

The original documents are located in Box C22, folder “Presidential Handwriting, 6/7/1975” of the Presidential Handwriting File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

[filed 6/7/75]

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 7, 1975

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: JIM CANNON
FROM: JERRY H. JONES
SUBJECT: Reauthorization of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Your memorandum to the President of June 3 on the above subject has been reviewed and the following notation was made:

-- YES

Thank you.

cc: Don Rumsfeld

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 6, 1975

MR. PRESIDENT:

The two original decision papers which you reviewed are also in the folder.


Dick

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 3, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Jim Cannon 

SUBJECT: Reauthorization of the Law Enforcement Assistance
Administration

At Tab A is a copy of a memorandum sent you several days ago setting forth several open issues regarding reauthorization of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). The purpose of this memorandum is to confirm Paul O'Neill's and my understanding of your decisions regarding those issues.

1. Suitability of the Present LEAA Program Structure

You concurred in the Attorney General's recommendation that the present LEAA program structure be continued through 1981.

2. Desirability of Additional Special Emphasis Programs for Courts and High Crime Areas

(a) Increased Emphasis on Courts

You directed that language emphasizing the need for State and local court reform and improvements be added to the statement of purposes for which LEAA block grant funds may be utilized at the discretion of the States.

(b) High Crime Program

You directed that LEAA's annual funding authorization of \$1.25 billion be increased to \$1.3 billion, with the additional \$50 million to be made available to the discretionary program of LEAA so that additional emphasis can be placed on programs for cities and counties with high crime rates.

3. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP)

You concurred in the recommendation of OMB that juvenile justice programs under the JJDP be funded out of LEAA's discretionary fund.

4. Funding Levels

See 2. (b) above.

I trust this accurately reflects your decision with respect to each of these issues.

YES

MC7

NO

A

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Jim Cannon

SUBJECT: Reauthorization of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Attached are the OMB memorandum and supporting documents on the reauthorization of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), which will be discussed at a meeting scheduled for 2:15 today.

The following issues are presented for your consideration:

1. Suitability of the Present LEAA Program Structure

The Attorney General has recommended that the present LEAA program structure, providing block, categorical and discretionary financial assistance to State and local governments, be continued through 1981.

The Domestic Council, the Counsel to the President, OMB, Jack Marsh and Bob Hartmann concur in this recommendation.

2. Desirability of Additional Special Emphasis Programs for Courts and High Crime Areas

a) Increased emphasis on courts. The Attorney General has recommended that the LEAA reauthorization legislation require that States allocate an "adequate share" of LEAA block grant funds for courts. Current law requires LEAA to approve State plans for expenditure of block grant funds, based on the general criteria that such plans are responsive to the overall criminal justice needs of the States. Therefore, the Attorney General's recommendation that an "adequate share" of block grant funds go for court purposes does not represent an operational deviation from current law.

The Domestic Council, the Counsel to the President and Jack Marsh recommend that you concur in the Attorney General's approach. OMB recommends that you require this special emphasis for courts to be funded out of LEAA's

discretionary funds. Bob Hartmann recommends that you encourage, but not require, States to allocate block grant funds for court purposes.

- b) High crime program. The Attorney General has recommended a supplemental block grant program to provide additional assistance to cities and counties with high crime rates. The effect of the Attorney General's recommendation would be to create a categorical program for localities with high crime rates, which, in all probability, would require additional funding in the coming fiscal year.

The Domestic Council, the Counsel to the President, OMB, Jack Marsh and Bob Hartmann recommend, instead, that you direct that this special emphasis program be funded from LEAA discretionary funds. Further, the Domestic Council and the Counsel to the President suggest that up to 50 per cent of discretionary funds be available for this purpose. This would give added vitality to your expressed interest in reducing "street crime" and would not require the expenditure of new monies.

3. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP)

The Attorney General has recommended that the categorical juvenile delinquency program established by the JJDP (which is independent of the LEAA program) be left intact, with funding levels to be determined in the annual budget review process.

The Domestic Council, the Counsel to the President and Bob Hartmann concur in the Attorney General's recommendation. OMB recommends merging the program into the regular LEAA program and requiring that it be funded from LEAA's discretionary funds. Jack Marsh recommends merging the program into the regular LEAA program and requiring States to devote an "adequate share" of block grant funds to it.

4. Funding Levels

The Attorney General has recommended increasing the 1976 funding authorization of \$1.25 billion by \$250 million annually for the next five years, resulting in a funding authorization of \$2.5 billion by 1981.

OMB recommends maintaining the funding authorization at the current level (\$1.25 billion) through 1981. The Domestic Council, the Counsel to the President, Jack Marsh and Bob Hartmann recommend modest graduations in the funding authorization of \$50 million annually, resulting in an annual authorization of \$1.5 billion in 1981.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN *dy*

THE WHITE HOUSE

ACTION

WASHINGTON

May 26, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR

THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

JIM CANNON *Jim*

SUBJECT:

Reauthorization of LEAA

The attached memorandum from Jim Lynn regarding the funding authorization for LEAA was received too late to be incorporated in the crime message package which was submitted to you on Saturday.

As there might be discussion on this subject at today's 5:00 meeting, the paper is submitted for your review. Comments from the senior staff have been requested and will be presented to you tomorrow.



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

ACTION

MAY 24 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: JAMES T. LYNN
SUBJECT: Reauthorization of the Law Enforcement Assistance
Administration

The funding authorization for the Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration expires on June 30, 1976. Under the requirements of the new Budget Reform Act of 1974, reauthorization legislation should be submitted to the Congress this year.

The Attorney General has submitted for Administration approval draft legislation to continue the program through 1981. The Attorney General's proposal continues the program in essentially its present form, increases the authorization to a level to \$2.5 billion annually by 1981, and proposes new program emphases in dealing with problems in State and local courts and localities with high crime rates. A listing of the specific changes proposed by the Attorney General is shown at Tab A.

I. Program Reauthorization

This reauthorization proposal raises a significant policy issue concerning the form of future Federal financial assistance to State and local governments for improving their law enforcement programs. Should the Administration's reauthorization proposal (a) continue the existing LEAA program structure which presently divides available assistance funds almost equally between block grants to State and local governments to fund projects of their choosing and categorical or discretionary grants for programs which meet Federal requirements or Federally-imposed conditions and emphases or (b) modify the program to channel an increasing proportion of available funds directly to State and local governments, thereby decreasing the Federal involvement in the program?

