assistance:

- assess the costs and benefits of any satellite location;
- assess the benefits of retaining sport utility vehicles for the Executive Director and staff; and
- develop priorities for using administrative funding for the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program.

Department of Corrections Expenditures

We also reviewed federal Juvenile Accountability grants program funds received by the Department of Corrections, which is the state agency that has received the majority of these funds. The Department of Corrections received \$3.7 million, or 66.1 percent, of \$5.6 million in discretionary grant funds available from federal fiscal year (FFY) 1997-98 through FFY 2000-01. This amount was awarded by OJA's former Executive Director without a needs analysis and without legislative review and approval.

As shown in Table 5, the Department used its allocation of Juvenile Accountability grants program funding for a wide variety of projects, all of which were allowable under federal regulations. However, it is not known whether the Department would have received this level of funding and for these specific projects if OJA had used a competitive process to award funding, or if the Juvenile Justice Commission had played more of an oversight role in the award process. At a minimum, the manner in which the funds were awarded provides limited assurance that the State's juvenile justice priorities were adequately considered.

Table 5

**Summary of Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program Awards
to Department of Corrections**

(FY 1999-2000 through FY 2001-02)

<u>Project</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>
Southern Oaks Girls School	Support a five bed mental health unit	\$1,308,449	35.1%
Emergency aid expenditures	Supplement an existing GPR appropriation	487,244	13.1
Juvenile Justice Information System	Support the Division of Juvenile Corrections	309,065	8.3
Milwaukee Public Schools	Provide one teacher to reduce class sizes	281,186	7.5
Community Intervention Programs	Supplement an existing GPR appropriation	200,000	5.3
Ethan Allen	Sex offender treatment	182,829	4.9
Aftercare Services	Support post-release juvenile programs	84,329	2.3
Juvenile Conferences	Support internal and external training	82,724	2.2
Mentoring	Fund a volunteer program for juvenile offender	71,394	1.9
Network classroom	Facilitate education of juveniles while incarcerated	60,295	1.6
Gang Prevention	Host regional conferences	57,500	1.5
Career Youth Development	Provide alcohol and drug abuse treatment	47,540	1.3
Video Teleconferencing	Reduce the cost of transporting incarcerated juveniles	44,548	1.2
Other	Various	39,232	1.1
Unspent/Other adjustments	—	<u>474,850</u>	<u>12.7</u>
Total		\$3,731,185	100.0%

Further, it is unclear whether the Legislature was aware of all of the uses of Juvenile Accountability grants program funds. For example, during 2000 and 2001, OJA's former Executive Director awarded the Department of Corrections a total of \$487,244 to supplement an annual general purpose revenue appropriation of \$250,000 for emergency placements of juveniles in secured detention. The general purpose revenue appropriation aids small counties.

While incarceration is one means of holding juveniles accountable for their crimes under the Juvenile Accountability grants program, and the availability of this funding provided fiscal relief to counties that would otherwise have had to make expenditures with local funds, we are concerned that the use of federal funding in this manner may not have been made clear to the Legislature. When an appropriation level is established by the Legislature, emergency supplementation is possible through a request to the Joint Committee on Finance under s. 13.10, Wis. Stats. The method of supplementation employed by OJA and the Department of Corrections appears to have circumvented an established mechanism to deal with emergencies and to have precluded an assessment of whether other, higher-priority items should have been funded by the grant program. Therefore, to ensure that statewide juvenile justice priorities are adequately considered, *we recommend the Office of Justice Assistance establish a competitive process for distributing all grant funds to local governments and state agencies.*

Enhancing Oversight

Federal rules for the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program require all states to designate an oversight body to participate in program decisions. As noted, the Juvenile Justice Commission has this oversight role in Wisconsin. We therefore expected that the Commission would have a role in assessing statewide priorities and developing a comprehensive plan for administration of the program, including developing grant requirements, developing procedures for making grant awards, and reviewing award applications. However, we found that the Commission has exercised limited oversight over the planning, distribution, and evaluation of Juvenile Accountability funds. We believe the inappropriate grant expenditures we identified resulted primarily from lack of a competitive award process and lack of effective oversight by the Commission, combined with the significant discretion allowed OJA's former Executive Director in making funding decisions.

