

June 1999

CRIME TECHNOLOGY

Federal Assistance to State and Local Law Enforcement





G A O

Accountability * Integrity * Reliability

United States General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

General Government Division

B-280998

June 7, 1999

The Honorable Mike DeWine
United States Senate

Dear Senator DeWine:

This report responds to your request for information about crime technology assistance¹ provided by the federal government to state and local law enforcement agencies. Specifically, for fiscal years 1996 through 1998, you requested that we identify the types and amounts of such assistance provided by the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, and the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP). Also, as agreed with you, we categorized the assistance into three types: (1) direct funding or grants; (2) access to support services and systems, such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) National Crime Information Center; and (3) in-kind (no cost) transfers of equipment or other assets.

Results in Brief

Identifiable crime technology assistance provided by Justice, Treasury, and ONDCP to state and local law enforcement agencies during fiscal years 1996 through 1998 totaled an estimated \$1.2 billion, as table 1 shows. This total is conservative because—given that these federal agencies are not required to, and do not specifically track crime technology assistance separately in their accounting systems—we included only amounts that could be identified or reasonably estimated by agency officials or us. As noted in table 1, this estimate was particularly conservative regarding multipurpose grants, such as Byrne Formula Grants and Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, which by design can be used for a variety of purposes. Further, as also noted in table 1, regarding applicable support services and systems, we did not include personnel costs.

¹ In developing the information in this report, we defined "crime technology assistance" to include federal programs and funding to support a broad array of activities, ranging from upgrading criminal history records to establishing or improving fingerprint and ballistic identification systems (see app. I).

Table 1: Estimated Federal Funding for Crime Technology Assistance, Fiscal Years 1996 Through 1998

Dollars in millions	
Type of Assistance	Amount
Direct single-purpose grants: Justice	\$ 255.1
Direct multipurpose grants: Justice ^a	746.3
Support services and systems: Justice ^b	146.6
Support services and systems: Treasury ^b	15.9
Technology transfers: ONDCP	13.0
Total	\$1,176.9

^aFunding estimates for some purpose areas in the Byrne Formula Grants Program are for 10 states (the largest recipients); and, funding estimates for the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program are based on data voluntarily provided to Justice by substantially less than all grantees for only 2 fiscal years—i.e., about 60 percent of the 1996 grantees and about 10 percent of the 1997 grantees.

^bFor most services and systems, federal agency officials made estimates by prorating operating costs (excluding personnel costs) based on the number of queries or other usage measures.

Source: Summary of data presented in appendixes II through V.

The large majority of identified crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies—\$1.0 billion or about 85 percent of the estimated \$1.2 billion total during fiscal years 1996 through 1998—was grants, all of which were administered by Justice. The three largest crime technology assistance grants during the 3 fiscal years were the (1) Office of Community Oriented Policing Services' Making Officer Redeployment Effective grants (\$466.1 million), (2) Bureau of Justice Assistance's Byrne Formula Grants (\$188.0 million), and (3) the Bureau of Justice Statistics' National Criminal History Improvement Program (\$147.2 million).

As table 1 shows, support services and systems was estimated to be the second largest category of crime technology assistance provided to state and local law enforcement agencies. In this category, Justice was the major provider, with an estimated \$146.6 million in assistance compared to Treasury's \$15.9 million.

Regarding in-kind transfers, responses from the three agencies we reviewed indicated that only ONDCP had an established, relevant program. ONDCP's technology transfer program totaled an estimated \$13.0 million in assistance during fiscal year 1998, the first year of the program's existence.

Background

Although states and localities have traditionally held the major responsibility for preventing and controlling crime in the United States, a significant aspect of the federal government's role has been its provision of financial and other assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies. Grants are the largest funding source of crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies.

Of the three agencies we reviewed, only Justice provided grants for crime technology purposes. These grants fall into one of two categories: single-purpose and multipurpose. Single-purpose grants were clearly or completely for crime technology assistance. For example, the purpose of the State Identification Systems Grant Program, which was authorized by the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-132), is to enable states to develop computerized identification systems that are compatible and integrated with certain FBI databases.

Multipurpose grants can be used by state and local law enforcement agencies for a number of purposes including, but not limited to, crime technology. For example, the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-570) established formula and discretionary grants to state and local law enforcement agencies for addressing crime related to illegal drugs and other purposes. The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (P.L. 100-690) expanded the grant programs and named them the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs. Byrne programs are to be used to improve criminal justice systems, to enhance anti-drug programs, and for other purposes.

More recently, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-322) authorized \$30.2 billion for law enforcement and crime prevention measures. In addition to authorizing additional funding for Byrne programs through fiscal year 2000, the 1994 Act established what is known as the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services within Justice and authorized \$8.8 billion in related funding. Also, the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-134) provided funding for the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program, which provides funding to state and local governments to reduce crime and improve public safety.

Nongrant federal assistance—such as providing state and local law enforcement with access to support services and systems—may be specifically authorized by legislation. For example, use of the Treasury Department’s Federal Law Enforcement Training Center by units of state and local government is authorized by P.L. 90-351, as amended.

Scope and Methodology

There is no formal or standardized definition of “crime technology assistance” used throughout the federal government. Therefore, for purposes of this review, we developed a working definition and discussed it with Justice, Treasury, and ONDCP officials, who indicated that the definition was appropriate. Also, because there is no overall requirement for agency accounting systems to track crime technology assistance, we

largely relied upon agency estimates. We did not fully or independently verify the accuracy and reliability of the funding data provided by agency officials. However, to help ensure data quality, among other steps, we (1) obtained information on and reviewed the processes used by agency officials to calculate the estimated amounts of crime technology assistance and (2) compared agency responses to primary source documents and attempted to reconcile any differences with agency officials. Also, as mentioned above, the funding totals presented in this report are conservative, especially regarding multipurpose grants. That is, because agency accounting systems did not specifically track crime technology assistance, we included only amounts that could be reasonably estimated by agency officials or by our reviews of agency information.

Appendix I presents more details about our objectives, scope, and methodology. We requested comments on a draft of this report from the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of ONDCP. Justice's, Treasury's, and ONDCP's oral and written comments are discussed near the end of this letter. We performed our work from August 1998 to April 1999 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

Grant Programs Were the Major Type of Federal Assistance

As table 1 shows, for the three federal agencies we reviewed, single-purpose grants (\$255.1 million) and multipurpose grants (\$746.3 million) were the major type of crime technology assistance provided to state and local law enforcement agencies during fiscal years 1996 through 1998.

We identified 13 relevant single-purpose grant programs. Of these, one program—the National Criminal History Improvement Program—represented about 58 percent of the \$255.1 million total. This program, funded at about \$147.2 million for fiscal years 1996 through 1998, wholly involved crime technology assistance in that its purpose is to help states upgrade the quality and completeness of criminal history records and to increase compatibility with and access to FBI criminal information databases. The other 12 single-purpose grant programs represented about 42 percent (\$107.9 million) of the \$255.1 million total and included programs such as a DNA Laboratory Improvement Program and the National Sex Offender Registry.

We identified 10 multipurpose grant programs that had some purposes involving crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies. Of these 10, the following 2 programs accounted for about 88 percent of the estimated \$746.3 million total:

-
- Making Officer Redeployment Effective Grants (\$466.1 million): This program, administered by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, allows law enforcement agencies to purchase equipment and technology to help expand the time available for community policing by current law enforcement officers.
 - Byrne Formula Grant Program (\$188.0 million): Three purpose areas in this program—purpose areas 15(a), 15(b), and 25—specifically involved crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies during fiscal years 1996 through 1998. Purpose area 15(a) is for improving drug-control technology; purpose area 15(b) is for criminal justice information systems (including a 5-percent set-aside for improving criminal justice records); and purpose area 25 is for developing DNA analysis capabilities.

The other eight multipurpose grant programs represented 12 percent (\$92.2 million) of the estimated \$746.3 million total funding through multipurpose grants for crime technology assistance. Among many other uses, grant recipients used these funds to develop (1) information management systems for drug court programs and (2) integrated computer systems for tracking domestic violence cases.

Appendix II provides more details about Justice's single-purpose and multipurpose grants that provided crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies during fiscal years 1996 through 1998.

Justice and Treasury Provided Access to Support Services and Systems

The second largest category of estimated crime technology assistance, as table 1 shows, was access to support services and systems provided by Justice and Treasury. Of these two agencies, Justice was the more significant provider, with an estimated \$146.6 million in assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies, or about 90 percent of the \$162.5 million total during fiscal years 1996 through 1998.

For these 3 fiscal years, about 62 percent of Justice's \$146.6 million in assistance was attributable to 4 of the 21 relevant support services or systems we identified:

- Regional Information Sharing Systems (\$50.3 million): Funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, six regional criminal intelligence centers provide state and local law enforcement with access to an Intelligence Database Pointer, a National Gang Database, a secure intranet, and other support services.

-
- Combined DNA Index System (\$16.7 million): The FBI's index system contains DNA records of persons convicted of crimes. State and local crime laboratories can use the system to store and match DNA records.
 - Law Enforcement On-Line (\$12.6 million): Managed by the FBI, this intranet links the law enforcement community throughout the United States and supports broad, immediate dissemination of information.
 - National Crime Information Center (\$11.1 million): Managed by the FBI, this is the nation's most extensive criminal justice information system. The system's largest file, the Interstate Identification Index, provides access to millions of criminal history information records in state systems.

Justice's other 17 support services and systems represented 38 percent (\$55.9 million) of the agency's \$146.6 million total assistance in this category. Two examples are (1) the Drug Enforcement Administration's National Drug Pointer Index, which has an automated response capability to determine if a case suspect is under active investigation by a participating law enforcement agency and (2) the National Institute of Justice's National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Centers, which offer technology and information assistance to law enforcement and corrections agencies by introducing promising technologies and providing technology training.

Appendix III presents more detailed information about Justice's support services and systems that provided crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies during fiscal years 1996 through 1998.

