

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
OF THE
DRUG, GANG AND VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL COMMITTEE
OF THE
ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION
AND
AGENDA**

Pursuant to A.R.S § 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the **Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Committee** of the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission and to the general public that the **Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Committee** will hold a meeting open to the public on **Thursday, May 22, 2014** beginning at **11:00 a.m.** at the **Arizona Criminal Justice Commission Office, 1110 W. Washington, Suite 250, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.**

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission endeavors to ensure the accessibility of its meetings to all persons with disabilities. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the Commission Office at (602) 364-1146. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Agenda for the meeting is as follows:

I. Call to Order and Roll Call **Chairperson Joe Brugman**

Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Committee Members:

Joe Brugman, Chairperson
Joseph Arpaio
Tim Dorn
Clarence Dupnik
Tom Horne
Sheila Polk
Charles Ryan
Steven Sheldon

II. Minutes of the January 23, 2014 Meeting

- Approval of Minutes

P-F-T

III. Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Program Cycle 28 Grant Awards **Tony Vidale**

- Review, discussion, consideration and possible action on FY15 Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control (Cycle 28) Grant Awards. **P-F-T**

IV. Call to the Public

Those wishing to address the Committee need not request permission in advance. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter or rescheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.

V. Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting

- The next Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Committee meeting will be held at the call of the Chairperson.

VI. Adjournment

A copy of the agenda background material provided to Committee members is available for public inspection at the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission Office, 1110 West Washington, Suite 230, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, (602) 364-1146. This document is available in alternative formats by contacting the Commission Office.



**DRUG, GANG AND VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL COMMITTEE
OF THE
ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION**

Request for Committee Action

Action Requested:	Type of Action Requested:	Subject:
May 22, 2014	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Formal Action/Motion <input type="checkbox"/> Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Minutes of the January 23, 2014 Meeting

TO: Chairperson and Committee Members

FROM: Tony Vidale, Program Manager
Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control

RECOMMENDATION:

The Committee approve the minutes of the Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Committee Meeting held on January 23, 2014.

DISCUSSION:

N/A

FISCAL IMPACT:

N/A

ALTERNATIVES:

Not Approve - Modify - Table

**Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Committee
Minutes
January 23, 2014**

A public meeting of the Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Committee of the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission was convened on January 23, 2014 at the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, 1110 W. Washington, Suite 250, Phoenix, AZ 85007.

Members Present:

Bill Montgomery, Maricopa County Attorney, Mark Faull representing
Timothy Dorn, Chief, Gilbert Police Department
Tom Horne, Attorney General, Paula Alleman representing
Sheila Polk, Yavapai County Attorney
Steven Sheldon, Former Judge

Members Absent:

Joseph Arpaio, Maricopa County Sheriff
Clarence Dupnik, Pima County Sheriff

Staff Participating:

Tony Vidale, Program Manager
Karen Ziegler, Deputy Director
Wendy Boyle, Executive Secretary

Guests Participating:

Lt. David McBride, Yuma County Drug Task Force

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Designee Mark Faull at 10:00 a.m. Roll was taken and a quorum was declared present.

II. Minutes of the December 9, 2013 Meeting

Chairperson Designee Faull called for a motion on the minutes. Commissioner Sheila Polk entered a motion to approve the minutes of the December 9, 2013 meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Charles Ryan and was unanimously approved by the Committee.

III. FY 2015 Match Requirement for Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Grant

Tony Vidale, Program Manager presented staff's recommendation to implement a 25 percent match requirement for the FY 2015 grant year. The Committee was referred to Table DC1 on page 9 of the agenda that reveals the level of federal and state funding for FY 2011 through FY 2015 broken out by grant fund source, and the year to year percentage change. For FY 2015 staff is estimating available grant funds of \$7.4 million, which reflects a total program reduction of about \$832,914. This is due in part to a decline in the federal Byrne/JAG grant.

Mr. Vidale also directed the Committee to Table DC 2 on page 10 of the agenda that displayed the match allocation options for the FY 2015 Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Grant. The first option is a zero match, which would set the total program size at \$7.4 million and would not require grantees to invest any additional funds to the project. The second option introduces a 20 percent match, which is currently in place for FY 2014 and would net a program size of \$9.3 million and a total program reduction of 10 percent. The third choice would establish a 25 percent match requirement that sets the program size at \$9.9 million, representing a total program reduction of 4 percent.