While LEAA was conceived originally as a block grant program, slightly more than \$400 million of the Administration's 1976 budget request of \$770 million will be available as block grants to State and local governments to fund projects in keeping with their assessment of priorities and needs. Remaining funds will be devoted to planning, research, demonstration, administration, and programs or projects selected or categorically determined at the Federal level. The modifications proposed by the Attorney General in the renewal legislation for courts and high crime impact areas (described in greater detail below) would impose further conditions or limitations on State use of block grant funds.

In light of your expressed concerns about enlarging the State and local roles in our Federalist system, especially in the law enforcement field which is regarded as primarily a State and local responsibility, it is appropriate to consider the following three issues in determining the future direction of the LEAA program:

1. The suitability of the present LEAA structure for providing flexible assistance to State and local governments;
2. The desirability of imposing further conditions on State block grant programs for special programs for courts and high crime impact areas; and
3. The desirability of funding the new categorical juvenile delinquency program enacted last year.

The discussion of these issues below arrays alternative decision options ranging from the greatest to the least degrees of Federal involvement in the program. In each case selection of the first option would continue or strengthen the degree of Federal involvement in program decisions while selection of the final option would provide for the least Federal role. Congressional pressure strongly favors increasing the Federal role.

1. Suitability of the present LEAA program structure

The present LEAA program structure, which the Attorney General's proposal would continue throughout the renewal period, is described at Tab B. A brief history of the development and evolution of the program is provided at Tab C. This structure provides several types of assistance to State and local governments:

- ° Block grants - awarded to States on a population basis for projects developed under their comprehensive State plans, which must be reviewed and approved by LEAA:

- ° Categorical grants - awarded to States for specific purposes;
- ° Discretionary grants - awarded to States for programs or projects approved by LEAA.

In addition, separate funds are provided for research, planning, technical assistance, and demonstration grants. With the exception of planning grants which are awarded directly to State Planning Agencies, these funds are controlled by LEAA.

The Attorney General believes that the present approach provides needed flexibility for appropriate Federal involvement in the law enforcement area, while preserving a sizeable block grant program which is responsive to State and local law enforcement priorities. He feels that the present flexible structure allows LEAA to provide the continuum of services required for an effective law enforcement program. This includes basic and applied research performed by LEAA to identify new approaches to solving crime problems, discretionary grants to demonstrate these programs in selected States and units of local government, and block grant funds to implement them on a nationwide basis. He believes that without one program the other two would fail to achieve their objectives.

The Attorney General would retain two categorical grant programs which are contained in the existing program, i.e., corrections programs and law enforcement education and training. He believes that categorization has provided needed visibility and emphasis to these important programs and has produced successful results. Furthermore, he states that the Congress, which mandated special emphasis for these programs, is not likely to agree to their elimination.

There are several alternatives which could channel a greater proportion of available funds directly to State and local governments as block grants, in keeping with your policy of relying primarily on State and local priorities and judgments. These alternatives consist of combining-- in whole or in part--existing discretionary and categorical programs into the block grant program. The Attorney General considered but rejected such alternatives on the grounds that they would deny the Federal Government a needed role in the identification and demonstration of innovative criminal justice techniques and programs, as well as engendering strong Congressional opposition over the elimination of categorical programs.

Options

- A. Retain the present LEAA program structure. This option continues the present Federal role but would limit the amount of funding for block grants to 50 percent or less of available LEAA funds (assuming continuation of current funding emphases). Relative funding for block grant programs could be increased if the Administration chooses to increase overall LEAA program levels. (Attorney General and OMB recommendation).
- B. Merge existing categorical programs (corrections and law enforcement education and training) into the block grant program and leave to State discretion whether and in what amounts to allocate block grant funds for these purposes. Under current funding levels and emphases, this option would provide approximately 70 percent of available funds as block grants.
- C. Merge existing categorical and discretionary funds into the block grant program, leaving only planning grants, research, and administration funded at the Federal level. Under current funding levels and emphases, this option would provide approximately 80 percent of available funds as block grants. This would provide no source of funding for special emphasis programs at the Federal level.

Decision: Option A MR7; Option B ____; Option C ____.

2. Desirability of additional special emphasis programs for courts and high crime impact areas

The Attorney General has proposed changes to provide emphasis for two more special programs at the State and local level: to require funding for improvements in State courts and to provide supplemental block grant funding for cities with high incidences of crime.

Increased emphasis on the Courts - The Attorney General's proposal would require States to expend an "adequate" share of their block grant funds on improving their court systems. This recognizes the important and unique needs of the courts, as well as an effort on the part of several professional interest groups to create a major new LEAA Program directed solely at the courts. This proposal attempts to address those concerns in a more modest way. The amount of funds to be devoted to court improvements from block grant funds would be determined by the States in consultation with LEAA.

Options

- A. Require States to allocate an "adequate" share of block grant funds for court reform. This option imposes further restrictions on State discretion in the use of block grants. (Attorney General's recommendation).
- B. Require LEAA to provide funds for this priority program from available discretionary funds. While this option restricts LEAA's ability to fund other pilot or demonstration programs, it avoids further restrictions on the block grant program. (OMB recommendation.)
- C. Encourage but do not require States to allocate block grant funds for court reform.

Decision: Option A ____; Option B NP?; Option C ____.

High Impact Crime Program - The Attorney General proposes adding a separate supplemental block grant program specifically designated for general units of local government (cities and counties) with high crime rates. This is modeled after an experimental High Impact Cities program conducted over the past year out of LEAA discretionary grant funds. It is intended to assure that areas with high crime rates receive additional funds for programs specifically designed to address those "crimes of fear" most prevalent in highly urbanized areas. These supplemental funds would be awarded to States for pass-through to units of local government with high crime rates. No recommendations have been made on the appropriate level of funding for these new programs.

Options

- A. Agree to a supplemental block grant program to allocate additional funds to units of local government with high crime rates. (Attorney General's recommendation.) Unless funding for the overall LEAA program is increased, this option could result in reduced funding for the regular block or discretionary grant programs.
- B. Require States to allocate a fixed portion of available block grant funds to units of local government on the basis of relative crime rates. Current law provides authority for such allocations. This would limit the State's discretion in determining where funds can be most effective.