Treasury's support services and systems provided \$15.9 million of assistance during this period, as table 1 shows. This assistance involved a total of 29 support services and systems. Of these, 14 were provided by one Treasury component—the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), which accounted for \$13.4 million (84 percent) of Treasury's \$15.9 million total assistance in this category. Further, as indicated next, 3 of ATF's 14 services and systems accounted for about two-thirds of the ATF's support to state and local law enforcement:

- Arson/Explosives Incident System (\$3.5 million): State and local agencies are able to query the system for information about component parts, stolen explosives, and device placement.
- Accelerant Detection Analysis (\$2.7 million): This service involves the laboratory analysis of fire debris to detect and identify flammable liquids potentially used as accelerants in an incendiary fire.

-
- Firearms Tracing System (\$2.5 million): The National Tracing Center traces firearms (from the manufacturer to the retail purchaser) for law enforcement agencies.

Treasury's other 15 relevant support services and systems accounted for the remaining 16 percent (\$2.5 million) of the \$15.9 million total assistance. Two examples are (1) the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network's Project Gateway, which helps state and local law enforcement agencies combat money laundering and other financial crimes and (2) the Secret Service's Questioned Document Branch, which maintains a forensic information system for analyzing handwriting samples.

Appendix IV presents more detailed information about Treasury's support services and systems that provided crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies during fiscal years 1996 through 1998.

In-Kind Transfer Programs

Based on information from Justice, Treasury, and ONDCP officials, we specifically identified only one established, relevant in-kind transfer program—i.e., an ONDCP technology transfer program that began in fiscal year 1998. According to ONDCP officials, the program involved 18 projects or systems that fit our definition of crime technology assistance, but only 15 of these were transferred to state and local law enforcement agencies in fiscal year 1998. For that year, as table 1 shows, federal funding for the transferred projects or systems totaled \$13 million. Examples of transferred technologies include (1) a vapor tracer device for detecting and identifying small quantities of narcotics and explosives and (2) a secure, miniaturized multichannel audio device for inconspicuous use during covert operations. Appendix V provides further details about ONDCP's technology transfer program.

Justice and Treasury officials told us that their agencies routinely make excess equipment available to other governmental and nongovernmental users through the General Services Administration. However, the officials said they had no readily available information regarding how much of the excess equipment was crime technology related and was subsequently received by state and local law enforcement agencies. Similarly, General Services Administration officials told us that their agency's accounting systems could not provide this type of information.

Treasury officials noted that there have been a few isolated or nonroutine instances of direct transfers, as when the Secret Service directly excessed

some used automated data processing and communications equipment² to state and local law enforcement agencies in 1998. We did not include these isolated or nonroutine transfers in the funding amounts presented in this report.

Agency Comments and Our Evaluation

Officials from Justice's Office of Justice Programs and Office of Audit Liaison met with us on May 13, 1999, and provided the following comments on a draft of this report:

- In their written comments, Office of Justice Programs officials provided several technical comments and clarifications, mostly centered on funding amounts for certain National Institute of Justice programs presented in table II.1 in appendix II. As appropriate, we made adjustments to table II.1 and also added some clarifying language to our scope and methodology (app. I).
- The Director, Office of Audit Liaison, told us that the draft report had been reviewed by officials in other relevant Justice components (including INTERPOL–U.S. National Central Bureau and the Marshals Service) and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, and that these officials had no comments.

Also, in written comments, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the FBI, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service suggested technical comments and clarifications, which have been incorporated in this report where appropriate.

Treasury officials met with us on May 12, 1999, and provided oral comments. More specifically:

- ATF, Customs Service, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and Financial Crimes Enforcement Network officials expressed agreement with the information presented in the report.
- Secret Service officials had technical comments and clarifications, which have been incorporated in this report where appropriate.
- A Treasury Office of Finance and Administration official indicated that, although not in attendance at the May 12 meeting, IRS officials had reviewed the draft report and had no comments.

² Secret Service officials told us that the original acquisition costs of this equipment totaled about \$535,000 but that no depreciated values have been calculated or assigned regarding the transfer.

On May 13, 1999, the Director of ONDCP's Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center met with us and expressed agreement with the information presented in the report. To provide additional perspective, he suggested that appendix V reflect the fact that, as of December 1998, the 15 relevant ONDCP projects or systems involved a total of 202 recipient state and local law enforcement agencies. We added this information to the appendix.

As arranged with your office, unless you publicly announce the contents of this report earlier, we plan no further distribution until 30 days after the date of this letter. We are sending copies of this report to Senator Orrin G. Hatch, Chairman, and Senator Patrick J. Leahy, Ranking Minority Member, Senate Committee on the Judiciary; Representative Henry J. Hyde, Chairman, and Representative John Conyers, Jr., Ranking Minority Member, House Committee on the Judiciary; The Honorable Janet Reno, Attorney General; The Honorable Robert E. Rubin, Secretary of the Treasury; The Honorable Barry R. McCaffrey, Director of ONDCP; and The Honorable Jacob Lew, Director, Office of Management and Budget. Copies will also be made available to others upon request.

The major contributors to this report are listed in appendix VI. If you or your staff have any questions about this report, please contact me on (202) 512-8777.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Richard M. Stana". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent initial "R".

Richard M. Stana
Associate Director
Administration of Justice Issues

Contents

Letter		1
Appendix I		14
Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	Objectives	14
	Definition of “Crime Technology Assistance”	14
	Overview of Scope and Methodology	14
	Scope and Methodology Regarding Grant Programs	16
	Scope and Methodology Regarding Support Services and Systems	20
	Scope and Methodology Regarding In-Kind Transfers	22
	Data Accuracy and Reliability	23
Appendix II		24
Crime Technology Assistance (Grants) Provided by the Department of Justice	Overview of Department of Justice Grant Programs	24
	Descriptions of Justice Grant Programs	28
Appendix III		34
Crime Technology Assistance (Support Services and Systems) Provided by the Department of Justice	Overview of Department of Justice Support Services and Systems	34
	Descriptions of Justice’s Support Services and Systems	36
Appendix IV		41
Crime Technology Assistance (Support Services and Systems) Provided by the Department of the Treasury	Overview of Department of the Treasury Support Services and Systems	41
	Descriptions of Treasury’s Support Services and Systems	42

<hr/>	
<p>Appendix V Crime Technology Assistance (In-Kind Transfers) Provided by the Office of National Drug Control Policy</p>	<p>Mission of ONDCP's Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center 48 Overview of Technology Transfer Pilot Program 48 Descriptions of Applicable Systems 49</p>
<hr/>	
<p>Appendix VI Major Contributors to This Report</p>	<p>52</p>
<hr/>	
<p>Tables</p>	<p>Table 1: Estimated Federal Funding for Crime Technology Assistance, Fiscal Years 1996 Through 1998 1 Table II.1: Estimated Obligations of Department of Justice Single-Purpose Grants for Crime Technology Provided to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, Fiscal Years 1996 Through 1998 25 Table II.2: Estimated Obligations of Department of Justice Multipurpose Grants With Crime Technology as a Permissible Use Provided to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, Fiscal Years 1996 Through 1998 28 Table III.1: Estimated Obligations of Department of Justice Support Services and Systems Provided to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, Fiscal Years 1996 Through 1998 35 Table IV.1: Estimated Obligations of Department of the Treasury Support Services and Systems Provided to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, Fiscal Years 1996 Through 1998 41 Table V.1: ONDCP Crime Technology Assistance Provided to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, Fiscal Year 1998 48</p>

Contents

Abbreviations

ATF	Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms
CODIS	Combined DNA Index System
CTAC	Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center
DEA	Drug Enforcement Administration
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
INS	Immigration and Naturalization Service
INTERPOL	International Criminal Police Organization
IRS	Internal Revenue Service
MORE	Making Officer Redeployment Effective
ONDCP	Office of National Drug Control Policy
STOP	Services Training Officers Prosecutors

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

Objectives

Senator Mike DeWine requested that we identify crime technology assistance provided by the federal government to state and local law enforcement agencies. Specifically, for fiscal years 1996 through 1998, Senator DeWine requested that we identify the types and amounts of such assistance provided by the Departments of Justice and the Treasury and the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP). As agreed with the requester, we categorized the assistance into three types: (1) direct funding or grants; (2) access to support services and systems, such as automated criminal history records and forensics laboratories; and (3) in-kind (no-cost) transfers of equipment or other assets.

Definition of “Crime Technology Assistance”

Initially, we conducted a literature search to determine whether there was a commonly accepted definition of “crime technology assistance.” Since our search did not yield a definition, we developed our own by reviewing (1) a then pending bill (S. 2022), which has since been enacted into law,¹ related to crime technology assistance introduced by Senator DeWine during the second session of the 105th Congress, and its legislative history; (2) his request letter to us and subsequent discussions with his staff; (3) the General Services Administration’s Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, a reference source of federal assistance programs, including crime control programs; and (4) Congressional Research Service reports on federal crime control assistance.

Accordingly, our definition of crime technology assistance was the following: “Any technology-related assistance provided to state and local law enforcement agencies, including those of Indian tribes, for establishing and/or improving (1) criminal justice history and/or information systems and specialized support services or (2) the availability of and capabilities to access such services and systems related to identification, information, communications, and forensics.” We discussed this definition with Justice, Treasury, and ONDCP officials, who indicated that the definition was appropriate and would be helpful in their efforts to compile the requested information.

Overview of Scope and Methodology

To determine the types and amounts of crime technology-related assistance for fiscal years 1996 to 1998, we reviewed (1) excerpts from the Budget of the United States Government, Appendices and Analytical Perspectives for fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000, (2) agencies’ fiscal year budget requests, (3) appropriations acts, and (4) budget execution reports provided by the Office of Management and Budget. Also, as noted above, we reviewed the General Services Administration’s Catalog of Federal

¹ P.L. 105-251 (October 9, 1998).

Appendix I
Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

Domestic Assistance (annual editions for 1996 through 1998) and Congressional Research Service reports on federal crime control assistance.

We contacted the Justice, Treasury, and ONDCP components most likely to provide crime technology-related assistance. Within Justice, we contacted

- the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA);
- the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI);
- the Immigration and Naturalization Service;
- the INTERPOL - U.S. National Central Bureau;
- the U.S. Marshals Service;
- the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services; and
- the Office of Justice Programs and its components (i.e., the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Drug Courts Program Office, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Violence Against Women Grants Office).

Within Treasury, we contacted

- the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF);
- the Customs Service;
- the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center;
- the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network;
- the Internal Revenue Service (IRS); and
- the Secret Service.

Within ONDCP, we contacted the Director of the Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center.