The Committee inquired if there were agencies that could not meet the match. Mr. Vidale explained that although grantees were not polled this year, last year grantees were asked if a match would be acceptable and met if the maximum was 25 percent. The majority of the agencies responded that they could meet the match and actually preferred this option.

Mr. Vidale identified the benefits of the match program as helping to maintain a dedicated level of effort in addressing the community's drug program; agencies also use the match requirement to secure or protect a funding set-aside for the project through the county or city appropriation authority.

Commissioner Sheila Polk entered a motion to recommend to the Commission a 25 percent match requirement for the FY 2015 Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Grant. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tim Dorn and was unanimously approved by the Committee.

IV. Program Income Policy-Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Funding

Tony Vidale, Program Manager presented staff's proposal to change the program income policy that is currently in effect and recommend the policy is changed to require agencies that earn program income to reinvest those earnings to activities directly related to the funded projects.

Mr. Vidale directed the Committee to page 12 of the agenda that lists examples of allowable expenditures under the Byrne/JAG grant. Allowable expenditures include state and local initiatives, technical assistance, strategic planning, research and evaluation, data collection, training, personnel, equipment, forensic laboratories, supplies, contractual support, and criminal justice information systems.

Staff recommends that the policy method approved in 2005 by the Commission be refined and the current use of the "Addition Method" remain as the preferred option, but that the program income earned is reinvested in activities related to the project.

Mr. Vidale explained that many grantees are reinvesting program income on the project by covering match costs or expenditures not covered by the grant. However, program income expenditures are not approved by ACJC and may be outside of activities directly related to the funded projects. This small adjustment would not have a large fiscal impact on current funded programs; however, is recommended from a policy standpoint.

The Committee discussed the question of what would happen if the program income exceeded the needs of the program. Mr. Vidale stated that the agency could use the program income as a fund source for following grant years since there is a four year period to expend the program income; it would not go unspent and would positively impact the grant program.

The discussion continued regarding if there are any existing guidelines or procedures given to agencies with the requirement and would ACJC become an administrator of how local, municipal and state agencies are spending money made on fines and other revenue funds for program income. Mr. Vidale explained there are no formal ACJC policies governing the use of program income; however, the federal government does have formal policies that define program income and how it can be used. The federal government allows for three options in dealing with program income; the grantee can return the funds to the federal government, use the program income to reduce project costs, or supplement the program.

Karen Ziegler, Deputy Director commented on enforcing guidelines for local oversight. The fines that are generated from law enforcement activities are not considered program income as it relates to the federal guidelines. The oversight that ACJC would have is limited to the definition and use of program income as outlined in federal guidelines and it does not include fines.

The Committee asked if there had been any abuses reported in the use of program income. Mr. Vidale responded that there were none, but indicated staff currently does not know what portion of program income is spent on general law enforcement expenditures versus drug related expenditures. With this change, it would give staff the ability to audit and understand what the agencies are spending on the drug program. Mr. Vidale responded to a question about the amount of program income earned by agencies that was above the match in FY13. There were five agencies earning program income above the match amount which totaled \$378,000. Also, for FY14 there are three agencies that have earned more program income in the first six months than six months of the match.

The Committee wanted to understand why the issue of program income was being addressed now. Mr. Vidale answered because of the years of program fund reductions staff is looking to maximize every available resource to continue to address the drug problems in Arizona communities.

Mr. Vidale also explained the record keeping of program income related to the grant would require setting up a sub-account to track. ACJC staff would review the reports from the account to ensure agencies are spending the appropriate level of program income according to the formula and take the additional step of making sure the expenditures were related to the project.

There was discussion from the Committee that RICO funds are addressed in state statute and federal guidelines on how the money can be spent, and now there could be an additional proposed reporting requirement for program income expenditures. Mr. Vidale explained there is a grant requirement on how the program income is spent; RICO makes up the largest portion of program income but program income is not spent the same way as RICO money. The focus is on the grant funded activities that earns the program income funds.