- C. Require LEAA to fund this priority program from available discretionary funds. (OMB recommendation.)
- D. Encourage but do not require States to allocate a higher proportion of their block grant funds to high crime areas.

Decision: Option A NR1; Option B ____; Option C ____; Option D ____.

3. Desirability of funding the Juvenile Delinquency program

In September 1974 you signed into law the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974. This Act established a new categorical grant juvenile delinquency program administered by LEAA but specifically separated from the regular LEAA program. It sets up a new formula grant program (based on population) for juvenile delinquency programs, with no State to receive less than \$200,000. To a large degree this new Act duplicates the legislative authorities and funding distribution mechanisms already available under the regular LEAA program. To date, no new funds have been requested for this program although you did permit LEAA to reprogram \$10 million of existing funds to implement certain aspects of the new Act. On signing the Act into law, you endorsed several parts which offered a potential for improving Federal juvenile justice programs, but stated that you did not intend to fund the new programs authorized by the Act until economic conditions improved. The Act also mandated that funds currently being spent on juvenile delinquency programs from regular LEAA funds (approximately \$140 million annually) not be reduced.

There is considerable Congressional pressure to initiate funding of this new Act. Both Houses are planning to add funds in the current Supplemental Appropriations bill (possibly up to \$35 million for 1975) for this purpose. Because of Congressional interest and concern for juvenile delinquency, it is highly probable that there will be funding for this program in the coming years.

The Attorney General considered but rejected a proposal to incorporate the new juvenile delinquency program into the regular LEAA program. That proposal would have left discretion to the States to determine whether and in what amounts to fund juvenile delinquency programs from available block grant funds, based on relative priorities with other criminal justice needs. Research and demonstration programs for juvenile delinquency could also be conducted with the regular LEAA program structure. The Attorney General concluded that Congressional support for the new Act was so overwhelming that efforts to change it would be rejected.

Options

- A. Accept a separate categorical juvenile delinquency program with funding levels to be determined in the annual budget review process. (Attorney General's recommendation.)
- B. Merge the juvenile delinquency program into the regular LEAA program and require States to devote an "adequate" share of block grant funds for this priority program.
- C. Merge the juvenile delinquency program into the regular LEAA program and require that it be funded from LEAA's discretionary funds. (OMB recommendation.)
- D. Merge the juvenile delinquency program into the regular LEAA program and encourage but do not require States to allocate block grant funds for this priority program.

Decision: Option A DE 7; Option B ____; Option C ____; Option D ____.

II. Funding Authorization

A final issue concerns the amounts at which the LEAA program is authorized during the renewal period. The Attorney General recommends increasing from the 1976 authorization of \$1.25 billion by \$250 million annually through 1981, resulting in a level of \$2.5 billion by 1981. The LEAA program is currently funded at \$880 million in 1975 and the 1976 request is for \$770 million. The 1976 budget projected the LEAA program to maintain the \$770 million level through 1980.

The Attorney General's recommendation is based on maintaining the existing proportion of Federal funds to total State and local spending for law enforcement through 1981 (approximately 9 percent). Since the vast proportion of State and local spending is for manpower and systems maintenance costs (which is not the mandate of LEAA), the desirability of LEAA remaining as a fixed percentage of States and local spending may be open to question. Moreover, in view of existing fiscal problems at the State and local levels, it is unlikely that their spending for law enforcement programs will double from 1976 to 1981, as projected in this proposal. No data has been provided to justify the benefits which would be derived from substantially increasing authorized funding levels.

The past authorization levels for LEAA have never been fully funded. The annual funding levels have been determined by the budget and appropriations processes. However, with the current emphasis on crime reduction, it may become increasingly difficult to avoid funding the program at the authorized levels in the future.

Options

Option A - Provide stairstep increases of \$250 million annually through 1981, resulting in an annual authorization of \$2.5 billion by 1981. (Attorney General's recommendation.)

Option B - Provide stairstep increases of \$50 million annually through 1981, resulting in an annual authorization of \$1.5 billion by 1981.

Option C - Maintain annual authorization amounts at the \$1.25 billion available for 1976. Actual budget levels would be determined in the annual budget and appropriations processes. (OMB recommendation.)

Option D - Maintain the annual authorization amounts identical to the long-range projections included in the 1976 budget (\$770 million). This would produce authorization levels below the \$1.25 billion available for 1976.

Decision: Option A ____; Option B ____; Option C ____; Option D ____.

Specific Legislative Changes Proposed by the Attorney General

- (1) Establishes an advisory committee to review LEAA grant applications;
- (2) Reauthorizes LEAA funding through 1981; proposes increasing from the 1976 authorization of \$1.25 billion by \$250 million annually through 1981, resulting in a level of \$2.5 billion by 1981;
- (3) Provides for emphasis on the courts and high-impact crime areas;
- (4) Places LEAA under the "policy direction" of the Attorney General;
- (5) Permits the Attorney General to appoint the Director of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice;
- (6) Allows the Institute to make grants to improve the civil justice system;
- (7) Clarifies authority on the use of reversionary funds;
- (8) Makes adjustments in LEAA's relationships with Indian tribes to increase the Federal share of grants to tribes without sufficient resources to meet matching requirements;
- (9) Proposes several technical amendments.

THE CURRENT LEGISLATION

Title I of the Act has the following eight parts:

Part A - Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Part A establishes LEAA within the Department of Justice under the "general authority" of the Attorney General.

Part B - Planning Grants

Part B authorizes LEAA to make grants for the establishment and operation of State Planning Agencies (SPAs). The purpose of the SPAs is to establish comprehensive statewide plans for the improvement of law enforcement and criminal justice, and to plan the coordination of local law enforcement efforts. Such plans must be submitted and approved by LEAA before a State is permitted to receive block grant funds for law enforcement provided under Part C. FY 1976 Funding Level: \$60 million.