From Justice, Treasury, and ONDCP, we obtained and reviewed relevant program descriptions and related explanatory materials, such as catalogs and program plans. Specifically, we reviewed (1) descriptions of grant programs and support services and systems and (2) corresponding funding data prepared by agency officials for this review.

Generally, in this report, our references to state and local law enforcement agencies may include recipients of federal assistance in (1) the 50 states; (2) the District of Columbia; (3) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and (4) where applicable, the U.S. territories of American Samoa and Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Scope and Methodology Regarding Grant Programs

During our review of grant programs, we identified many crime technology projects that were funded by federal grants distributed to entities other than state and local law enforcement agencies. These recipients included federal agencies, private firms, colleges and universities, and others. Specifically, under the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program, 1 percent of authorized appropriations (\$20 million per year) was for law enforcement technologies. According to a National Institute of Justice official, this 1-percent set-aside supported 153 projects during fiscal years 1996 through 1998; and, of this total, 145 projects involved grant funding in which state or local law enforcement agencies did not participate in the specific project at all. Therefore, we did not include grant funding for these 145 projects in the data tables presented in appendix II. However, the other eight projects directly involved state or local law enforcement agencies. For these eight projects, we included grant funding (a total of \$2,325,600) in table II.1.

We determined that, of the three agencies we reviewed, only Justice provided direct grant funding to state and local law enforcement agencies for crime technology assistance. Within Justice, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services and the Office of Justice Programs administered the majority of grant programs that included crime technology assistance. We divided crime technology assistance grants into two categories—single-purpose grants and multipurpose grants.

Single-Purpose Grants

We defined single-purpose grants as those that clearly or completely fell within the definition of crime technology assistance. For single-purpose

grants, Justice was able to identify applicable grants and specifically quantify funding amounts (see table II.1 in app. II).

As table II.1 shows, the National Institute of Justice is one of Justice's components that provided crime technology assistance. The Institute's role includes allocating funds for certain research and development projects that may directly or indirectly involve crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies. For purposes of our review and table II.1, we included the Institute's research and development project costs for only those projects wherein the Institute was able to identify that a state or local law enforcement agency was directly involved or partnered with private firms, companies, universities, or federal agencies. In commenting on a draft of this report, National Institute of Justice officials noted that:

- Such partnerships are difficult to identify and quantify unless the state or local agency is a subgrantee, which is something that is not electronically tracked by the Office of Justice Programs or the National Institute of Justice.
- Also, there are inherent difficulties in using research and development project costs to quantify direct benefits to state and local law enforcement agencies. For instance, partnering arrangements can result in a diffusion of funds among various entities, in contrast to grants made directly to a state or local law enforcement agency. Also, direct benefits may not be immediately realized given that research and development efforts may involve extended time frames and/or may not result in practical implementation.

In further commenting on a draft of this report, National Institute of Justice officials emphasized that, in providing funding input for table II.1, they focused on crime technology assistance that involved information systems or information-sharing systems. The officials noted that the Institute is involved in other crime technology-related projects--such as concealed weapons detection systems and less-than-lethal technologies--that were not included in the funding figures provided to us.

Multipurpose Grants

We defined multipurpose grants as those that could be used for two or more purposes, including crime technology assistance. Since Justice did not have a system to track crime technology assistance, it was unable to determine the exact amount of crime technology assistance provided to state and local law enforcement agencies through multipurpose grants.

However, in many cases, Justice officials were able to estimate the portions or amounts of multipurpose grants that involved technology assistance, as indicated in following sections and reflected in table II.2 in appendix II.

Byrne Formula Grants

Byrne Formula Grants may be used for a total of 26 purpose areas, 8 of which could involve crime technology. According to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, three of these eight purpose areas clearly consisted of crime technology-related activities:

- Purpose area 15(a) was for improving drug-control technology.
- Purpose area 15(b) was for improving criminal justice information systems.
- Purpose area 25 was for developing DNA analysis capabilities.

However, for the other five potentially relevant purpose areas, Justice was unable to estimate the amounts of crime technology assistance provided by the Byrne Formula Grants.² Therefore, regarding these 5 purpose areas, we conducted a file review of Byrne Formula Grants to determine the amount of crime technology assistance provided to the 10 states that received the most Byrne Formula Grants funds during fiscal year 1998. The 10 states (California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas) received nearly half of all Byrne Formula Grants funds during fiscal year 1998. Our findings concerning these 10 states are not statistically projectable to the total universe of recipients.

Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program

According to the Office of Justice Programs, one of seven purpose areas of the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program involves crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies. This purpose area is entitled “equipment and technology” and includes both traditional law enforcement equipment (such as guns, vests, and batons) and crime technology. During fiscal years 1996 through 1998, the Office of Justice Programs obligated approximately \$628 million for equipment and technology. Since the Office of Justice Programs did not specifically track how funding was allocated in the equipment and technology purpose area, it was unable to determine how much of the approximately \$628 million

² The 5 potentially relevant purpose areas are numbers 6, 7, 9, 10, and 26. Purpose area 6 is for improving the investigations of white-collar crime; purpose area 7 is for improving the operational effectiveness of law enforcement; purpose area 9 is for enhancing financial investigative capabilities; purpose area 10 is for improving the operational effectiveness of the courts; and purpose area 26 is for developing antiterrorism training and procuring equipment.

obligated for fiscal years 1996 through 1998 was for traditional law enforcement equipment and how much was for crime technology.

Although the Office of Justice Programs does not specifically track crime technology assistance provided through the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program, it asked grantees to complete reports describing how grantees expended equipment and technology funds. Grantees completing the reports classified their equipment and technology expenditures into 10 subcategories, 5 of which were most likely to include expenditures for crime technology,³ according to the Office of Justice Programs. However, since completion of the expenditure reports was not mandatory, at the time of our review the Office of Justice Programs had received these reports from only 60 percent of the 1996 grantees, about 10 percent of the 1997 grantees, and none of the 1998 grantees. The grantee expenditure reports showed that approximately \$63 million was obligated for equipment and technology during fiscal years 1996 and 1997; and, of this amount, about \$33 million (or 52 percent) was for the 5 crime technology-related categories.

Drug Courts Program Office

This office awarded three categories of grants under the Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program: planning, implementation, and enhancement. According to the Drug Courts Program Office, based on experience to date, “enhancement” grants is the category most likely to involve crime technology, especially grants for management information systems.

The Office of Justice Programs conducted a word search for “crime technology” of Drug Court Discretionary Grants. The word search identified six Drug Court grants that involved crime technology. Office of Justice Programs staff examined the six grants to determine how much funding the grantees planned to allocate specifically for crime technology purposes. Funding for these programs, three in fiscal year 1997 and three in fiscal year 1998, is depicted in table II.2 in appendix II.

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services had four programs that included funding for crime technology assistance: (1) Making Officer Redeployment Effective (MORE), (2) Advancing Community Policing, (3) Problem-Solving Partnerships, and (4) Community Policing to Combat Domestic Violence. Under MORE, grant funds could be used for hiring

³ The Office of Justice Programs described the five relevant subcategories as: (1) communications equipment, (2) lab/forensic/drug-testing equipment, (3) systems hardware, (4) software, and (5) systems improvements.

civilian personnel or obtaining crime technology. However, for purposes of our review, agency officials specifically excluded personnel funding and identified the funding obligated for crime technology during fiscal years 1996 through 1998.

Violence Against Women Grants Office

This Justice office administered two multipurpose grant programs that could involve funding for crime technology: (1) Formula Grants for Law Enforcement and Prosecution, also known as the STOP program, and (2) Discretionary Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies.

The Office of Justice Programs conducted a word search for “crime technology” that identified 4 STOP grants and 62 Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies during fiscal years 1996 through 1998. The Office of Justice Programs reviewed these grants to determine how much grantees planned to specifically allocate for crime technology purposes.

Scope and Methodology Regarding Support Services and Systems

For applicable support services and systems in Justice and Treasury, we asked responsible officials to provide us with funding data regarding usage related to meeting the needs of state and local law enforcement agencies. That is, for criminal history databases, forensics laboratories, and other crime technology-related services and systems, we wanted to know what portions of the federal operating costs were used to support state and local law enforcement. In response, Justice and Treasury officials provided us with estimates for each applicable service and system. (See apps. III and IV.)

Justice: 21 Support Services and Systems

Table III.1 in appendix III presents the 21 relevant Justice support services and systems that we identified. For 15 of these services and systems—that is, those provided by DEA, FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the INTERPOL-U.S. National Central Bureau—Justice officials told us that in most cases they calculated funding estimates by prorating total operating costs (excluding federal salaries and other personnel costs) between federal and state/local law enforcement agencies based on the number of queries or other usage measures.

Justice’s other six relevant support services and systems are under three components—the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and the National Institute of Justice—that are not directly involved in conducting criminal investigations. According to Justice officials, these services and systems were established explicitly to benefit state and local law enforcement agencies. As such, the officials said that

the funding figures provided to us represent total, nonprorated operating costs (excluding personnel costs), even though federal law enforcement agencies can be participants, as is the case with the Regional Information Sharing Systems program.

Treasury: 29 Support
Services and Systems

Table IV.1 in appendix IV presents the 29 relevant Treasury support services and systems that we identified. Personnel costs were not included in any of the funding figures provided us by the Treasury Department agencies.

ATF provided 14 of the 29 support services and systems to state and local law enforcement. For 10 of these 14 support services and systems, ATF prorated the obligated costs of crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies. For the remaining four ATF support services and systems, obligated costs were not prorated because all of these costs supported state and local law enforcement.

The Customs Service provided one relevant support service and system, the Treasury Enforcement Communications System, to state and local law enforcement agencies. Customs prorated its expenditures based on the number of state and local law enforcement transactions relative to the total number of system transactions for each fiscal year from 1996 through 1998.

The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center provided 2 of Treasury's 29 support services and systems to state and local law enforcement agencies. The Center calculated the actual costs of the two training programs provided.

The Financial Crimes Enforcement Network provided one support service and system—the Gateway System—to state and local law enforcement agencies. Since the Gateway system was designed to help state and local law enforcement agencies pursue criminal investigations, all obligations during fiscal years 1996 through 1998 applied to state and local law enforcement.

