



United States Department of Justice

**Office on Violence Against Women**

---

*Working Together to End the Violence*

# **S•T•O•P Program**

**Services • Training • Officers  
• Prosecutors**

**Annual Report 2006**



# Contents

<b>Acknowledgments.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Background.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Statutory Purpose Areas of STOP Program.....	5
Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds .....	6
Eligibility Requirements .....	7
Reporting Requirements .....	8
Reporting Methods .....	9
<b>STOP Program 2005: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds.....</b>	<b>11</b>
Sources of Data.....	11
How STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators .....	12
How STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees .....	12
Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed.....	14
Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds .....	15
Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects.....	16
<b>Effectiveness of the STOP Program .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Coordinated Community Response .....	17
Training.....	20
Victim Services.....	22
Law Enforcement Response .....	24
Prosecution Response .....	26
Courts.....	28
Probation Supervision.....	29
Protection Orders .....	31
Sexual Assault and Stalking .....	33
Historically Underserved Populations .....	36
American Indians and Alaska Natives.....	37
Victims with Disabilities and Victims Who Are Older .....	38
Women Who Are Immigrants or Refugees.....	39
Victims Who Live in Rural Areas .....	41
<b>STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments.....</b>	<b>43</b>
Training.....	44
Coordinated Community Response .....	45
Policies.....	46
Products .....	47
Data Collection and Communication Systems .....	47
Specialized Units .....	48
System Improvement .....	49
Victim Services.....	49

Demographics of Victims Served.....	51
Types of Services Provided to Victims .....	52
Criminal Justice.....	53
Law Enforcement .....	53
Prosecution .....	54
Courts .....	55
Probation .....	55
<b>References.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Appendix A. STOP Program Funding Allocation and Distribution .....</b>	<b>61</b>
Table A1. STOP Program allocations, by state: 1999–2005 .....	63
Table A2. STOP Program funding awarded to subgrantees, by state: 1999–2005....	64
Table A3. STOP Program funding returned unused by subgrantees, by state: 1999–2005.....	65
Table A4. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to victim services, by state: 1999–2005 .....	66
Table A5. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to law enforcement, by state: 1999–2005 .....	68
Table A6. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to prosecution, by state: 1999–2005.....	70
Table A7. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to court, by state: 1999–2005 .....	72
Table A8. STOP Program amount allocated to administration, by state: 1999– 2005.....	74
Table A9. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to Other, by state: 1999–2005 .....	75
Table A10. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2005 .....	77
<b>Appendix B. STOP Program-Funded Activities and Victims Served: 2005.....</b>	<b>79</b>
Table B1. Number of awards reported by activities funded, by state .....	81
Table B2. Number of subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state .....	83
Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving services, by state	
Table B4. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/ who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving services, by state.....	85
Table B5. Victim’s relationship to offender, by state .....	87
<b>List of Text Tables</b>	
Table 1. Number and distribution of subgrant awards.....	12
Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds.....	14
Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds .....	15
Table 4. Types of victimization addressed by funded projects.....	16
Table 5. Subgrantees reporting weekly/monthly meetings with community agencies/organizations.....	19
Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds—Selected professional positions.....	21
Table 7. Individuals receiving STOP Program-funded victim services.....	22

---

Table 8. Distribution of new charges filed by STOP Program-funded prosecutors and percentage of dispositions resulting in convictions .....	27
Table 9. Disposition of selected violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts .....	29
Table 10. Disposition of selected probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments .....	30
Table 11. Protection orders assisted/processed with STOP Program funds .....	31
Table 12. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program.....	43
Table 13. People trained using STOP Program funds .....	44
Table 14. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies .....	45
Table 15. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols .....	46
Table 16. Use of STOP Program funds to develop or revise products for distribution .....	47
Table 17. Use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems .....	48
Table 18. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems .....	48
Table 19. Use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities .....	48
Table 20. Use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities.....	49
Table 21. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees, by level of service and type of victimization .....	50
Table 22. Victims receiving full or partial service from STOP Program subgrantees, by type of victimization.....	50
Table 23. Most frequently reported reasons victims were not served or were partially served .....	50
Table 24. Demographic characteristics of victims served.....	51
Table 25. Victim's relationship to offender.....	52
Table 26. Services provided by STOP Program subgrantees .....	52
Table 27. Law enforcement activities funded by STOP Program .....	53
Table 28. Prosecution of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking charges ....	54
Table 29. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders.....	55
Table 30. Offender monitoring by STOP Program subgrantees, by type and number of contacts .....	56
Table 31. Disposition of probation violations .....	56



# Acknowledgments

The Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) gratefully acknowledges the work of the staff of the Violence Against Women Act's Measuring Effectiveness Initiative at the Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine (Muskie School); the staff played a central role in the development of this report to Congress.