Part C - Grants for Law Enforcement Purposes

Part C authorizes LEAA to make grants to States and units of local government for criminal justice improvement and crime reduction programs. It establishes the specific requirements for comprehensive criminal justice plans which the States must submit to receive block grants under Part C. Eighty-five percent of funds appropriated for Part C are awarded as block grants to SPAs on the basis of State population and 15 percent are awarded as categorical discretionary grants to SPAs, units of local governments, or private nonprofit organizations. FY 1976 Funding Level: \$487 million.

Part D - Training, Education, Research, Demonstration and Special Grants

Part D establishes a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILECJ) within the Department of Justice and under the "general authority" of LEAA. Its purpose is "to encourage research and development to improve and strengthen law enforcement and criminal justice," to disseminate research results to State and local governments, and to assist in the development and training of law enforcement and criminal justice personnel. The Institute is authorized to make grants and contracts to carry out its purposes. Part D also authorizes LEAA to make grants and contracts to support educational programs to improve and strengthen law enforcement and criminal justice, and to support individuals participating in such programs. FY 1976 Funding Level: \$69 million.

Part E - Grants for Correctional Institutions and Facilities

Part E authorizes LEAA to make grants "for the improvement of correctional programs and practices." Part E authorizes block grants to the State Planning Agencies established pursuant to Part B if the comprehensive plan submitted under Part C sets forth a comprehensive statewide corrections program. LEAA is also authorized to make categorical discretionary grants under Part E. BY 1976 Funding Level: \$97 million.

Part F - Administrative Provisions

Part F contains a number of administrative provisions including authority to issue regulations, to hold hearings and to cut off grant funds for non-compliance with the Act and LEAA regulations. Part F also includes civil rights requirements which LEAA grantees must meet. It contains LEAA's funding authorization levels. FY 1976 Funding Level: \$57 million.

Part G - Definitions

Part G defines various terms used in the LEAA Act including "comprehensive," "law enforcement and criminal justice," and "unit of local government."

Part H - Criminal Penalties

Part H establishes criminal penalties for the misuse of LEAA funds.

Development and Evolution of the LEAA Program

The LEAA program was the Federal Government's first comprehensive grant-in-aid program for assisting State and local jurisdictions in their law enforcement and criminal justice efforts.

The program was enacted in June 1968 at a time of growing national concern about crime caused by rising crime rates and the riots and civil disorders in the summer of 1967 and in May 1968 following the death of Martin Luther King, Jr.

The origins of the LEAA program, however, extend back to 1965 which is viewed as a landmark year for federalism and the criminal justice system. In 1965 President Johnson sent his first crime message to Congress. In this message, he announced the creation of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice and he proposed the enactment of a Law Enforcement Assistance Act. This Act, passed in 1965, established a small (\$5 million a year) demonstration categorical grant-in-aid program to assist States and local governments and administered by the Department of Justice. This Act was the forerunner of the LEAA program.

In January 1967, the Crime Commission completed its work and called for a major Federal assistance program to implement its recommendations. In his February 6, 1967 message "Crime in America," President Johnson proposed the enactment of the "Safe Streets Act and Crime Control Act of 1967." This Act was designed to build on the experience of the Department of Justice under the 1965 Act. The bill was typical of the "direct federalism" categorical grants of the 1960's and would have allowed the Federal Government to bypass the States and make direct grants to major urban areas. The primary justification for bypassing the States was that they had a limited law enforcement role. "Direct federalism," however, was rejected by Congress, and in June 1968 it not only created the first major Federal grant program for criminal justice and law enforcement but also the first "block grant" program.

Under the block grant program of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, LEAA funds flow from the Federal Government to the States and then from the States to units of local government. In the first step, LEAA makes a planning grant to each State which has established a State planning agency in accordance with the requirements of Part B of the Safe Streets Act. The States pass a portion of these funds through to units of local government. The States in cooperation with the units of local government then prepare a comprehensive plan. Requirements for this plan are set out in Part C of the Safe Streets Act. Under Part C, LEAA is required to allocate appropriated

law enforcement funds among the States on a formula basis. When a State submits a plan which meets the requirements of Part C LEAA must approve the plan and award the State its formula share of funds in a single block grant.

The reasons why Congress rejected direct federalism and enacted block grants are significant to understanding the LEAA program. President Johnson's bill would have required the States to prepare a comprehensive law enforcement plan for the entire State. Local governments, however, would have had no obligation to conform with the plan and could have received direct grants from the Federal Government in conflict with the State plan.

Congress felt that a comprehensive statewide plan should address problems throughout the State, should establish statewide priorities and should provide for overall State coordination of projects funded under the LEAA Act. Block grants were considered the most effective mechanism for achieving these ends.

There was considerable debate over whether the Department of Justice would be able through its grant-making authority to exercise supervision and control over the operations of local police departments.

Block grants were viewed as a means of limiting Federal control over local law enforcement efforts. In order to reduce the likelihood of Federal control over local law enforcement units, the LEAA Act was amended to prohibit Federal supervision of local law enforcement efforts and to prohibit a grantee from using more than one-third of block grant funds for personnel salaries and compensation.

The LEAA Act contains substantial references to criminal justice improvement programs such as recruiting, training, education, coordination planning and the like and a review of the comprehensive plans submitted by the States to LEAA clearly shows that the thrust of the LEAA program has been towards systems improvement and capacity building.

At the same time LEAA's efforts have been directed towards establishing and supporting experimental programs. LEAA's policy allows funds to be used to assist in the establishment of programs for a limited period. This is consistent with the LEAA Act which requires that State comprehensive plans "demonstrate the willingness of the State and units of local government to assume the costs of improvements funded . . . after a reasonable period of time." This also reflects Congress' intent that LEAA act as a catalyst to encourage States to undertake longer term efforts.

Goals of crime reduction, systems improvement, and capacity building are part of LEAA's mission which is "to assist State and local governments to reduce crime by improving and strengthening their criminal justice systems."

This mission is consistent with the "Declarations and Purposes" provision of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act which provides that:

"To reduce and prevent crime and juvenile delinquency, and to insure the greater safety of the people, law enforcement and criminal justice efforts must be better coordinated, intensified, and made more effective at all levels of government. It is therefore the declared policy of the Congress to assist State and local governments in strengthening and improving law enforcement and criminal justice at every level by national assistance."