Acting Chairperson Faull summarized the point of discussion is the problem of declining funding from the federal government, not the expenditures. The expenditures are governed by the Byrne/JAG guidelines, RICO guidelines, and mandated to be spent on criminal justice activities identified by the agency. The Committee was asked to consider should there be a different accountability or should there be more information about the expenditures in terms of reporting and a year's data before the policy is changed to see whether the concerns are significant or not.

Mr. Vidale commented that staff could go back to the agencies requesting the numbers to see what program income expenditures were spent on or outside of the program.

Lt. David McBride, spoke on behalf of Yuma County Drug Task Force and stated the additional reporting of program income expenditures would place an extra burden on the county.

Acting Chairperson Faull entertained three options for the Committee to either vote up or down on the issue, adopt a different motion, or table the issue for additional information.

Commissioner Steven Sheldon entered a motion to table the issue and ask staff to survey the counties finding out the implications to the stakeholder, the financial impact, the opinion if this is a useful suggestion overall to the criminal justice agencies, and report the results back to the Committee. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Timothy Dorn and was unanimously approved by the Committee.

V. Fine Structure-Drug, Gang and Violent Funding

Tony Vidale, Program Manager presented staff's recommendation to support changes to Arizona Revised Statutes in Title 13, Chapter 34 that would simplify the fine structure for drug crime convictions making the level of the fine more consistent with sentencing by implementing a fine schedule based on the class of offense.

Mr. Vidale explained the issue came out of the November 2013 meeting where the Committee expressed concern over revenue issues. It was found that not all violations in Title 13, Chapter 34 or associated preparatory offenses have mandatory fines, and the fine schedule in statute is not consistent with sentencing. Staff was directed to explore any improvement to the current fine structure for drug crime convictions.

Mr. Vidale proposed two main changes to the drug crime statutes in Title 13, Chapter 34, statutes that do not have a mandatory fine and preparatory offenses and making fine schedules more consistent with sentencing by basing the fine on the class offense rather than the type of drug involved.

The Committee was directed to Table DC1 on page 14 of the agenda that outlined changes to class offenses and included preparatory offenses. The schedule would maintain the option that allows convictions for marijuana, dangerous drugs, narcotic drugs, offenses involving or using minors, or offenses in drug-free school zones to be fined at three times the value of the drug. Staff also proposes language in statute that the court not waive the assessment of a fine or any surcharge imposed by A.R.S. § 12-116.01 or § 12-116.02.

After review and discussion, Commissioner Sheila Polk entered a motion to recommend to the full Commission to initiate changes to Arizona Revised Statutes that would make application of drug fines more consistent with sentencing and the addition of the issue of diversion of drug court programs to waive the surcharge. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Timothy Dorn and was unanimously approved by the Committee.

Mr. Vidale assured the Committee that staff will look into the language for the matter of the drug court programs for this piece of legislation.

VI. Call to the Public

Chairperson Designee Faulk made a call to the public. No members of the audience addressed the Committee.

VII. Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting

The next Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Committee meeting will be held on **Thursday, March 20, 2014** at the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, 1110 W. Washington, Suite 250, Phoenix, AZ 85007.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



John A. Blackburn, Jr.
Executive Director

Audio recording available upon request.



**DRUG, GANG AND VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL COMMITTEE
OF THE
ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION**

Request for Committee Action

Action Requested:	Type of Action Requested:	Subject:
May 22, 2014	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Formal Action/Motion <input type="checkbox"/> Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Program Cycle 28 Grant Awards

TO: Chairperson and Committee Members

FROM: Tony Vidale, Program Manager
Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control

RECOMMENDATION:

The Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Committee recommends to the Commission the award of the Arizona Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Cycle 28 grant funds to eligible criminal justice agencies for the period beginning July 1, 2014 and ending June 30, 2015, except the Attorney General's Office Medicaid Fraud project, which will be funded from October 1, 2014 and end September 30, 2015.