IRS' National Forensic Laboratory supports criminal investigations related to tax and financial statutes. However, the laboratory has few resources to support state and local law enforcement and does so only under exceptional circumstances. Although no precise records existed regarding assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies, an IRS official estimated that during fiscal years 1996 through 1998, the laboratory incurred annual costs of less than \$1,000.

The Secret Service provided 10 of Treasury's 29 support services and systems. The Secret Service prorated costs for eight of its support services and systems and provided us full or actual costs for the other two (Identification Branch Training and Operation Safe Kids).

Other Federal Support Not Included in Funding Tables

Also, it should be noted that the support services and systems listed in appendixes III and IV do not include certain multiagency intelligence organizations, such as the El Paso Intelligence Center, which was established to collect, process, and disseminate intelligence information concerning illicit drug and currency movement, alien smuggling, weapons trafficking, and related activity. The Center's 15 federal members include various Justice (e.g., DEA and FBI), Treasury (e.g., Customs Service and IRS), and Department of Transportation (e.g., Coast Guard and the Federal Aviation Administration) components; the Departments of the Interior and State; and liaison agencies such as the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Defense. In addition, all 50 states are associate members. The Center accepts queries from federal and state member agencies.

Scope and Methodology Regarding In-Kind Transfers

For their respective organizations, we asked officials at Justice, Treasury, and ONDCP to identify any in-kind transfer programs that provided crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies during fiscal years 1996 through 1998. Responses from the three agencies indicated that only ONDCP had an established, relevant in-kind transfer program (see app. V).

Justice and Treasury officials told us that their agencies generally do not directly transfer excess equipment—whether for crime technology or any other purpose—to state and local law enforcement agencies. However, Treasury officials noted that there have been a few isolated or nonroutine instances whereby some equipment has been given directly to a state or local law enforcement agency. For example, the officials noted that, during fiscal year 1998:

- The Secret Service directly excessed about \$535,000 worth of automated data processing and communications equipment (based on original acquisition cost) to state and local law enforcement agencies.
- The Financial Crimes Enforcement Network directly excessed 186 pieces of computer equipment to state and local law enforcement agencies. The original acquisition cost of this equipment was about \$367,000.
- The Secret Service directly excessed two polygraph instruments (original acquisition costs totaled about \$8,900); one instrument was given to the St. Joseph (MO) Police Department and the other to the Chicago (IL) Police Department.

Also, Justice and Treasury officials told us their agencies routinely make excess equipment available to other users through the General Services Administration, which is to make dispositions in the following priority order: (1) distribution to other federal agencies, (2) donation to state and local agencies, (3) sale to the general public, and (4) donation to nonprofit organizations through a state agency for surplus property. The Justice and Treasury officials said they had no readily available information regarding how much of the excessed equipment was crime technology related and was subsequently received by state and local law enforcement agencies. Similarly, General Services Administration officials told us that their accounting systems could not provide this type of information.

Data Accuracy and Reliability

Generally, we relied on funding information that agency officials provided to us. Since agency accounting systems typically did not track crime technology assistance, agency officials used a number of methods to estimate crime technology assistance. For example, the Office of Justice Programs had its program managers calculate how much crime technology assistance was in the multipurpose grant programs.

We did not fully or independently verify the accuracy and reliability of the funding data provided by agency officials. However, to help ensure the overall quality of the funding data, we

- compared agency responses to primary source documents and attempted to reconcile any differences with agency officials,
- obtained information on and reviewed the processes used by agency officials to calculate the estimated amounts of crime technology assistance, and
- compiled the program and funding information we obtained into matrices and asked agency officials to verify the accuracy of this information.

Finally, we note that the funding figures presented in this report are conservative, particularly regarding multipurpose grants, such as Byrne Formula Grants and Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, because we included only amounts that could be reasonably estimated by agency officials or by our reviews of agency information.

Crime Technology Assistance (Grants) Provided by the Department of Justice

Overview of Department of Justice Grant Programs

This appendix presents information about the types and amounts of crime technology-related grants provided by the Department of Justice to state and local law enforcement agencies during fiscal years 1996 through 1998. Generally, as reflected in the following two sections, we categorized applicable grants as being either single-purpose or multipurpose:

- Single-purpose grants are clearly for crime technology purposes—which can include any number of a wide array of activities under the definition of “crime technology assistance” provided in appendix I.
- Multipurpose grants, distributed funds that could be used by state and local law enforcement agencies for a variety of purposes including, but not limited to, crime technology assistance. Justice officials provided us with estimates of the funding amounts related to crime technology assistance.

The last section in this appendix provides brief descriptions of applicable grant programs.

Single-Purpose Grant Programs

Table II.1 shows the types and amounts of grants provided by Justice components to state and local law enforcement to be used expressly for crime technology-related purposes during fiscal years 1996 through 1998. Grants for these purposes totaled about \$255.1 million for the 3-year period.

Appendix II
Crime Technology Assistance (Grants) Provided by the Department of Justice

Table II.1: Estimated Obligations of Department of Justice Single-Purpose Grants for Crime Technology Provided to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, Fiscal Years 1996 Through 1998

Dollars in thousands

Component and program	1996	1997	1998	Total
Bureau of Justice Assistance				
Drugfire	\$2,166.9	\$1,954.6	\$945.3	\$5,066.8
Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program: Technical assistance and training allocation	0	2,103.2	9,843.8	11,947.0
National White Collar Crime Center	1.3	30.1	74.8	106.2
State Identification Systems Grants Program	0	8,300.0	9,908.0	18,208.0
Subtotal	\$2,168.2	\$12,387.9	\$20,771.9	\$35,328.0
Bureau of Justice Statistics				
National Criminal History Improvement Program	48,895.0	48,048.0	50,230.0	147,173.0
National Sex Offender Registry	0	0	24,255.0	24,255.0
State Justice Statistics Program for Statistical Analysis Centers	1,920.0	1,779.0	1,939.0	5,638.0
Subtotal	\$50,815.0	\$49,827.0	\$76,424.0	\$177,066.0
National Institute of Justice				
Counterterrorism Technology Program	0	1,127.0	1,506.0	2,633.0
Crime Act 1-Percent Set-Aside (funded by Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program)	159.6	1,096.8	1,069.2	2,325.6
Forensic DNA Laboratory Improvement Program ^a	8,750.0	2,952.0	12,281.0	23,983.0
Science and Technology Programs (funds from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services)	3,331.7	0	0	3,331.7
Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System ^b	0	588.0	5,821.5	6,409.5
Subtotal	\$12,241.3	\$5,763.8	\$20,677.7	\$38,682.8
Office of Justice Programs				
Improved Training and Technical Automation Grants	4,062.2	0	0	4,062.2
Justice total	\$69,286.7	\$67,978.7	\$117,873.6	\$255,139.0

^aThe DNA Laboratory Improvement Program is a joint program with the FBI.

^bFiscal year 1998 funding was based on a reimbursement from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Source: GAO summary of data provided by Justice components.

Multipurpose Grant Programs

Table II.2 shows estimates of the funding amounts involving crime technology assistance in multipurpose grants for fiscal years 1996 through 1998. As shown, the funding totaled about \$746.3 million for the 3 years. However, for some of the grant programs, including the Byrne Formula Grant Program and the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program, the amounts shown in the table do not represent all of the applicable funding

involving crime technology. Rather, as indicated below, the amounts are only a partial accounting.

Byrne Formula Grants:
Complete Data for Some
Purpose Areas and Data for 10
States for Other Purpose Areas

State and local law enforcement agencies can use Byrne Formula Grant funds for a total of 26 purpose areas. Sample uses include demand-reduction education programs and improving corrections systems. Eight of the 26 purpose areas could involve crime technology. According to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, three of these eight purpose areas clearly consist of crime technology-related activities (see app. I for more information). The Bureau of Justice Assistance provided us with funding amounts for these 3 purpose areas for all recipients, which totaled about \$183.0 million for the 3 fiscal years, as presented in table II.2.

However, because its accounting systems do not specifically track crime technology assistance as a separate category, the Bureau of Justice Assistance was unable to provide us with an estimate for the other five purpose areas. Thus, for these five purpose areas, we reviewed grant files at the Bureau of Justice Assistance. Due to time constraints, we limited our review to the 10 states that received the largest amounts of Byrne Formula Grant funding in fiscal year 1998. Collectively, these 10 states received 48 percent of total Byrne Formula Grant funding in fiscal year 1998. For these 10 states, we reviewed grants files for fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998. The relevant funding for these five purpose areas (about \$5.0 million total for the 3 years) is also included in table II.2. An analysis of grant files for the other 40 states, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories would likely result in a higher funding total.

Local Law Enforcement Block
Grants Program: Partial Data
from Grantees for Only 2 Years

As shown in table II.2, the funding figures for the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program totaled about \$32.7 million and are based on data from about 60 percent of fiscal year 1996 grantees and about 10 percent of fiscal year 1997 grantees. No data were available for fiscal year 1998. As indicated below, a more thorough accounting would likely result in a higher funding total for this grant program.

According to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, only one purpose area of the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program involves crime technology assistance—that is, the purpose area called “equipment and technology.” However, by the Bureau’s definition, the “equipment” portion of this purpose area does not constitute crime technology assistance. Nonetheless, in response to our request, a Bureau of Justice Assistance official said that the Bureau’s accounting systems could not differentiate this portion of the purpose area from the “technology” portion. Alternatively, the official provided us with the following information:

-
- The equipment and technology purpose area has 10 subcategories. Of these, five subcategories—i.e., those pertaining to systems improvements (data linkage, criminal history records, etc.)—are most likely to include expenditures related to crime technology.
 - For these five subcategories, actual expenditure data have been reported by some grantees for fiscal years 1996 and 1997. Specifically, based on reports from about 60 percent of fiscal year 1996 grantees, actual expenditures by these grantees for the five subcategories totaled about \$28.9 million in 1996. Based on reports from about 10 percent of fiscal year 1997 grantees, actual expenditures by these grantees for the five subcategories totaled about \$3.7 million. There has been no reporting by fiscal year 1998 grantees.

Thus, for the five subcategories, the reported actual expenditures at the time of our review totaled about \$32.7 million, as reflected in table II.2. From these same 1996 and 1997 grantees, the total expenditures reported for all 10 subcategories at the time of our review was about \$63.4 million. The reported actual expenditures for the five crime technology-related subcategories (\$32.7 million) represent about 50 percent of the total reported actual expenditures for the “equipment and technology” purpose area (\$63.4 million). During fiscal years 1996 to 1998, funds obligated for this purpose area totaled about \$628 million. However, the 50-percent figure cannot be used to statistically project how much of this total involved crime technology assistance during fiscal years 1996 through 1998.