In determining whether LEAA has achieved its purposes, the national, State and local crime rates are measures, though not the only measures, of its performance. LEAA annually has available six percent of the total funds expended by government agencies for criminal justice purposes. Since most criminal justice expenditures are for manpower and system maintenance costs, LEAA does provide a significant percentage of the total criminal justice funds available for innovative purposes. This fact supports the argument that LEAA's performance in meeting its goals should be evaluated by determining the degree to which funds are committed to developing and supporting programs and projects which improve and strengthen law enforcement and criminal justice, as well as by the degree to which crime is reduced.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Jim Cannon *Jm*
SUBJECT: Reauthorization of the Law Enforcement Assistance
Administration

Attached are the OMB memorandum and supporting documents on the reauthorization of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), which will be discussed at a meeting scheduled for 2:15 today.

The following issues are presented for your consideration:

1. Suitability of the Present LEAA Program Structure

The Attorney General has recommended that the present LEAA program structure, providing block, categorical and discretionary financial assistance to State and local governments, be continued through 1981.

The Domestic Council, the Counsel to the President, OMB, Jack Marsh and Bob Hartmann concur in this recommendation.

2. Desirability of Additional Special Emphasis Programs for Courts and High Crime Areas

a) Increased emphasis on courts. The Attorney General has recommended that the LEAA reauthorization legislation require that States allocate an "adequate share" of LEAA block grant funds for courts. Current law requires LEAA to approve State plans for expenditure of block grant funds, based on the general criteria that such plans are responsive to the overall criminal justice needs of the States. Therefore, the Attorney General's recommendation that an "adequate share" of block grant funds go for court purposes does not represent an operational deviation from current law.

The Domestic Council, the Counsel to the President and Jack Marsh recommend that you concur in the Attorney General's approach. OMB recommends that you require this special emphasis for courts to be funded out of LEAA's

discretionary funds. Bob Hartmann recommends that you encourage, but not require, States to allocate block grant funds for court purposes.

- b) High crime program. The Attorney General has recommended a supplemental block grant program to provide additional assistance to cities and counties with high crime rates. The effect of the Attorney General's recommendation would be to create a categorical program for localities with high crime rates, which, in all probability, would require additional funding in the coming fiscal year.

The Domestic Council, the Counsel to the President, OMB, Jack Marsh and Bob Hartmann recommend, instead, that you direct that this special emphasis program be funded from LEAA discretionary funds. Further, the Domestic Council and the Counsel to the President suggest that up to 50 per cent of discretionary funds be available for this purpose. This would give added vitality to your expressed interest in reducing "street crime" and would not require the expenditure of new monies.

3. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP)

The Attorney General has recommended that the categorical juvenile delinquency program established by the JJDP (which is independent of the LEAA program) be left intact, with funding levels to be determined in the annual budget review process.

The Domestic Council, the Counsel to the President and Bob Hartmann concur in the Attorney General's recommendation. OMB recommends merging the program into the regular LEAA program and requiring that it be funded from LEAA's discretionary funds. Jack Marsh recommends merging the program into the regular LEAA program and requiring States to devote an "adequate share" of block grant funds to it.

4. Funding Levels

The Attorney General has recommended increasing the 1976 funding authorization of \$1.25 billion by \$250 million annually for the next five years, resulting in a funding authorization of \$2.5 billion by 1981.

OMB recommends maintaining the funding authorization at the current level (\$1.25 billion) through 1981. The Domestic Council, the Counsel to the President, Jack Marsh and Bob Hartmann recommend modest graduations in the funding authorization of \$50 million annually, resulting in an annual authorization of \$1.5 billion in 1981.

THE WHITE HOUSE THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN... 67

WASHINGTON

May 27, 1975

MEETING WITH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Tuesday, May 27, 1975

2:15 p.m. (30 min.)

The Cabinet Room

From: Jim Cannon



I. PURPOSE

To discuss the reauthorization of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA).

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPATION & PRESS PLAN

A. Background: The funding authorization for LEAA expires on June 30, 1976. Under the requirements of the new Budget Reform Act of 1974, reauthorization legislation must be submitted to the Congress this year.

The Attorney General has submitted for consideration draft legislation to continue the program through 1981. This proposal, together with other options, are set forth in more detail in a memo from Jim Lynn, which is attached.

B. Participants: The Attorney General (or Richard Velde, LEAA Administrator), Phil Buchen, Robert Hartmann, Jack Marsh, Jim Lynn, Jim Cannon, Max Friedersdorf, Bob Goldwin, Ken Lazarus and Dick Parsons.

C. Press Plan: White House photographer.

III. TALKING POINTS

1. The question before us concerns the reauthorization of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in the Department of Justice.
2. Jim (Cannon), why don't you get us underway?

ACTION

MAY 24 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: JAMES F. LYNN
SUBJECT: Reauthorization of the Law Enforcement Assistance
Administration

The funding authorization for the Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration expires on June 30, 1976. Under the requirements of the new Budget Reform Act of 1974, reauthorization legislation should be submitted to the Congress this year.

The Attorney General has submitted for Administration approval draft legislation to continue the program through 1981. The Attorney General's proposal continues the program in essentially its present form, increases the authorization to a level to \$2.5 billion annually by 1981, and proposes new program emphases in dealing with problems in State and local courts and localities with high crime rates. A listing of the specific changes proposed by the Attorney General is shown at Tab A.

I. Program Reauthorization

This reauthorization proposal raises a significant policy issue concerning the form of future Federal financial assistance to State and local governments for improving their law enforcement programs. Should the Administration's reauthorization proposal (a) continue the existing LEAA program structure which presently divides available assistance funds almost equally between block grants to State and local governments to fund projects of their choosing and categorical or discretionary grants for programs which meet Federal requirements or Federally-imposed conditions and emphases or (b) modify the program to channel an increasing proportion of available funds directly to State and local governments, thereby decreasing the Federal involvement in the program?

While LEAA was conceived originally as a block grant program, slightly more than \$400 million of the Administration's 1976 budget request of \$770 million will be available as block grants to State and local governments to fund projects in keeping with their assessment of priorities and needs. Remaining funds will be devoted to planning, research, demonstration, administration, and programs or projects selected or categorically determined at the Federal level. The modifications proposed by the Attorney General in the renewal legislation for courts and high crime impact areas (described in greater detail below) would impose further conditions or limitations on State use of block grant funds.