DISCUSSION:

See attached

FISCAL IMPACT:

Significant to recipient agencies

ALTERNATIVES:

Not Approve - Modify - Table

Program Background

The Drug, Gang, and Violent Crime Control Program (DC) allows state, county, local and tribal governments to support activities that combat drugs, gangs, and violent crime. The DC program provides funding to support the components of a statewide, system-wide enhanced drug, gang, and violent crime control program as stated in the *2012-2015 Arizona Drug, Gang, and Violent Crime Control Strategy*. The strategy includes the following two goals for the foundation and direction of the program:

- *Curtail the flow of illicit drugs, drug proceeds and instruments used to perpetuate violence across Arizona.*
- *Reduce violent crime and illicit drug use and deter repeat offenders in Arizona.*

The strategy also outlines purpose areas as a guide to funding projects meant to address the drug, gang, and violent crime problem in the state. These purpose areas are as follows:

- Apprehension
- Prosecution
- Forensic Support Services
- Adjudication & Sentencing
- Corrections & Community Corrections
- Substance Abuse Treatment for Corrections-Involved Individuals
- Prevention and Education

In FY 2014, grant awards were made in the amount of \$10.3 million. These funds were awarded to projects addressing apprehension of drug offenders, prosecution of drug offenses, statewide forfeiture activities, forensic support of task forces, and drug adjudication projects. Table **DC 1** on page 11 shows a summary of the FY 2014 grant awards, the FY 2015 grant requests made by applicants, and the FY 2015 proposed projects.

Funding

The program is supported by several funding streams to successfully carry out the statewide strategy. The Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne/JAG) funds awarded to Arizona by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance (DOJ/BJA) continue to support program activities along with state Drug and Gang Enforcement Account (DEA) funds established under A.R.S. §41-2402, and matching funds when approved by the Commission. At its January 2014 meeting, the Commission approved implementing a match requirement of 25 percent for the FY 2015 grant in response to reductions in overall program revenue.

In FY 2014, \$10.3 million was allocated to grant projects. This amount was comprised of \$4 million in Byrne/JAG funds, \$4.2 million in DEA funds, and \$2 million in matching funds.

For FY 2015, staff is proposing a program size of \$10,307,537. Of this amount, \$3,211,105 is from the federal Byrne/JAG grant, \$4,334,516 is from the state DEA fund, \$210,234 is from unspent program income funds and \$2,551,682 is from matching funds. The unspent program income was from a previous grantee that chose to return the funds to ACJC. The FY 2015 program size represents a decrease of \$(28,755) from the FY 2014 program size. Table **DC 2** summarizes the change in program size, by fund source, for FY 2014 and FY 2015.

DC 2 Program Size FY 2014 – FY 2015			
	FY 2014	FY 2015 (Recommended)	Change
Program Size	\$ 10,336,292	\$ 10,307,537	\$ (28,755)
Fund Source:			
Byrne/JAG	\$ 4,044,682	\$ 3,211,105	\$ (833,577)
DEA Fund	\$ 4,244,516	\$ 4,334,516	\$ 90,000
Prog. Income	\$0	\$210,234	\$210,234
Match Funds	\$ 2,047,094	\$ 2,551,682	\$ 504,588
Total	\$ 10,336,292	\$ 10,307,537	\$ (28,755)

Applications Received

The solicitation for the Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Program opened February 24, 2014 and closed March 21, 2014. Thirty-five applications were received requesting a total of \$14,462,570. Of the 35 applications, 14 were apprehension projects (Tier 1), 17 were prosecution projects (Tier 1), one was a statewide forfeiture project (Tier 1), two were forensic support projects (Tier 2), and one was a drug adjudication project (Tier 2). Table **DC 3** on page 12 displays the grant request for each eligible applicant broken out by priority area and expenditure type.

Evaluation and Scoring

Eligible applications were reviewed by an evaluation team consisting of ACJC staff and outside evaluators. The projects were scored based on the criteria published in the solicitation with an emphasis on the goals of the statewide strategy. In addition, the solicitation emphasized that personnel expenditures would be prioritized in the budget recommendation allocation.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the funding allocation according to table **DC 4** on page 13. Under the proposal, \$3,439,148 would be allocated to tier one apprehension projects, \$3,818,100 for tier one prosecution projects, \$869,400 for a tier one statewide forfeiture project, \$503,343 for tier two forensic support projects and \$1,677,546 for tier two drug adjudication projects. The total grant project amount is comprised of \$7,755,855 in grant funds and \$2,551,682 in match funds. All of the funding would support personnel costs

for grant projects, allocating \$7,028,976 in personal services, \$2,851,386 in employee related expenditures, and \$427,176 in overtime expenditures.