Appendix II
Crime Technology Assistance (Grants) Provided by the Department of Justice

Table II.2: Estimated Obligations of Department of Justice Multipurpose Grants With Crime Technology as a Permissible Use Provided to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, Fiscal Years 1996 Through 1998

Dollars in thousands				
Component and program	1996	1997	1998	Total
Bureau of Justice Assistance				
Byrne Discretionary Grants	\$3,667.0	\$1,313.0	\$5,485.0	\$10,465.0
Byrne Formula Grants				
Purpose areas 15(a), 15(b), and 25 ^a	60,536.0	62,196.0	60,273.0	183,005.0
Purpose areas 6,7,9,10, and 26 ^b	337.5	3,033.8	1,585.6	4,956.9
Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program ^c	28,936.8	3,745.1	Not estimated	32,681.9
Subtotal	\$93,477.3	\$70,287.9	\$67,343.6	\$231,108.8
Drug Courts Program Office				
Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program ^d	0	190.6	726.3	916.9
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services				
Advancing Community Policing Grants	0	12,997.6	0	12,997.6
Community Policing to Combat Domestic Violence Grants	7,640.8	0	N/A	7,640.8
Making Officer Redeployment Effective Grants	126,937.1	115,581.7	223,532.6	466,051.4
Problem-Solving Partnerships	0	20,571.7	0	20,571.7
Subtotal	\$134,577.9	\$149,151.0	\$223,532.6	\$507,261.5
Violence Against Women Grants Office				
Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies ^d	5.7	5,953.0	974.0	6,932.7
STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grants ^d	14.0	0	104.4	118.4
Subtotal	\$19.7	\$5,953.0	\$1,078.4	\$7,051.1
Justice total	\$228,074.9	\$225,582.5	\$292,680.9	\$746,338.3

^a The amounts shown represent funding for three purpose areas: Purpose area 15(a) is for improving drug-control technology; purpose area 15(b) is for criminal justice information systems (including a 5-percent set-aside for improving criminal justice records); and purpose area 25 is for developing DNA analysis capabilities.

^b The figures shown are based on our review of grant files for 10 states that received the largest amount of Byrne Formula Grant funding. Funding for these 10 states represented approximately 48 percent of total Byrne funding for fiscal year 1998.

^c The figures shown represent actual expenditures reported by 60 percent of the 1996 grantees and 10 percent of the 1997 grantees. At the time of our review, 1998 grantees had not reported.

^d The figures shown are not obligations. Rather, they are planning amounts submitted by grantees during the application process. The Office of Justice Programs ascertained these amounts by (1) electronically conducting a word search (using the term "crime technology") of applicable grant programs and (2) manually reviewing those files identified by the word search.

Source: GAO summary of data provided by Justice components.

Descriptions of Justice Grant Programs

Brief descriptions of Justice's single-purpose and multipurpose grant programs are given next.

Single-Purpose Grants

Following are brief descriptions of the Justice single-purpose grants listed in table II.1. The grant programs are grouped by the applicable Justice component.

Bureau of Justice Assistance

The Bureau of Justice Assistance provided the following grants for crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies.

- Drugfire: This program consists of a “reimbursable agreement” from the FBI under which the Bureau of Justice Assistance administers grants to state and local law enforcement to purchase Drugfire software, equipment, and training. Drugfire is a database system providing the ability to exchange and compare images of fired ammunition casings and bullets. The database is capable of connecting shootings based on a comparison and matching of firearms-related evidence.
- Local Law Enforcement Block Grants - Technical Assistance and Training Allocation: This allocation supports investigative personnel in using surveillance equipment and information systems applications. The program also provides for technology training.
- National White Collar Crime Center: The Center provides limited “case funding” assistance to states and localities to track and investigate white-collar crimes. The focus is on improving information-sharing capabilities in multijurisdictional investigations.
- State Identification Systems Grants Program: These are formula grants to states to develop computerized identification systems integrated with FBI’s national identification databases. The FBI reimburses the Bureau of Justice Assistance to administer programs to integrate state systems with the national DNA database (CODIS), the National Crime Information Center, and the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System.

Bureau of Justice Statistics

The Bureau of Justice Statistics provided the following grants for crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies.

- National Criminal History Improvement Program: This program helps states upgrade the quality and completeness of criminal records and provides increased compatibility with and access to national crime information databases. A priority is to ensure that state criminal history records are complete and ready for access through the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.
- National Sex Offender Registry: This is a component of the National Criminal History Improvement Program but is separately funded. States use funds to identify, collect, and disseminate information on sexual

offenders within their jurisdictions. Funds are also available to enhance state access to the FBI's sex offender database.

- State Justice Statistics Program for Statistical Analysis Centers: This program is designed to provide financial support to supplement state funding of a central state criminal justice statistics capability to carry out data collection and research that can benefit both the state and the nation. Grants are awarded to state statistics centers for data collection and analysis relating to identifiable themes, including technology-based research focusing on the analysis and use of machine-readable criminal history record data for tracking case-processing decisions, evaluation of record systems management, or studies related to the use of records to limit or control firearms acquisition by ineligible individuals.

National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice provided the following grants for crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies.

- Counterterrorism Technology Program: This program assists state and local law enforcement by developing technologies to combat terrorism and improve public safety. The funding amounts presented in table II.1 are for a project (the "InfoTech" project) to develop a technology to allow law enforcement agencies to share information using their existing systems and networks.
- Crime Act 1-Percent Set-Aside: Under the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program, 1 percent (\$20 million) per year--of the \$2 billion annual authorizations for fiscal years 1996 through 1998--were set aside for use by the National Institute of Justice for new law enforcement technologies. According to National Institute of Justice officials, this 1-percent set-aside supported 153 projects during the 3 fiscal years; and, of this total, 8 projects directly benefited state or local law enforcement agencies.¹ Funding for these eight projects (about \$2,325,600) is reflected in table II.1.
- Forensic DNA Laboratory Improvement Program: This program is for improving the quality and availability of DNA analysis for law enforcement identification, such as by expanding on-line capabilities with the national DNA database.
- Science and Technology Programs: This broad grant category supports research, development, and evaluation of approaches, techniques, and systems to improve the criminal justice system. Funded by a transfer of funds from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, state and local law enforcement grantees test and implement crime-fighting technologies that serve a community policing function.

¹ Regarding the other 145 projects, as mentioned in appendix I, grant recipients were federal agencies, private firms, colleges and universities, and others.

-
- Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System: These grants can be used to construct or improve state databases, build interface capabilities with the overall information system, and help procure hardware and consulting services.

Office of Justice Programs

Improved Training and Technical Automation Grants: This is a general technology assistance program focusing on communications and information integration. Grant purposes include improving communications systems, establishing or improving ballistics identification programs, increasing access to automated fingerprint identification systems, and improving computerized collection of criminal records. This program transferred funds for the FBI's Law Enforcement On-Line program in fiscal year 1996, which are reflected in table III.1.

Multipurpose Grants

Following are brief descriptions of Justice's multipurpose grants listed in table II.2. Multipurpose grants have numerous criminal justice purposes established by law. State and local law enforcement can use the respective funds for a number of activities, including crime technology. The grant programs are grouped by the applicable Justice component.

Bureau of Justice Assistance

- Byrne Discretionary Grants: These grants are authorized to be awarded to state and local law enforcement, as well as private entities, for crime control and violence prevention activities. The grant program focuses specifically on education and training for criminal justice personnel, technical assistance, multijurisdictional projects (e.g., state records integration), and program demonstrations. Grants also support research and development projects.
- Byrne Formula Grants: States receive federal funds to improve the functioning of criminal justice systems. Amounts are based on a set percentage (0.25) per state, with the remaining funds allocated based on state population. Eligible uses of funds are categorized by 26 program purpose areas. Of these, eight contain or could encompass crime technology assistance. Three of these purpose areas—criminal justice information systems, drug-control technology, and DNA analysis—are singularly allocated for crime technology assistance. Included in the criminal justice information systems purpose area is the 5 percent of Byrne funds that states must allocate toward improving criminal justice records. In the remaining five purpose areas, a portion of funds could potentially be spent on crime technology.
- Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program: General purpose law enforcement grants are distributed directly to localities. The amounts are determined by the number of violent crimes reported in the jurisdiction. The program has seven broad purpose areas. Of those, one contains a

specific funding stream for procuring equipment and technology. Funds cannot be used to purchase or lease tanks, fixed-wing aircraft, or other large items without direct law enforcement uses.

Drug Courts Program Office

Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program: This program provides financial and technical assistance to states and localities to develop and implement drug treatment courts that use a mix of treatment, testing, incentives, and sanctions to remove nonviolent offenders from the cycle of substance abuse and crime. Grant recipients can use funds to support the development of information management systems and accompanying software. Data sharing among drug courts is a primary focus.

Office of Community Oriented
Policing Services

- Advancing Community Policing: These grants assist state and local law enforcement in further developing community policing infrastructures. Grants can be used to purchase technology and equipment, statistical and crime-mapping software, and training services. Also, grants can be used to help law enforcement agencies overcome organizational obstacles and to establish demonstration centers that model current community policing methods.
- Community Policing to Combat Domestic Violence: These grants fund innovative community policing efforts to curb domestic violence by developing partnerships between law enforcement agencies and community organizations.
- Making Officer Redeployment Effective Grants: This program serves a broad purpose of increasing the deployment of law enforcement officers devoted to community policing by expanding available officer time without hiring new officers. Grants can be used to purchase equipment and technology to free up community policing resources. Grants fund up to 75 percent of the cost of equipment and technology, with a 25-percent local match.
- Problem-Solving Partnerships: These grants fund problem-solving partnerships between police agencies and community organizations to address persistent crime problems, such as drug dealing and other public disorder problems. Grants can be used for technology training and procurement of equipment.

Violence Against Women
Grants Office

- Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies: This grant program encourages states and localities to increase law enforcement attention to domestic abuse. Grants can support development of integrated computer tracking systems as well as provide training for police to improve tracking of domestic violence cases.