The Commission has provided adequate oversight for the smaller Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Grant program, which OJA also administers. In this role, it has developed three-year Juvenile Delinquency Prevention plans, reviewed proposals for awards, attended oral presentations made by applicants, and approved awards based on its review. In contrast, the Commission did not develop a coordinated enforcement plan for the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program. Funding for a portion of one year's award was discussed at a Commission meeting in June 1999; however, the Commission had not approved a coordinated enforcement plan that covered all aspects of the program. At the time of a May 2001 site visit from the United States Department of Justice, federal officials found the State deficient in planning and formally instructed OJA to submit the required plans.

In October 2001, OJA submitted a plan that described how FFY 1997-98 funding had been allocated. However, the plan was submitted without the Commission's review and did not provide an assessment of how juvenile justice needs had been determined. No subsequent plans have been prepared. As a result, the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program has not benefited from the experience and diversity of the Commission's members.

We also found that the Commission has not reviewed proposals for grant funds, as would be expected. In fact, the Commission had no role in reviewing awards until September 2001, and then it approved applications for only a portion of the program's funding. OJA's former Executive Director both notified local governments of the availability of the program funds and, as noted, exercised considerable independence in determining which proposals would be funded and at what levels. We found no established process for mass mailing applications or for otherwise directly notifying potential recipients of funding availability. Furthermore, there were no application deadlines; submitted applications were not evaluated by the Commission; and the Executive Director's criteria for granting awards were not clear.

During our review period, OJA made Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program awards to 30 local units of government. However, we question whether all eligible counties, cities, towns, villages, and school districts in the state were informed of the availability of these discretionary funds, which are not allocated on a formula basis but by application. It has also been asserted that the process used to distribute funds depended, in part, on the timing of trips made by the former Executive Director to various parts of the state. We were unable to confirm or refute this assertion because a listing of all local units of government visited by the Executive Director or his staff was not maintained. Appendix 2 lists the 30 local units of government that received discretionary funding under the Juvenile Accountability grants program during our review period.

Without the active involvement of an oversight body in the award process, and without a comprehensive plan for the program, formal procedures could have served as an important guide for OJA staff in soliciting and accepting proposals and helping to ensure the consistent treatment of applicants. However, neither the former Executive Director, OJA staff, nor the Commission developed formal, written procedures for administering the program. In fact, official application deadlines were not established until September 2001, when the Commission's role in reviewing some awards began.

Inadequate program procedures were also cited as a problem by a Department of Administration review of OJA's management practices, which was conducted in response to concerns raised by OJA staff. In a July 2002 letter to the Executive Director, the Department of Administration concluded that the "lack of communication within [OJA] has led to a dysfunctional Office environment." The letter further indicated that "mistrust and poor communication between management and staff appears to have resonated from staff's disagreement with some management decisions. Due to the absence of uniform operational policies, at times these decisions may have appeared arbitrary and without justification." The Department of Administration recommended that OJA review its organizational structure, develop operational policies and procedures, and establish uniform personnel policies and procedures.

We also note that at a time when the State is seeking to maximize federal funding, OJA failed to fully spend its federal award during the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program's first two years and returned \$212,177 in unspent funds to the federal government. While OJA staff assert that they had limited time to implement the new federal program, we believe improved office procedures would have done much to ensure expenditure of the entire federal award and better enable the State to use the funds in the best possible manner.

We believe that improved oversight of OJA's operations is needed. Therefore, we recommend the Juvenile Justice Commission:

- establish funding priorities for all Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program funds;
- establish a competitive and well-publicized process to award discretionary funds;
- review and approve all discretionary awards that are made; and
- target funds to the areas of the state in greatest need when making funding decisions.

Appendix 1

**Formula Grant Awards
 Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program
 FFY 1997-98 through FFY 2000-01**

Recipient	Amount
<u>Counties</u>	
Adams County	\$ 18,147
Barron County	33,853
Brown County	267,303
Chippewa County	27,429
Clark County	26,041
Columbia County	41,055
Dane County*	414,115
Dodge County*	58,941
Door County	20,591
Douglas County*	84,932
Dunn County	21,407
Eau Claire	105,896
Fond du Lac County	94,610
Grant County	27,335
Green County	19,443
Jackson County	12,362
Jefferson County	95,328
Juneau County	31,776
Kenosha County	181,976
Kewaunee County	16,777
La Crosse County*	148,229
Lincoln County*	8,319
Manitowoc County	111,500
Marathon County*	126,804
Marinette County	46,492
Milwaukee County*	1,036,621
Monroe County	31,906
Oconto County	33,566
Oneida County*	33,749
Outagamie County*	194,552
Pierce County	12,848
Polk County	20,796
Portage County*	62,280
Racine County*	264,750

* Some amounts are estimates because awards were given to multiple municipalities.