For applicants scored as eligible, all expenditure types were analyzed by staff and allocated based on the needs and best interests of the grant program in meeting the statewide strategy. The following guidelines were used by staff to build the recommendation:

- Prioritize previously funded projects that demonstrate effectiveness.
- Maintain as much balance funding as possible between tier one apprehension and prosecution projects.
- Fund at least one tier one apprehension project and prosecution project in each county.
- Provide some level of funding to tier two projects impacted by apprehension and prosecution activities.
- Prioritize funding core operations positions. Core operations positions are those considered most critical in meeting the purposes of the strategy (i.e. task force officers, attorneys, criminalists).
- Fund a position and the associated ERE at the current costs as reported by the agency in the application.
- As a priority, fund personal services, ERE, and overtime before considering any other budget category.
- Avoid funding multiple support-type positions for any project until core position needs are met.

The recommendation for the Attorney General's Office Medicaid Fraud project would require the grant period to run from October 1, 2014 to September 30, 2015. This project would provide matching funds for a federal grant and the grant period needs to run concurrent to the federal fiscal year. All other projects would have a grant period of July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015.

Table **DC 5** on page 14 shows the FY 2014 awards and the FY 2015 recommended awards, broken out by county.

DC 1 Summary of FY 2015 Grant Requests & Proposed Awards				
APPLICANT AGENCY	FY14 Grant Awards	FY15 Grant Request	FY15 Proposed Grant Awards	Distribution % (A.R.S. § 41-2402)
Tier 1 Apprehension				
Apache County SO	\$ 239,496	\$ 443,414	\$ 236,316	
Cochise County SO	132,839	196,532	131,197	
Flagstaff PD	293,693	362,272	291,660	
Gila County SO	340,146	416,906	336,917	
Graham County SO	28,728	35,012	28,429	
Greenlee County SO	32,200	72,000	32,000	
Kingman PD	346,016	368,293	345,254	
La Paz County SO	-	320,351	67,914	
Navajo County SO	241,860	423,667	241,425	
Pinal County SO	148,810	166,932	147,520	
Prescott Valley PD	409,884	560,850	408,756	
Santa Cruz County SO	170,534	170,540	169,526	
Tucson PD	762,162	1,137,049	756,637	
Yuma SO	246,777	324,538	245,597	
Sub-Total	\$ 3,393,144	\$ 4,998,356	\$ 3,439,148	33.4%
Tier 1 Prosecution				
AG's Office - Medicaid Fraud	\$ 100,816	\$ 163,754	\$ 100,816	
Apache County Attorney	91,849	103,249	90,469	
Cochise County Attorney	158,957	241,519	157,305	
Coconino County Attorney	138,354	293,939	135,988	
Gila County Attorney	63,818	74,889	63,656	
Graham County Attorney	51,315	102,376	51,188	
Greenlee County Attorney	36,600	53,056	36,600	
La Paz County Attorney	72,250	130,855	71,499	
Maricopa County Attorney	1,394,295	1,494,831	1,377,099	
Mohave County Attorney	156,239	385,096	154,171	
Navajo County Attorney	112,452	290,863	112,450	
Pima County Attorney	523,652	1,358,493	515,145	
Pinal County Attorney	190,162	270,337	189,749	
Santa Cruz County Attorney	48,918	98,028	49,014	
Tucson City Prosecutor	317,352	315,018	315,358	
Yavapai County Attorney	128,023	295,443	127,004	
Yuma County Attorney	272,440	332,026	270,589	
Sub-Total	\$ 3,857,492	\$ 6,003,772	\$ 3,818,100	37.0%
Tier 1 Prosecution - Statewide Forfeiture Activities				
Attorney General's Office	\$ 874,481	\$ 1,137,525	\$ 869,400	
Sub-Total	\$ 874,481	\$ 1,137,525	\$ 869,400	8.4%
Tier 2 Forensic Support				
Arizona Department of Public Safety	\$ 446,167	\$ 560,989	\$ 445,265	
Tucson PD - Forensics	59,471	58,078	58,078	
Sub-Total	\$ 505,638	\$ 619,067	\$ 503,343	4.9%
Tier 2 Drug Adjudication and Corrections				
Administrative Office of the Courts	\$ 1,705,536	\$ 1,703,850	\$ 1,677,546	
Sub-Total	\$ 1,705,536	\$ 1,703,850	\$ 1,677,546	16.3%
TOTAL	\$ 10,336,291	\$ 14,462,570	\$ 10,307,537	100%