In light of your expressed concerns about enlarging the State and local roles in our Federalist system, especially in the law enforcement field which is regarded as primarily a State and local responsibility, it is appropriate to consider the following three issues in determining the future direction of the LEAA program:

1. The suitability of the present LEAA structure for providing flexible assistance to State and local governments;
2. The desirability of imposing further conditions on State block grant programs for special programs for courts and high crime impact areas; and
3. The desirability of funding the new categorical juvenile delinquency program enacted last year.

The discussion of these issues below arrays alternative decision options ranging from the greatest to the least degrees of Federal involvement in the program. In each case selection of the first option would continue or strengthen the degree of Federal involvement in program decisions while selection of the final option would provide for the least Federal role. Congressional pressure strongly favors increasing the Federal role.

1. Suitability of the present LEAA program structure

The present LEAA program structure, which the Attorney General's proposal would continue throughout the renewal period, is described at Tab B. A brief history of the development and evolution of the program is provided at Tab C. This structure provides several types of assistance to State and local governments:

- ° Block grants - awarded to States on a population basis for projects developed under their comprehensive State plans, which must be reviewed and approved by LEAA:

- ° Categorical grants - awarded to States for specific purposes;
- ° Discretionary grants - awarded to States for programs or projects approved by LEAA.

In addition, separate funds are provided for research, planning, technical assistance, and demonstration grants. With the exception of planning grants which are awarded directly to State Planning Agencies, these funds are controlled by LEAA.

The Attorney General believes that the present approach provides needed flexibility for appropriate Federal involvement in the law enforcement area, while preserving a sizeable block grant program which is responsive to State and local law enforcement priorities. He feels that the present flexible structure allows LEAA to provide the continuum of services required for an effective law enforcement program. This includes basic and applied research performed by LEAA to identify new approaches to solving crime problems, discretionary grants to demonstrate these programs in selected States and units of local government, and block grant funds to implement them on a nationwide basis. He believes that without one program the other two would fail to achieve their objectives.

The Attorney General would retain two categorical grant programs which are contained in the existing program, i.e., corrections programs and law enforcement education and training. He believes that categorization has provided needed visibility and emphasis to these important programs and has produced successful results. Furthermore, he states that the Congress, which mandated special emphasis for these programs, is not likely to agree to their elimination.

There are several alternatives which could channel a greater proportion of available funds directly to State and local governments as block grants, in keeping with your policy of relying primarily on State and local priorities and judgments. These alternatives consist of combining-- in whole or in part--existing discretionary and categorical programs into the block grant program. The Attorney General considered but rejected such alternatives on the grounds that they would deny the Federal Government a needed role in the identification and demonstration of innovative criminal justice techniques and programs, as well as engendering strong Congressional opposition over the elimination of categorical programs.

Options

- A. Retain the present LEAA program structure. This option continues the present Federal role but would limit the amount of funding for block grants to 50 percent or less of available LEAA funds (assuming continuation of current funding emphases). Relative funding for block grant programs could be increased if the Administration chooses to increase overall LEAA program levels. (Attorney General and OMB recommendation).
- B. Merge existing categorical programs (corrections and law enforcement education and training) into the block grant program and leave to State discretion whether and in what amounts to allocate block grant funds for these purposes. Under current funding levels and emphases, this option would provide approximately 70 percent of available funds as block grants.
- C. Merge existing categorical and discretionary funds into the block grant program, leaving only planning grants, research, and administration funded at the Federal level. Under current funding levels and emphases, this option would provide approximately 80 percent of available funds as block grants. This would provide no source of funding for special emphasis programs at the Federal level.

Decision: Option A X; Option B ____; Option C ____.

2. Desirability of additional special emphasis programs for courts and high crime impact areas

The Attorney General has proposed changes to provide emphasis for two more special programs at the State and local level: to require funding for improvements in State courts and to provide supplemental block grant funding for cities with high incidences of crime.

Increased emphasis on the Courts - The Attorney General's proposal would require States to expend an "adequate" share of their block grant funds on improving their court systems. This recognizes the important and unique needs of the courts, as well as an effort on the part of several professional interest groups to create a major new LEAA Program directed solely at the courts. This proposal attempts to address those concerns in a more modest way. The amount of funds to be devoted to court improvements from block grant funds would be determined by the States in consultation with LEAA.

Options

- ?
- A. Require States to allocate an "adequate" share of block grant funds for court reform. This option imposes further restrictions on State discretion in the use of block grants. (Attorney General's recommendation).
 - B. Require LEAA to provide funds for this priority program from available discretionary funds. While this option restricts LEAA's ability to fund other pilot or demonstration programs, it avoids further restrictions on the block grant program. (OMB recommendation.)
 - C. Encourage but do not require States to allocate block grant funds for court reform.

Decision: Option A X; Option B ____; Option C ____.

High Impact Crime Program - The Attorney General proposes adding a separate supplemental block grant program specifically designated for general units of local government (cities and counties) with high crime rates. This is modeled after an experimental High Impact Cities program conducted over the past year out of LEAA discretionary grant funds. It is intended to assure that areas with high crime rates receive additional funds for programs specifically designed to address those "crimes of fear" most prevalent in highly urbanized areas. These supplemental funds would be awarded to States for pass-through to units of local government with high crime rates. No recommendations have been made on the appropriate level of funding for these new programs.

Options

- A. Agree to a supplemental block grant program to allocate additional funds to units of local government with high crime rates. (Attorney General's recommendation.) Unless funding for the overall LEAA program is increased, this option could result in reduced funding for the regular block or discretionary grant programs.
- B. Require States to allocate a fixed portion of available block grant funds to units of local government on the basis of relative crime rates. Current law provides authority for such allocations. This would limit the State's discretion in determining where funds can be most effective.

- C. Require LEAA to fund this priority program from available discretionary funds. (OMB recommendation.)
- D. Encourage but do not require States to allocate a higher proportion of their block grant funds to high crime areas.

Decision: Option A _____; Option B _____; Option C X; Option D _____.