Recipient	Amount
<u>Counties</u>	
Richland County	\$ 5,049
Rock County*	233,454
Rusk County	27,572
Sauk County	35,916
Sawyer County	24,067
Shawano County	32,363
Sheboygan County	151,006
St. Croix County	56,551
Trempeleau County	16,337
Vilas County*	17,360
Walworth County	121,382
Washington County*	111,694
Waukesha County	258,749
Waupaca County	28,084
Winnebago County*	123,194
Wood County*	<u>68,129</u>
Subtotal	5,042,636

Cities, Towns and Villages

City of Appleton*	\$ 19,702
City of Beaver Dam*	21,388
City of Beloit	94,591
City of Calumet*	19,702
City of Cudahy*	77,667
City of De Pere*	50,011
City of Eau Claire*	48,645
City of Fitchburg*	32,921
City of Fond du Lac	26,096
City of Franklin	17,038
City of Glendale	46,117
City of Green Bay	115,181
City of Greendale*	83,327
City of Greenfield*	77,667
City of Janesville*	33,494
City of Kenosha	200,771
City of La Crosse*	21,390
City of Madison	478,591
City of Marshfield	24,682
City of Menasha*	13,781

* Some amounts are estimates because awards were given to multiple municipalities.

Recipient	Amount
<u>Cities, Towns and Villages</u>	
City of Milwaukee	\$ 2,912,133
City of Neenah*	16,447
City of New Berlin	34,678
City of Oshkosh	63,937
City of Racine*	153,079
City of Sheboygan	20,284
City of Stevens Point*	12,239
City of Sun Prairie*	47,794
City of Superior*	11,588
City of Two Rivers	5,006
City of Watertown	6,545
City of Wausau*	18,640
City of Wauwatosa*	392,145
City of West Allis*	140,363
City of West Bend*	16,166
City of West Milwaukee*	20,402
City of Wisconsin Rapids*	9,377
Town of Madison*	32,921
Town of Mt. Pleasant	20,858
Village of Brown Deer*	28,839
Village of Glendale*	6,797
Village of Greendale	5,657
Village of Menomonee Falls	19,948
Village of Shorewood*	<u>9,013</u>
Subtotal	5,507,618
<u>Other</u>	
Lac du Flambeau	\$ 8,893
Menominee Indian Tribe	23,811
Mendota Juvenile Treatment Center	64,693
Oneida Tribe of Indians	<u>5,307</u>
Subtotal	<u>102,704</u>
Total**	\$10,652,958

* Some amounts are estimates because awards were given to multiple municipalities.

** The total is less than the \$11.0 million disclosed in Table 2 because awards are still being made, and some funding was returned to the federal government.

Appendix 2

Discretionary Grant Awards
Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program
 FFY 1997-98 through FFY 2000-01

Recipient	Amount
<u>Counties</u>	
Barron County	\$ 15,003
Bayfield County	30,000
Brown County	103,948
Buffalo County*	25,512
Burnett County	76,614
Douglas County	42,750
Forest County	3,204
Green Lake County	57,915
Juneau County	5,405
Lafayette County	11,837
Menominee County	68,155
Pepin County*	25,512
Racine County	35,000
Richland County	79,974
Rusk County	3,120
Taylor County	40,541
Vernon County	138,268
Waukesha County	<u>15,000</u>
Subtotal	777,758
<u>Cities, Towns and Villages</u>	
City of Clintonville	\$ 20,000
City of Hayward	141,048
City of Milwaukee	4,040
City of Mukwonago	10,444
City of Shawano	15,325
City of Sparta	91,035
City of Sun Prairie	10,000
City of Washburn	6,507
City of West Allis	47,406
Village of Cameron	113,196
Village of Germantown	18,153
Village of Spencer	<u>86,175</u>
Subtotal	563,329

* Some amounts are estimates because awards were given to multiple municipalities.

Recipient	Amount
<u>Department of Corrections</u>	
Various programs	\$3,043,941
Emergency Youth Aids	487,244
Community Intervention	<u>200,000</u>
Subtotal	3,731,185
<u>Other</u>	
Department of Administration	\$ 43,584
Fox Valley Technical College	66,755
Department of Health and Family Services	56,249
Office of Justice Assistance Gang Office	30,000
State Public Defender's Office	<u>172,543</u>
Subtotal	<u>369,131</u>
Total**	\$5,441,403

** The total is less than the \$5.6 million disclosed in Table 2 because awards are still being made, and some funding was returned to the federal government.