DC 3 FY 2015 Drug, Gang, & Violent Crime Control Grant Requests								
Applicant Agency	Salary	Overtime	ERE	P & O Services	In-State Travel	Operating Expense	Equipment	Total FY15 Requested
Tier 1 Apprehension								
Apache County SO	\$ 236,997	\$ 12,198	\$ 194,219	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 443,414
Cochise County SO	-	176,532	-	-	-	20,000	-	196,532
Flagstaff PD	134,641	39,304	80,267	93,480	-	14,580	-	362,272
Gila County SO	260,270	-	156,636	-	-	-	-	416,906
Graham County SO	-	35,012	-	-	-	-	-	35,012
Greenlee County SO	-	72,000	-	-	-	-	-	72,000
Kingman PD	80,523	-	43,973	243,797	-	-	-	368,293
La Paz County SO	234,038	-	86,313	-	-	-	-	320,351
Navajo County SO	260,902	-	162,765	-	-	-	-	423,667
Pinal County SO	50,935	70,740	30,561	-	-	10,000	4,696	166,932
Prescott Valley PD	313,010	-	171,930	-	-	75,910	-	560,850
Santa Cruz County SO	-	108,033	-	62,507	-	-	-	170,540
Tucson PD	762,878	-	374,171	-	-	-	-	1,137,049
Yuma SO	191,636	49,662	83,240	-	-	-	-	324,538
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 2,525,830	\$ 563,481	\$ 1,384,075	\$ 399,784	\$ -	\$ 120,490	\$ 4,696	\$ 4,998,356
Tier 1 Prosecution								
AG's Office - Medicaid Fraud	\$ 88,671	\$ -	\$ 75,083	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 163,754
Apache County Attorney	77,882	-	25,367	-	-	-	-	103,249
Cochise County Attorney	185,233	-	56,286	-	-	-	-	241,519
Cocoonino County Attorney	225,057	-	68,882	-	-	-	-	293,939
Gila County Attorney	55,875	-	19,014	-	-	-	-	74,889
Graham County Attorney	76,646	-	25,730	-	-	-	-	102,376
Greenlee County Attorney	42,445	-	10,611	-	-	-	-	53,056
La Paz County Attorney	91,101	-	39,754	-	-	-	-	130,855
Maricopa County Attorney	1,139,152	-	355,679	-	-	-	-	1,494,831
Mohave County Attorney	269,298	-	115,798	-	-	-	-	385,096
Navajo County Attorney	213,234	-	75,239	-	2,390	-	-	290,863
Pima County Attorney	1,029,185	-	329,308	-	-	-	-	1,358,493
Pinal County Attorney	210,162	-	60,175	-	-	-	-	270,337
Santa Cruz County Attorney	74,000	-	24,028	-	-	-	-	98,028
Tucson City Prosecutor	210,233	-	104,785	-	-	-	-	315,018
Yavapai County Attorney	220,540	-	74,903	-	-	-	-	295,443
Yuma County Attorney	225,107	-	106,919	-	-	-	-	332,026
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 4,433,821	\$ -	\$ 1,567,561	\$ -	\$ 2,390	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,003,772
Tier 1 Prosecution - Statewide Forfeiture Activities								
Attorney General's Office	\$ 740,236	\$ -	\$ 362,459	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,830	\$ -	\$ 1,137,525
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 740,236	\$ -	\$ 362,459	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,830	\$ -	\$ 1,137,525
Tier 2 Forensic Support								
Arizona Department of Public Safety	\$ 428,537	\$ -	\$ 132,452	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 560,989
Tucson PD - Forensics	40,900	-	17,178	-	-	-	-	58,078
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 469,437	\$ -	\$ 149,630	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 619,067
Tier 2 Drug Adjudication and Corrections								
Administrative Office of the Courts	\$ 1,243,479	\$ -	\$ 460,371	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,703,850
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 1,243,479	\$ -	\$ 460,371	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,703,850
TOTAL	\$ 9,412,803	\$ 563,481	\$ 3,924,096	\$ 399,784	\$ 2,390	\$ 155,320	\$ 4,696	\$ 14,462,570