-
- STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grants: These formula grants are for creating a “coordinated, integrated” strategy involving all elements of the criminal justice system to respond to violent crimes against women. Broad program purposes include training for law enforcement and developing and implementing “services” to effectively address violent crimes against women.

Crime Technology Assistance (Support Services and Systems) Provided by the Department of Justice

Overview of Department of Justice Support Services and Systems

Department of Justice components provided crime technology assistance in the form of access to and use of specialized support services and systems. Table III.1 shows the specific types of assistance provided by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, DEA, FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the INTERPOL-U.S. National Central Bureau, and the National Institute of Justice. As shown, regarding support services and systems, Justice's crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies for fiscal years 1996 to 1998 totaled about \$146.6 million. Marshals Service officials told us that their organization did not have support services and systems that provided crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement.

The last section of this appendix provides brief descriptions of the support services and systems presented in table III.1.

Appendix III
Crime Technology Assistance (Support Services and Systems) Provided by the Department of Justice

Table III.1: Estimated Obligations of Department of Justice Support Services and Systems Provided to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, Fiscal Years 1996 Through 1998

Dollars in thousands

Justice component	Assistance	1996	1997	1998	Total
Bureau of Justice Assistance					
	National Cybercrime Training Partnership	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 3,278.0	\$ 3,278.0
	National White Collar Crime Center	864.3	1,822.1	2,400.6	5,087.0
	Regional Information Sharing Systems ^a	13,610.6	13,407.8	23,295.0	50,313.4
Subtotal		\$14,474.9	\$15,229.9	\$28,973.6	\$58,678.4
Bureau of Justice Statistics					
	National Incident-Based Reporting System	0	0	955.4	955.4
DEA					
	Forensic laboratory analysis for District of Columbia Metropolitan Police	94.6	103.3	110.8	308.7
	National Drug Pointer Index	0	45.0	35.5	80.5
	Training	647.1	1,580.7	1,215.2	3,443.0
Subtotal		\$741.7	\$1729.0	\$1,361.5	\$3,832.2
FBI					
	Combined DNA Index System	5,334.8	5,247.9	6,144.1	16,726.8
	Computer Analysis Response Team	694.8	1,180.0	1,387.3	3,262.1
	Criminal Justice Information Services Wide Area Network ^b	0	0	153.7	153.7
	Express	0	0	20.8	20.8
	Fingerprint Identification Program ^b	422.2	3,236.3	3,001.2	6,659.7
	Identification Automated System ^b	401.6	644.0	1,042.4	2,088.0
	Law Enforcement On-Line	4,932.8	200.0	7,500.0	12,632.8
	National Crime Information Center ^b	3,631.0	3,664.3	3,783.0	11,078.3
	National Integrated Ballistics Information Network	1,476.3	1,424.4	2,712.5	5,613.2
	Training ^c	407.5	569.3	628.5	1,605.3
Subtotal		\$17,301.0	\$16,166.2	\$26,373.5	\$59,840.7
INS					
	Law Enforcement Support Center	1,177.2	583.6	1,656.1	3,416.9
INTERPOL -U.S. National Central Bureau					
	State Liaison Program	654.0	583.0	773.0	2,010.0
National Institute of Justice					
	National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Centers	2,598.4	3,954.5	4,747.5	11,300.4
	Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System ^d	0	2,705.6	3,840.2	6,545.8
Subtotal		\$ 2,598.4	\$ 6,660.1	\$ 8,587.7	\$17,846.2
Total		\$36,947.2	\$40,951.8	\$68,680.8	\$146,579.8

^aThe figures shown do not include program income (user fees)--about \$3.2 million in total--collected by the six centers during fiscal years 1996 through 1998.

^bThe amounts shown are actual expenditures.

Appendix III

Crime Technology Assistance (Support Services and Systems) Provided by the Department of Justice

^c Training consists of Forensic Services training (in obligations) and Criminal Justice Information Services training (in expenditures).

^d Fiscal year 1997 funding was based on an earmark from the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program. Fiscal year 1998 funding was based on an earmark on grant funds administered by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Source: GAO summary of data provided by Justice components.

Descriptions of Justice's Support Services and Systems

Following are brief descriptions of Justice's crime technology assistance programs listed in table III.1. The descriptions are based on information that the Justice components provided to us. The services and systems are grouped by the component providing them.

Bureau of Justice Assistance

- **National Cybercrime Training Partnership**: To address the changing role of computers and the Internet in the commission of crimes, the National Cybercrime Training Partnership supports all levels of law enforcement with "cyber-tools, research, and development." The Partnership is developing a nationwide communications network to serve law enforcement by providing secure "interconnectivity" over the Internet. Also, the Partnership focuses on training by (1) developing a cadre of instructors capable of training law enforcement and (2) distributing nontraditional modes of curricula, such as CD-ROMs, among other things. In addition, the Partnership plans to serve as a clearinghouse for information and experts available to law enforcement.
- **National White Collar Crime Center**: Headquartered in Richmond, VA, the center maintains a national support system for state and local law enforcement to facilitate multijurisdictional investigations of white-collar and economic crimes. The center operates a training and research institute that serves as a national resource for fighting economic crime.
- **Regional Information Sharing Systems**: Six regional criminal intelligence centers focus on multijurisdictional criminal activities. Each center operates in a mutually exclusive geographic area, a division designed to more effectively support investigation and prosecution of regional crimes. State and local law enforcement support services and systems include an Intelligence Pointer Database, a National Gang Database (under development), and a secure intranet. All six centers are electronically connected, and state and local members (about 87 percent of total membership as of December 31, 1997) are provided with access to the secure intranet, which facilitates secure E-mail transmissions and access to other databases. The centers also sponsor technical training

conferences. Member jurisdictions can be assessed a nominal annual fee that varies by center.

Bureau of Justice Statistics

National Incident-Based Reporting System: This system represents the next generation of crime data from federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies. Designed to replace the Uniform Crime Reporting Program initiated by the FBI in 1930, the development of the National Incident-Based Reporting System represents a joint effort of the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the FBI to encourage the presentation of higher quality data on a wider variety of crimes. The Bureau of Justice Statistics has played a significant role in fostering participation and developing techniques to assist jurisdictions in conforming to program requirements. Also, the Bureau of Justice Statistics funds the operation of a dedicated website and the formulation of model analytic strategies.

Drug Enforcement
Administration

DEA provided the following crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies.

- Forensic laboratory analysis, District of Columbia Metropolitan Police: One of eight forensic laboratories located throughout the United States, the DEA's Mid-Atlantic Laboratory provides forensic support to the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police.
- National Drug Pointer Index: This system provides participating law enforcement agencies with an automated response capability to determine if a case suspect is under active investigation by any other participating agency. If a match occurs, the system provides point-of-contact information for each identified record. Simultaneously, the system notifies each record owner that point-of-contact information has been released to the entry maker for that particular target. If the search finds no matching records, a negative response is returned.
- Training: DEA provided three training courses that were applicable to our definition of crime technology assistance. The Clandestine Laboratory Unit and the Specialized Training Unit both provided training on topics such as how to use technological devices to assess risks presented by chemicals found in laboratories. DEA also provided briefings to state and local law enforcement personnel on the National Drug Pointer Index and its benefits.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

The FBI Laboratory, which is one of the largest and most comprehensive forensic laboratories in the world, and the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Division provided various support services and systems to state and local law enforcement agencies.

- Combined DNA Index System: An index containing DNA records from persons convicted of crimes. State and local crime laboratories are able to store and match DNA records.
- Computer Analysis Response Team: Technical assistance regarding computer technology and computer forensics is provided to federal as well as state and local law enforcement agencies.
- Criminal Justice Information Wide Area Network: This network supports the electronic capture, submission, processing, matching, storage, and retrieval of both criminal and civil fingerprints received by the FBI for use in the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System environment.
- Express: An explosives reference database, Express provides and correlates information from bombing crime scenes and undetonated explosive devices.
- Fingerprint Identification Program: An identification process that scans fingerprint cards and captures fingerprint features for classification and selects candidates for future manual comparison.
- Identification Automated System: A system containing the criminal history records of persons arrested for the first time and reported to the FBI since July 1974, as well as selected manual records that have been converted to the automated system.
- Law Enforcement On-Line: As the intranet for the U.S. law enforcement community, Law Enforcement On-Line links all levels of law enforcement throughout the United States and supports broad, immediate dissemination of information. Learning programs through electronic sources are also delivered to local, state, and federal law enforcement through this intranet.
- National Crime Information Center: This is the nation's most extensive computerized criminal justice information system. It consists of a central computer at FBI headquarters, dedicated telecommunications lines, and a coordinated network of federal and state criminal justice information

systems. The center provides users with access to files on wanted persons, stolen vehicles, and missing persons. The system's largest file, the Interstate Identification Index, provides access to millions of criminal history information records contained in state systems.

- National Integrated Ballistics Information Network: A joint effort between the FBI and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, this national database computer system allows laboratories across the country to exchange and compare images of fired ammunition casings. The images of microscopic marks that result after a gun is fired are stored in this database.
- Training: The FBI Laboratory and the Criminal Justice Information Services Division's Education/Training Services Unit provide training to the law enforcement community. Forensic laboratory training includes a variety of topics such as management of forensic and technical services; identification and comparison of latent fingerprints; explosives detection; postblast bombing investigations; and responding to and resolving the scientific, forensic, and technical elements of incidents involving chemical, biological, and nuclear materials.

The Criminal Justice Information Services Division provides training on, among other things, the National Crime Information Center, Uniform Crime Reports, and the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System.

Immigration and Naturalization Service

The Law Enforcement Support Center is accessible 24 hours a day to the criminal justice community. The center provides state and local law enforcement agencies with the ability to exchange information on the immigration status of foreign-born suspects under arrest or investigation. Information requests are submitted through the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System. Upon receipt of an inquiry, the center searches INS and other criminal databases and transmits the findings to the requester. Also, the center provides an important source of information to each state conducting firearms purchaser inquiries stemming from the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (Brady Act). State firearms points of contact may query the center on prospective gun purchasers and receive a "proceed" or "deny" recommendation using the disqualifying criteria mandated by the Brady Act.