3. Desirability of funding the Juvenile Delinquency program

In September 1974 you signed into law the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974. This Act established a new categorical grant juvenile delinquency program administered by LEAA but specifically separated from the regular LEAA program. It sets up a new formula grant program (based on population) for juvenile delinquency programs, with no State to receive less than \$200,000. To a large degree this new Act duplicates the legislative authorities and funding distribution mechanisms already available under the regular LEAA program. To date, no new funds have been requested for this program although you did permit LEAA to reprogram \$10 million of existing funds to implement certain aspects of the new Act. On signing the Act into law, you endorsed several parts which offered a potential for improving Federal juvenile justice programs, but stated that you did not intend to fund the new programs authorized by the Act until economic conditions improved. The Act also mandated that funds currently being spent on juvenile delinquency programs from regular LEAA funds (approximately \$140 million annually) not be reduced.

There is considerable Congressional pressure to initiate funding of this new Act. Both Houses are planning to add funds in the current Supplemental Appropriations bill (possibly up to \$35 million for 1975) for this purpose. Because of Congressional interest and concern for juvenile delinquency, it is highly probable that there will be funding for this program in the coming years.

The Attorney General considered but rejected a proposal to incorporate the new juvenile delinquency program into the regular LEAA program. That proposal would have left discretion to the States to determine whether and in what amounts to fund juvenile delinquency programs from available block grant funds, based on relative priorities with other criminal justice needs. Research and demonstration programs for juvenile delinquency could also be conducted with the regular LEAA program structure. The Attorney General concluded that Congressional support for the new Act was so overwhelming that efforts to change it would be rejected.

Options

- A. Accept a separate categorical juvenile delinquency program with funding levels to be determined in the annual budget review process. (Attorney General's recommendation.)
- B. Merge the juvenile delinquency program into the regular LEAA program and require States to devote an "adequate" share of block grant funds for this priority program.
- C. Merge the juvenile delinquency program into the regular LEAA program and require that it be funded from LEAA's discretionary funds. (OMB recommendation.)
- D. Merge the juvenile delinquency program into the regular LEAA program and encourage but do not require States to allocate block grant funds for this priority program.

Decision: Option A ____; Option B ____; Option C X; Option D ____.

II. Funding Authorization

A final issue concerns the amounts at which the LEAA program is authorized during the renewal period. The Attorney General recommends increasing from the 1976 authorization of \$1.25 billion by \$250 million annually through 1981, resulting in a level of \$2.5 billion by 1981. The LEAA program is currently funded at \$880 million in 1975 and the 1976 request is for \$770 million. The 1976 budget projected the LEAA program to maintain the \$770 million level through 1980.

The Attorney General's recommendation is based on maintaining the existing proportion of Federal funds to total State and local spending for law enforcement through 1981 (approximately 9 percent). Since the vast proportion of State and local spending is for manpower and systems maintenance costs (which is not the mandate of LEAA), the desirability of LEAA remaining as a fixed percentage of States and local spending may be open to question. Moreover, in view of existing fiscal problems at the State and local levels, it is unlikely that their spending for law enforcement programs will double from 1976 to 1981, as projected in this proposal. No data has been provided to justify the benefits which would be derived from substantially increasing authorized funding levels.

The past authorization levels for LEAA have never been fully funded. The annual funding levels have been determined by the budget and appropriations processes. However, with the current emphasis on crime reduction, it may become increasingly difficult to avoid funding the program at the authorized levels in the future.

Options

Option A - Provide stairstep increases of \$250 million annually through 1981, resulting in an annual authorization of \$2.5 billion by 1981. (Attorney General's recommendation.)

Option B - Provide stairstep increases of \$50 million annually through 1981, resulting in an annual authorization of \$1.5 billion by 1981.

Option C - Maintain annual authorization amounts at the \$1.25 billion available for 1976. Actual budget levels would be determined in the annual budget and appropriations processes. (OMB recommendation.)

Option D - Maintain the annual authorization amounts identical to the long-range projections included in the 1976 budget (\$770 million). This would produce authorization levels below the \$1.25 billion available for 1976.

Decision: Option A ____; Option B ____; Option C ____; Option D ____.

TAB A

Specific Legislative Changes Proposed by the Attorney General

- (1) Establishes an advisory committee to review LEAA grant applications;
- (2) Reauthorizes LEAA funding through 1981; proposes increasing from the 1976 authorization of \$1.25 billion by \$250 million annually through 1981, resulting in a level of \$2.5 billion by 1981;
- (3) Provides for emphasis on the courts and high-impact crime areas;
- (4) Places LEAA under the "policy direction" of the Attorney General;
- (5) Permits the Attorney General to appoint the Director of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice;
- (6) Allows the Institute to make grants to improve the civil justice system;
- (7) Clarifies authority on the use of reversionary funds;
- (8) Makes adjustments in LEAA's relationships with Indian tribes to increase the Federal share of grants to tribes without sufficient resources to meet matching requirements;
- (9) Proposes several technical amendments.

TAB B

THE CURRENT LEGISLATION

Title I of the Act has the following eight parts:

Part A - Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Part A establishes LEAA within the Department of Justice under the "general authority" of the Attorney General.

Part B - Planning Grants

Part B authorizes LEAA to make grants for the establishment and operation of State Planning Agencies (SPAs). The purpose of the SPAs is to establish comprehensive statewide plans for the improvement of law enforcement and criminal justice, and to plan the coordination of local law enforcement efforts. Such plans must be submitted and approved by LEAA before a State is permitted to receive block grant funds for law enforcement provided under Part C. FY 1976 Funding Level: \$60 million.

Part C - Grants for Law Enforcement Purposes

Part C authorizes LEAA to make grants to States and units of local government for criminal justice improvement and crime reduction programs. It establishes the specific requirements for comprehensive criminal justice plans which the States must submit to receive block grants under Part C. Eighty-five percent of funds appropriated for Part C are awarded as block grants to SPAs on the basis of State population and 15 percent are awarded as categorical discretionary grants to SPAs, units of local governments, or private nonprofit organizations. FY 1976 Funding Level: \$487 million.

Part D - Training, Education, Research, Demonstration and Special Grants

Part D establishes a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILECJ) within the Department of Justice and under the "general authority" of LEAA. Its purpose is "to encourage research and development to improve and strengthen law enforcement and criminal justice," to disseminate research results to State and local governments, and to assist in the development and training of law enforcement and criminal justice personnel. The Institute is authorized to make grants and contracts to carry out its purposes. Part D also authorizes LEAA to make grants and contracts to support educational programs to improve and strengthen law enforcement and criminal justice, and to support individuals participating in such programs. FY 1976 Funding Level: \$69 million.