DC 4 FY 2015 Drug, Gang, & Violent Crime Control Grant Proposed Awards						
Applicant Agency	Personal Services	Overtime	ERE	Total Proposed Project	Federal & State Funds	Match Funds
Tier 1 Apprehension						
Apache County SO	\$ 138,997	\$ -	\$ 97,319	\$ 236,316	\$ 177,237	\$ 59,079
Cochise County SO	-	131,197	-	131,197	98,398	32,799
Flagstaff PD	187,573	-	104,087	291,660	218,745	72,915
Gila County SO	211,003	-	125,914	336,917	252,688	84,229
Graham County SO	-	28,429	-	28,429	21,322	7,107
Greenlee County SO	-	32,000	-	32,000	24,000	8,000
Kingman PD	210,401	-	134,853	345,254	258,940	86,314
La Paz County SO	47,466	-	20,448	67,914	50,935	16,979
Navajo County SO	155,684	-	85,741	241,425	181,069	60,356
Pinal County SO	50,935	66,024	30,561	147,520	110,640	36,880
Prescott Valley PD	261,667	-	147,089	408,756	306,567	102,189
Santa Cruz County SO	-	169,526	-	169,526	127,144	42,382
Tucson PD	499,688	-	256,949	756,637	567,478	189,159
Yuma SO	171,775	-	73,822	245,597	184,198	61,399
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 1,935,189	\$ 427,176	\$ 1,076,783	\$ 3,439,148	\$ 2,579,361	\$ 859,787
Tier 1 Prosecution						
AG's Office - Medicaid Fraud	\$ 58,155	\$ -	\$ 42,661	\$ 100,816	\$ 100,816	\$ -
Apache County Attorney	68,601	-	21,868	90,469	67,852	22,617
Cochise County Attorney	123,064	-	34,241	157,305	117,979	39,326
Coconino County Attorney	106,835	-	29,153	135,988	101,991	33,997
Gila County Attorney	47,494	-	16,162	63,656	47,742	15,914
Graham County Attorney	38,323	-	12,865	51,188	38,391	12,797
Greenlee County Attorney	29,284	-	7,316	36,600	27,450	9,150
La Paz County Attorney	52,075	-	19,424	71,499	53,624	17,875
Maricopa County Attorney	1,051,979	-	325,120	1,377,099	1,032,824	344,275
Mohave County Attorney	107,812	-	46,359	154,171	115,628	38,543
Navajo County Attorney	82,690	-	29,760	112,450	84,337	28,113
Pima County Attorney	411,249	-	103,896	515,145	386,359	128,786
Pinal County Attorney	149,516	-	40,233	189,749	142,312	47,437
Santa Cruz County Attorney	37,000	-	12,014	49,014	36,760	12,254
Tucson City Prosecutor	208,012	-	107,346	315,358	236,518	78,840
Yavapai County Attorney	97,620	-	29,384	127,004	95,253	31,751
Yuma County Attorney	188,231	-	82,358	270,589	202,942	67,647
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 2,857,940	\$ -	\$ 960,160	\$ 3,818,100	\$ 2,888,778	\$ 929,322
Tier 1 Prosecution - Statewide Forfeiture Activities						
Attorney General's Office	\$ 629,586	\$ -	\$ 239,814	\$ 869,400	\$ 652,050	\$ 217,350
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 629,586	\$ -	\$ 239,814	\$ 869,400	\$ 652,050	\$ 217,350
Tier 2 Forensic Support						
Arizona Department of Public Safety	\$ 340,198	\$ -	\$ 105,067	\$ 445,265	\$ 333,949	\$ 111,316
Tucson PD - Forensics	40,900	-	17,178	58,078	43,558	14,520
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 381,098	\$ -	\$ 122,245	\$ 503,343	\$ 377,507	\$ 125,836
Tier 2 Drug Adjudication and Corrections						
Administrative Office of the Courts	\$ 1,225,163	\$ -	\$ 452,383	\$ 1,677,546	\$ 1,258,159	\$ 419,387
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 1,225,163	\$ -	\$ 452,383	\$ 1,677,546	\$ 1,258,159	\$ 419,387
TOTAL	\$ 7,028,976	\$ 427,176	\$ 2,851,386	\$ 10,307,537	\$ 7,755,855	\$ 2,551,682