INTERPOL – U.S. National Central Bureau

INTERPOL- U.S. National Central Bureau is a resource for state and local law enforcement agencies to conduct international investigations. The bureau is electronically connected through a secure network to the national police agencies of 177 INTERPOL member countries and the INTERPOL General Secretariat (headquarters) in Lyons, France. Also, the bureau communicates with state offices that have liaisons responsible for contacting foreign police. Coordination between the liaison offices and member countries is maintained through the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System.

National Institute of Justice

- National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Centers: The five regional centers and one national center identify and evaluate available technologies to determine law enforcement suitability, facilitate public/private partnerships to develop new technologies, and provide technology and information assistance to law enforcement and corrections agencies by introducing promising new technologies and providing technology training. According to a National Institute of Justice official, while the centers do not directly transfer crime technology, they serve as (1) brokers between crime technology manufacturers and state and local jurisdictions and (2) an information resource for law enforcement agencies.
- Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System: A secure law enforcement information sharing system that connects intelligence databases of four southwest border states (Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas); the three Regional Information Sharing Systems centers in that area; and the El Paso Intelligence Center. This system provides for secure E-mail transmissions and includes a preestablished query system. The system allows all participants to query the databases of all other participants and is composed of an administrative web server that offers key electronic services, such as providing agency contact information and system usage statistics.

Crime Technology Assistance (Support Services and Systems) Provided by the Department of the Treasury

Overview of Department of the Treasury Support Services and Systems

Department of the Treasury components provided crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies in the form of access to, and use of, specialized support services and systems, such as computerized databases and forensics laboratories. Treasury components also provided training on the use of technology-related equipment to state and local law enforcement agencies. Table IV.1 shows the specific types of crime technology assistance provided by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; the Customs Service; the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center; the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; IRS; and the Secret Service. As shown, Treasury's crime technology assistance for fiscal years 1996 to 1998 totaled about \$15.9 million.

The last section in this appendix provides brief descriptions of applicable support services and systems.

Table IV.1: Estimated Obligations of Department of the Treasury Support Services and Systems Provided to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, Fiscal Years 1996 Through 1998

Dollars in thousands

Treasury component	Assistance	1996	1997	1998	Total
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms					
	Accelerant Detection Analysis	\$ 816.0	\$639.0	\$1,292.0	\$2,747.0
	Advanced Serial Case Management	46.0	37.0	58.0	141.0
	Arson CD-ROM	0	0	375.0	375.0
	Arson/Explosives Incident System	97.0	2,614.0	835.0	3,546.0
	Consolidated Gang Database	4.0	0	0	4.0
	Dipole Study	150.0	150.0	150.0	450.0
	Electronic Facial Identification Technique	15.0	15.0	15.0	45.0
	Explosive Forensics	163.0	127.0	258.0	548.0
	Federal Firearms License System	9.0	0	9.0	18.0
	Firearms Tracing System	768.0	507.0	1,216.0	2,491.0
	Integrated Ballistics Identification System	0	499.0	902.0	1,401.0
	National (Arson and Explosives) Repository	0	243.0	243.0	486.0
	National Response Team	250.0	250.0	250.0	750.0
	Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative	0	255.0	150.0	405.0
Subtotal		\$2,318.0	\$5,336.0	\$5,753.0	\$13,407.0
Customs Service					
	Treasury Enforcement Communications System	1.2	1.6	1.7	4.5
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center					
	Advanced Airborne Counterdrug Operations Training Program	0	7.6	0	7.6
	Airborne Counterdrug Operations Training Program	30.7	46.0	76.8	153.5

**Appendix IV
Crime Technology Assistance (Support Services and Systems) Provided by the Department
of the Treasury**

Treasury component	Assistance	1996	1997	1998	Total
Subtotal		\$30.7	\$53.6	\$76.8	\$161.1
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network	Project Gateway	472.7	621.6	518.3	1,612.6
Internal Revenue Service	National Forensic Laboratory	negligible ^a	negligible ^a	negligible ^a	negligible ^a
Secret Service	Audio/Image Enhancement	1.2	1.3	2.8	5.3
	Automated Fingerprint Identification System	5.9	5.8	4.5	16.2
	Cellular Tracking Project	0	0	65.0	65.0
	Computer Forensic Support	0	40.0	220.0	260.0
	Electronic Crimes Branch Support	60.0	30.0	20.0	110.0
	Encryption	0	0	70.0	70.0
	Identification Branch Training	21.8	33.3	9.1	64.2
	"Operation Safe Kids"	0	15.4	5.1	20.5
	Polygraph examinations	6.4	8.5	7.0	21.9
	Questioned Document Branch	33.1	23.3	27.0	83.4
Subtotal		\$128.4	\$157.6	\$430.5	\$716.5
Total		\$2,951.0	\$6,170.4	\$6,780.3	\$15,901.7

^aAccording to an IRS official, the cost of providing laboratory assistance was less than \$1,000 per year.

Source: GAO summary of data provided by Treasury components.

Descriptions of Treasury's Support Services and Systems

Following are brief descriptions of the Treasury's crime technology assistance programs listed in table IV.1. The descriptions are based on information that the Treasury components provided to us. The services and systems are grouped by the component providing them.

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms

ATF provided the following types of crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies:

- **Accelerant Detection Analysis:** The laboratory analysis of fire debris to detect and identify flammable liquids potentially used as accelerants in an incendiary fire. ATF has offered on-site training in fire debris analysis to analysts from state and local laboratories and is currently assisting in fire debris analysis training provided by the National Fire Safety Training Center.
- **Advanced Serial Case Management:** A case management and lead-tracking database designed to accept large volumes of data. The database analyzes information to assist investigators in identifying trends, patterns, and investigative leads for major federal or state incidents.

- Arson CD-ROM: An interactive training tool, the CD-ROM/virtual reality training program is designed to elevate the overall investigative competency levels of all fire investigators in the United States and establish a consistent standard for fire investigation.
- Arson/Explosives Incident System: A clearinghouse for data collected from several agencies. The system produces statistical and investigative data that can be used real-time by arson and bomb investigators. State and local agencies can query the system for things such as component parts, stolen explosives, and device placement.
- Consolidated Gang Database: A database to track various types of information about outlaw motorcycle gangs, street and ethnic gangs, and antigovernment groups involved in criminal activity. Data are compiled from ATF investigative reports and state and local law enforcement agencies.
- Dipole Study: The Dipole Study is intended to assist state, local, and federal explosives investigators and building designers. For courtroom presentation purposes, the study produced a software package that will allow investigators to support their theory of an explosion and explain blast damage and fragmentary damage.
- Electronic Facial Identification Technique: A specialized software program that allows operators to create composite sketches of suspected perpetrators or unidentified persons who surface as suspects or potential witnesses during an investigation.
- Explosive Forensics: Examination of debris collected at the scene of an explosion or of suspected explosive material obtained from recovery or undercover purchase.
- Federal Firearms License System: The primary objective of this system is to produce a relational database of firearms and explosives licensing information. This system allows users to search for licensing information. On a semiannual basis, information is provided to state and local police departments identifying the federal firearms licensees in their geographical area of responsibility.
- Firearms Tracing System: The National Tracing Center traces firearms for federal, state, local, and foreign law enforcement agencies. The firearms are traced from the manufacturer to the retail purchaser.
- Integrated Ballistics Identification System: A system that allows firearms technicians to digitize and automatically correlate and compare bullet and shell casing signatures. The equipment quickly provides investigators with leads to solve greater numbers of crimes.
- National (Arson and Explosives) Repository: A database, the repository contains information regarding arson incidents and the actual and suspected criminal misuse of explosives throughout the United States.

The information will be available for statistical analysis and research, investigative leads, and intelligence.

- National Response Team: The National Response Team was established to assist state and local police and fire departments in investigating large-scale fires and explosions.
- Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative: This initiative is a focused component of the federal effort to combat firearms trafficking. Working with state and local law enforcement agencies, the tracing of crime guns provides leads to interdict the trafficking of firearms to youths and juveniles. Among other things, this initiative makes ATF's firearms trace capabilities and data more accessible to state and local law enforcement agencies.

Customs Service

The Treasury Enforcement Communications System has three programs that provide crime technology-related assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies:

- Diplomatic Licensing and Registration Program: Users may query vehicle registration and drivers license information for persons and vehicles licensed by the Department of State.
- Aircraft Registration and Tracking: Users may query information about aircraft registered with the Federal Aviation Administration.
- Bank Secrecy Act Program: Provides information to state agencies responsible for enforcing state money laundering statutes.

Federal Law Enforcement Training Center

The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center provides two training programs involving use of crime technology-related equipment:

- Advanced Airborne Counterdrug Operations Training Program: This program provides students with the opportunity to use technical equipment in darkness.
- Airborne Counterdrug Operations Training Program: This program teaches students how to use equipment such as global positioning hand-held devices and thermal imaging systems.

Financial Crimes
Enforcement Network

Project Gateway: Established to facilitate the exchange of Bank Secrecy Act information with state and local law enforcement agencies.⁴ Gateway incorporates custom-designed software to provide designated state coordinators with rapid and direct on-line electronic access to Bank Secrecy Act records, including suspicious activity reports.

Internal Revenue
Service

National Forensic Laboratory: The laboratory primarily supports IRS criminal investigations involving violations of federal tax law and related financial crimes. According to IRS officials, a limited or negligible amount of support (less than \$1,000 per year) is provided to state and local law enforcement. However, when provided, forensic support or assistance may include (1) document and handwriting analyses, (2) polygraph examinations, and (3) audio/video surveillance tape enhancements.

Secret Service

The Secret Service provided the following types of crime technology assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies:

- Audio/Image Enhancement: Audio enhancements include 911 calls, telephone answering machine recordings, court recordings, and gunfire analysis. Image enhancements include images obtained from surveillance cameras that recorded robberies of stores, banks, and ATMs, as well as devices that recorded homicides in a variety of locations.
- Automated Fingerprint Identification System: This hybrid network of state and local digitized fingerprint databases provides in excess of 20 million fingerprint records to be searched by the Secret Service's Identification Branch.
- Cellular Tracking Project: Equipment is used to track cellular telephones. The system is capable of identifying the suspect's location. This system is made available to federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies upon request and, according to Secret Service officials, has proven to be very successful in cases where state and local law enforcement officials have requested this Secret Service equipment and expertise in murder, carjacking, and kidnapping cases.
- Computer Forensic Support: Forensic examination of electronic evidence is provided through the Electronic Crimes Special Agent Program. Special agents, among other things, assist state and local law enforcement

⁴ Enacted in 1970, the Bank Secrecy Act requires, among other things, financial institutions to maintain records and report certain domestic currency transactions and cross-border transportation of currency. One purpose of such records and reports was to create a paper trail for investigators' use in tracing illicit funds.

agencies in the examination of computers, computer systems, electronic communication systems, telecommunication systems and devices, electronic organizers, scanners, and other devices manufactured to intercept or duplicate telecommunications services.