Part E - Grants for Correctional Institutions and Facilities

Part E authorizes LEAA to make grants "for the improvement of correctional programs and practices." Part E authorizes block grants to the State Planning Agencies established pursuant to Part B if the comprehensive plan submitted under Part C sets forth a comprehensive statewide corrections program. LEAA is also authorized to make categorical discretionary grants under Part E. BY 1976 Funding Level: \$97 million.

Part F - Administrative Provisions

Part F contains a number of administrative provisions including authority to issue regulations, to hold hearings and to cut off grant funds for non-compliance with the Act and LEAA regulations. Part F also includes civil rights requirements which LEAA grantees must meet. It contains LEAA's funding authorization levels. FY 1976 Funding Level: \$57 million.

Part G - Definitions

Part G defines various terms used in the LEAA Act including "comprehensive," "law enforcement and criminal justice," and "unit of local government."

Part H - Criminal Penalties

Part H establishes criminal penalties for the misuse of LEAA funds.

TAB C

Development and Evolution of the LEAA Program

The LEAA program was the Federal Government's first comprehensive grant-in-aid program for assisting State and local jurisdictions in their law enforcement and criminal justice efforts.

The program was enacted in June 1968 at a time of growing national concern about crime caused by rising crime rates and the riots and civil disorders in the summer of 1967 and in May 1968 following the death of Martin Luther King, Jr.

The origins of the LEAA program, however, extend back to 1965 which is viewed as a landmark year for federalism and the criminal justice system. In 1965 President Johnson sent his first crime message to Congress. In this message, he announced the creation of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice and he proposed the enactment of a Law Enforcement Assistance Act. This Act, passed in 1965, established a small (\$5 million a year) demonstration categorical grant-in-aid program to assist States and local governments and administered by the Department of Justice. This Act was the forerunner of the LEAA program.

In January 1967, the Crime Commission completed its work and called for a major Federal assistance program to implement its recommendations. In his February 6, 1967 message "Crime in America," President Johnson proposed the enactment of the "Safe Streets Act and Crime Control Act of 1967." This Act was designed to build on the experience of the Department of Justice under the 1965 Act. The bill was typical of the "direct federalism" categorical grants of the 1960's and would have allowed the Federal Government to bypass the States and make direct grants to major urban areas. The primary justification for bypassing the States was that they had a limited law enforcement role. "Direct federalism," however, was rejected by Congress, and in June 1968 it not only created the first major Federal grant program for criminal justice and law enforcement but also the first "block grant" program.

Under the block grant program of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, LEAA funds flow from the Federal Government to the States and then from the States to units of local government. In the first step, LEAA makes a planning grant to each State which has established a State planning agency in accordance with the requirements of Part B of the Safe Streets Act. The States pass a portion of these funds through to units of local government. The States in cooperation with the units of local government then prepare a comprehensive plan. Requirements for this plan are set out in Part C of the Safe Streets Act. Under Part C, LEAA is required to allocate appropriated

law enforcement funds among the States on a formula basis. When a State submits a plan which meets the requirements of Part C LEAA must approve the plan and award the State its formula share of funds in a single block grant.

The reasons why Congress rejected direct federalism and enacted block grants are significant to understanding the LEAA program. President Johnson's bill would have required the States to prepare a comprehensive law enforcement plan for the entire State. Local governments, however, would have had no obligation to conform with the plan and could have received direct grants from the Federal Government in conflict with the State plan.

Congress felt that a comprehensive statewide plan should address problems throughout the State, should establish statewide priorities and should provide for overall State coordination of projects funded under the LEAA Act. Block grants were considered the most effective mechanism for achieving these ends.

There was considerable debate over whether the Department of Justice would be able through its grant-making authority to exercise supervision and control over the operations of local police departments.

Block grants were viewed as a means of limiting Federal control over local law enforcement efforts. In order to reduce the likelihood of Federal control over local law enforcement units, the LEAA Act was amended to prohibit Federal supervision of local law enforcement efforts and to prohibit a grantee from using more than one-third of block grant funds for personnel salaries and compensation.

The LEAA Act contains substantial references to criminal justice improvement programs such as recruiting, training, education, coordination planning and the like and a review of the comprehensive plans submitted by the States to LEAA clearly shows that the thrust of the LEAA program has been towards systems improvement and capacity building.

At the same time LEAA's efforts have been directed towards establishing and supporting experimental programs. LEAA's policy allows funds to be used to assist in the establishment of programs for a limited period. This is consistent with the LEAA Act which requires that State comprehensive plans "demonstrate the willingness of the State and units of local government to assume the costs of improvements funded . . . after a reasonable period of time." This also reflects Congress' intent that LEAA act as a catalyst to encourage States to undertake longer term efforts.

Goals of crime reduction, systems improvement, and capacity building are part of LEAA's mission which is "to assist State and local governments to reduce crime by improving and strengthening their criminal justice systems."

This mission is consistent with the "Declarations and Purposes" provision of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act which provides that:

"To reduce and prevent crime and juvenile delinquency, and to insure the greater safety of the people, law enforcement and criminal justice efforts must be better coordinated, intensified, and made more effective at all levels of government. It is therefore the declared policy of the Congress to assist State and local governments in strengthening and improving law enforcement and criminal justice at every level by national assistance."

In determining whether LEAA has achieved its purposes, the national, State and local crime rates are measures, though not the only measures, of its performance. LEAA annually has available six percent of the total funds expended by government agencies for criminal justice purposes. Since most criminal justice expenditures are for manpower and system maintenance costs, LEAA does provide a significant percentage of the total criminal justice funds available for innovative purposes. This fact supports the argument that LEAA's performance in meeting its goals should be evaluated by determining the degree to which funds are committed to developing and supporting programs and projects which improve and strengthen law enforcement and criminal justice, as well as by the degree to which crime is reduced.

MEETING WITH
ATTORNEY GENERAL LEVI

Tuesday, May 27, 1975

2:15 P. M.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

dey