DC 5 FY 2014 Awards and FY 2015 Recommended Awards by County				
County	FY 14 Approved	% Allocation	FY 15 Recommended	% Allocation
Apache County				
Apache County Attorney	\$ 91,849		\$ 90,469	
Apache County Sheriff	\$ 239,496		\$ 236,316	
Total	\$ 331,345	3.21%	\$ 326,785	3.17%
Cochise County				
Cochise County Attorney	\$ 158,957		\$ 157,305	
Cochise County Sheriff	\$ 132,839		\$ 131,197	
Total	\$ 291,796	2.82%	\$ 288,502	2.80%
Coconino County				
Coconino County Attorney	\$ 138,354		\$ 135,988	
Flagstaff Police Department	\$ 293,693		\$ 291,660	
Total	\$ 432,047	4.18%	\$ 427,648	4.15%
Gila County				
Gila County Attorney	\$ 63,818		\$ 63,656	
Gila County Sheriff	\$ 340,146		\$ 336,917	
Total	\$ 403,964	3.91%	\$ 400,573	3.89%
Graham County				
Graham County Attorney	\$ 51,315		\$ 51,188	
Graham County Sheriff	\$ 28,728		\$ 28,429	
Total	\$ 80,043	0.77%	\$ 79,617	0.77%
Greenlee County				
Greenlee County Attorney	\$ 36,600		\$ 36,600	
Greenlee County Sheriff	\$ 32,200		\$ 32,000	
Total	\$ 68,800	0.67%	\$ 68,600	0.67%
La Paz County				
La Paz County Attorney	\$ 72,250		\$ 71,499	
La Paz County Sheriff	\$ -		\$ 67,914	
Total	\$ 72,250	0.70%	\$ 139,413	1.35%
Maricopa County				
Maricopa County Attorney	\$ 1,394,295		\$ 1,377,099	
Total	\$ 1,394,295	13.49%	\$ 1,377,099	13.36%
Mohave County				
Mohave County Attorney	\$ 156,239		\$ 154,171	
Kingman Police Department	\$ 346,016		\$ 345,254	
Total	\$ 502,255	4.86%	\$ 499,425	4.85%
Navajo County				
Navajo County Attorney	\$ 112,452		\$ 112,450	
Navajo County Sheriff	\$ 241,860		\$ 241,425	
Total	\$ 354,312	3.43%	\$ 353,875	3.43%
Pima County				
Pima County Attorney	\$ 523,652		\$ 515,145	
Tucson City Prosecutor	\$ 317,352		\$ 315,358	
Tucson Police Department - Task Force	\$ 762,162		\$ 756,637	
Tucson Police Department - Crime Lab	\$ 59,471		\$ 58,078	
Total	\$ 1,662,636	16.09%	\$ 1,645,218	15.96%
Pinal County				
Pinal County Attorney	\$ 190,162		\$ 189,749	
Pinal County Sheriff	\$ 148,810		\$ 147,520	
Total	\$ 338,972	3.28%	\$ 337,269	3.27%
Santa Cruz County				
Santa Cruz County Attorney	\$ 48,918		\$ 49,014	
Santa Cruz County Sheriff	\$ 170,534		\$ 169,526	
Total	\$ 219,452	2.12%	\$ 218,540	2.12%
Yavapai County				
Yavapai County Attorney	\$ 128,023		\$ 127,004	
Prescott Valley Police Department	\$ 409,884		\$ 408,756	
Total	\$ 537,907	5.20%	\$ 535,760	5.20%
Yuma County				
Yuma County Attorney	\$ 272,440		\$ 270,589	
Yuma County Sheriff	\$ 246,777		\$ 245,597	
Total	\$ 519,217	5.02%	\$ 516,186	5.01%
Statewide				
Administrative Office of the Courts	\$ 1,705,536		\$ 1,677,546	
Attorney General - Forefeiture	\$ 874,481		\$ 869,400	
Attorney General - Medicaid Fraud	\$ 100,816		\$ 100,816	
Department of Public Safety - Crime Lab	\$ 446,167		\$ 445,265	
Total	\$ 3,127,000	30.25%	\$ 3,093,027	30.01%
Grand Total	\$ 10,336,291		\$ 10,307,537	