- Electronic Crimes Branch Support: This branch supports law enforcement investigations involving computers, computer systems intrusions, electronic communication systems, and telecommunication systems and devices. Among the branch's duties are the oversight of all telecommunications and computer fraud cases; establishment and operation of a forensic laboratory to process electronically stored data and telecommunications devices; and coordination of training initiatives for field office investigators, state and local police, and industry representatives.
- Encryption: Assistance is provided to state and local law enforcement agencies in decoding encrypted computer files.
- Identification Branch Training: This branch provides training to state and local law enforcement agencies on appropriate methods for operating computerized fingerprinting systems.
- Operation Safe Kids: This program is sponsored by the Secret Service at the request of state and local law enforcement agencies. Operation Safe Kids uses digital cameras and fingerprint scanning technology to provide parents with a printed document that contains a photograph and thumbprints of their child.
- Polygraph examinations: The Secret Service's Polygraph Branch conducts polygraph examinations regarding criminal activities ranging from embezzlement to child molestation and homicide.
- Questioned Document Branch: Four branch sections (document examination, instrumental analysis, document authentication, and automated recognition) provide forensic science support. The branch maintains three databases that can support state and local law enforcement:
 1. The Forensic Information System for Handwriting is a software system where known and unknown writing samples are scanned, digitized, and subjected to mathematical algorithms against authors maintained in the database.

Appendix IV
Crime Technology Assistance (Support Services and Systems) Provided by the Department of the Treasury

-
2. The Watermark Collection database contains over 23,000 watermarks enabling the identification of partial as well as complete watermarks. This database is updated several times a year as the paper industry submits new and updated watermarks.
 3. The Ink Collection database contains over 7,500 inks dating back to the 1920s. Chemical analysis of these inks allows for differentiation and identification of the first date a particular entry could have been made based on the first commercial availability date of the writing ink. This database is updated yearly through submissions from the ink industry.

Crime Technology Assistance (In-Kind Transfers) Provided by the Office of National Drug Control Policy

Mission of ONDCP's Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center

ONDCP's Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center (CTAC) was established to serve as the central counterdrug enforcement research and development organization of the U.S. government. CTAC was established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (P.L. 101-510), which amended the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 and placed CTAC under the operating authority of the Director of ONDCP and required that CTAC be headed by a Chief Scientist of Counterdrug Technology.¹

CTAC's mission is to advance technologies that support the national drug control goals by improving the effectiveness of law enforcement, drug interdiction, and substance abuse treatment research. As part of its mission, CTAC is to identify and define the scientific and technological needs of federal, state, and local drug enforcement agencies. According to ONDCP officials, in fiscal year 1998, CTAC implemented the Technology Transfer Pilot Program to assist state and local law enforcement agencies.

Overview of Technology Transfer Pilot Program

According to ONDCP officials, for fiscal year 1998, the Technology Transfer Pilot Program involved 18 projects or systems that fit our definition of crime technology assistance. However, only 15 of these projects or systems were transferred or provided to state and local law enforcement agencies. According to the CTAC Director, as of December 1998, these 15 projects or systems involved a total of 202 recipient state and local law enforcement agencies. As table V.1 shows, the fiscal year 1998 obligations for these 15 projects or systems totaled \$13 million.

Table V.1: ONDCP Crime Technology Assistance Provided to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, Fiscal Year 1998

Dollars in thousands	
Systems Provided Under the Technology Transfer Pilot Program	
Program	Obligations
Air-Ground Surveillance Management System	\$ 1,500.0
Body Worn	550.0
Borderline with VoiceBox System	1,750.0
Data Locator System	250.0
Drugwipe	150.0
GLADYS ^a	350.0
Mini-Buster Contraband Detector	1,300.0
Money Laundering Software	250.0
Signcutter	\$250.0
Small Look	850.0
Tactical Speech Collection and Analysis System	150.0
Thermal Imagers	1,500.0
Vapor Tracer	1,800.0
Video Stabilization System	200.0

¹Drug Control: Planned Actions Should Clarify Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center's Impact (GAO/GGD-98-28, Feb. 3, 1998).

Appendix V
Crime Technology Assistance (In-Kind Transfers) Provided by the Office of National Drug Control Policy

Systems Provided Under the Technology Transfer Pilot Program	Obligations
Wireless Interoperability System	1,400.0
Total	\$13,000.0

^a According to an ONDCP official, GLADYS is not an acronym; rather, the system's title is based upon a fictional person's name.

Source: GAO summary of data provided by ONDCP.

The Technology Transfer Pilot Program matched CTAC-sponsored systems with state or local law enforcement agency requirements and arranged for the transfer of those systems. In order to participate in the program, state and local law enforcement agencies submitted letters and a completed ONDCP questionnaire. When awarded, the recipients received a technical team, training, and technical assistance that was directly related to the technology product. The U.S. Army Electronic Proving Ground at Fort Huachuca, AZ, assisted CTAC by managing the Technology Transfer Pilot Program and providing engineering expertise in communications and electronics.

Descriptions of Applicable Systems

The following are descriptions of the 15 CTAC crime technology assistance systems (see table V.1) that were transferred to state and local law enforcement agencies in fiscal year 1998.

- Air-Ground Surveillance Management System: This technology provides the ability to track and locate both field units (friendly assets) and suspects (targets) using a variety of remote sensors. Tracking and other information is graphically displayed and archived on a moving map display at the base station.
- Body Worn: A miniaturized audio device (body wire). The secure multichannel transmitter, with voice privacy and low probability of detection capabilities, can be worn inconspicuously during covert operations.
- Borderline With Voicebox System: A telephone intercept monitoring and recording system. The system digitally records telephone conversations, faxes, and computer data, plus any short notes typed by the monitor/operator. The recordings are then available for review and transcription and use in investigations.
- Data Locator System: A software package that provides secure exchange of electronic mail, database input and extraction, and police intelligence analysis information over a standard internet connection.
- Drugwipe: A surface residue test kit that identifies trace amounts of cannabis, cocaine, opiates, and amphetamines. Evidence of narcotic materials is identified by color change.

- GLADYS: A computer-based system that uses telephone company billing records to analyze cellular phone traffic.
- Mini-Buster Contraband Detector: A portable contraband detection kit. A “Buster” detector indicates differences in density encountered when moved across a surface. The kit includes an ultrasonic range finder that measures distances up to 90 feet within 1-inch accuracy for detection of false walls or bulkheads. The flexible fiber optic scope contains a portable light source for remote viewing inside inaccessible spaces such as fuel tanks.
- Money Laundering Software: A software package used to detect suspicious financial transactions. The software identifies underlying patterns and trends associated with money laundering, including suspicious financial transactions within complex data sources, such as state and bank activities involving money transfers and currency exchanges.
- Signcutter: A system that tracks and locates vehicles using a tracking unit based on Global Positioning System technology. The unit may be used to track law enforcement vehicles or covertly track a “suspect” vehicle.
- Small Look: A miniaturized video surveillance system consisting of a miniature, solid-state electronic camera system. It captures, processes, and stores hundreds of digital picture images in nonvolatile memory.
- Tactical Speech Collection and Analysis System: A voice identification system that can store up to 25 voice samples on the system’s hard drive.
- Thermal Imagers: An infrared imaging surveillance system that provides night vision capabilities. Real-time video pictures are generated in all lighting conditions when the unit senses heat.
- Vapor Tracer: A hand-held detection system, this device is capable of detecting and identifying extremely small quantities of narcotics and explosives. This system works by drawing a sample of vapor into the detector where it is heated, ionized, and identified.
- Video Stabilization System: A surveillance video enhancement system. The system is used to eliminate jitter and camera motion, typically associated with surveillance video.
- Wireless Interoperability System: A computer-based interagency radio communications switching system. Computer-aided switching technology is used to connect numerous law enforcement agencies to a central radio system console for the purpose of improving interagency communications during counternarcotic investigations.

Although available in fiscal year 1998, three other crime technology-related systems sponsored by ONDCP were not transferred to state and local law enforcement agencies:

Appendix V
Crime Technology Assistance (In-Kind Transfers) Provided by the Office of National Drug Control Policy

-
- Secure Messaging and Investigative Information Transmission System: A system using a secure web server to upload, search, and distribute images using wireless transmission between field and police headquarters.
 - Suspect Pointer Index Network: A relational database application to be used for the entry, retention, and analysis of multimedia data, such as images and text, supporting counterdrug operations, general case investigations, and crime analysis requirements.
 - Tactical Video Communication System: An analog communication system for transmitting live video and audio from a forward area back to a command post.

Major Contributors to This Report

General Government
Division, Washington,
D.C.

Danny R. Burton, Assistant Director
Mark A. Tremba, Evaluator-in-Charge
Seto J. Bagdoyan, Senior Evaluator
Chan My J. Battcher, Evaluator
Andrew B. Hoffman, Evaluator
David P. Alexander, Senior Social Science Analyst

Accounting and
Information
Management Division,
Washington, D.C.

Denise M. Fantone, Assistant Director

Office of the General
Counsel, Washington,
D.C.

Jan B. Montgomery, Assistant General Counsel
Geoffrey R. Hamilton, Senior Attorney

Ordering Information

The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. VISA and MasterCard credit cards are accepted, also. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

Order by mail:

**U.S. General Accounting Office
P.O. Box 37050
Washington, DC 20013**

or visit:

**Room 1100
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC**

Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000 or by using fax number (202) 512-6061, or TDD (202) 512-2537.

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (202) 512-6000 using a touch-tone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.

For information on how to access GAO reports on the INTERNET, send e-mail message with "info" in the body to:

info@www.gao.gov

or visit GAO's World Wide Web Home Page at:

<http://www.gao.gov>

**United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001**

**Bulk Rate
Postage & Fees Paid
GAO
Permit No. G100**

**Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

Address Correction Requested