In addition, we wish to express our appreciation to the STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program (STOP Program) administrators and subgrantees who collected and reported the data on which this report is based, and who worked with the Muskie School to ensure the accuracy of the data. OVW also thanks the administrators and subgrantees who participated in meetings with the Muskie School staff during site visits and shared information about the impact of STOP Program funding in their states and communities. Information gathered during these visits has added significant depth and detail to this report, providing specific examples of the STOP Program's accomplishments on behalf of women who are victims of violence.

**Cynthia Dyer**

Director

Office on Violence Against Women

U.S. Department of Justice





# Introduction

The STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Program 2006 Report is submitted in fulfillment of the statutory requirement that the U.S. Attorney General provide an annual report to Congress on the STOP Program, including how funds were used and an evaluation of the effectiveness of funded programs. The overall structure of the report is designed to move from the general to the specific.

“Background” (page 5) sets out the statutory origins and outlines of the STOP Program—the Program’s goals, the allocation and distribution of STOP Program funds, and states’ eligibility, reporting requirements, and reporting methods.<sup>1</sup> “STOP Program 2005: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds” (page 11) describes the sources of the data and how funds were used during calendar year 2005—what types of agencies and organizations received funding and the types of activities they engaged in. “Effectiveness of the STOP Program” (page 17) explains the importance of activities supported with STOP Program funds generally and demonstrates how specific projects have contributed to the overall effectiveness of the STOP Program. “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” (page 43) presents the data reported by subgrantees in greater detail with regard to activities engaged in with STOP Program funds. Finally, the appendixes provide an opportunity to look at data on awards in the mandated allocation categories and the number and characteristics of victims served on a state-by-state basis.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this report, the word “state” is intended to refer to *all* recipients of STOP awards—i.e., the 50 states, the five U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia.



# Background

## Statutory Purpose Areas of STOP Program

The STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program, also known as the STOP Program, was authorized by the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law No. 103–322), and reauthorized and amended by VAWA 2000 (Public Law No. 106–386) and VAWA 2005 (Public Law No. 109–162). The STOP Program promotes a coordinated, multidisciplinary approach to improving the criminal justice system’s response to violent crimes against women. The Program encourages the development and strengthening of effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies and victim services.

By statute, STOP Program funds may be used for the following purposes:<sup>2</sup>

- Training law enforcement officers, judges, other court personnel, and prosecutors to more effectively identify and respond to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault.
- Developing, training, or expanding units of law enforcement officers, judges, other court personnel, and prosecutors specifically targeting violent crimes against women, including the crimes of domestic violence and sexual assault.
- Developing and implementing more effective police, court, and prosecution policies, protocols, orders, and services specifically devoted to preventing, identifying, and responding to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of domestic violence and sexual assault.
- Developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems linking police, prosecutors, and courts for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women, including the crimes of domestic violence and sexual assault.
- Developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault programs; developing or improving delivery of victim services to underserved populations; providing specialized domestic violence court advocates in courts where a significant number of protection orders are granted; and increasing reporting and reducing attrition rates for cases involving violent crimes against women, including crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault.

---

<sup>2</sup> VAWA 2005 added purpose areas to the STOP Program that are not included here; this report reflects STOP Program-supported activities for calendar year 2005, before VAWA 2005 became effective.

- Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs addressing stalking.
- Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs that address the needs and circumstances of Indian tribes dealing with violent crimes against women, including the crimes of domestic violence and sexual assault.
- Supporting formal and informal statewide multidisciplinary efforts (to the extent not supported by state funds) to coordinate the response of state law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, courts, victim services agencies, and other state agencies and departments in addressing violent crimes against women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault.
- Training sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners in the treatment of trauma related to sexual assault, collection and preservation of evidence, analysis, prevention, and providing expert testimony.
- Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs to assist law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and others to address the needs and circumstances of older and disabled women who are victims of domestic violence or sexual assault, including recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of such violence or assault and targeting outreach and support, counseling, and other victim services to older and disabled individuals.
- Providing assistance to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in immigration matters.

## **Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds**

The Department of Justice's (DOJ's) Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) administers the STOP Program according to a statutory formula. All states, including the U.S. territories and the District of Columbia, are eligible to apply for STOP Program grants to address the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Funds are distributed to the states according to the following formula: a base award of \$600,000 is made to each state, and

appropriated remaining funds are awarded to each state in an amount that bears the same ratio to the amount of remaining funds as the population of the state bears to the population of all of the states that results from a distribution among the states on the basis of each state's population in relation to the population of all states (not including populations of Indian tribes (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(b)(5) and (6)).

The statute requires each state to distribute STOP Program funds to subgrantees for projects in each of the following areas: 25 percent to law enforcement, 25 percent to prosecution, 30 percent to victim services, and 5 percent to state and local courts. The use of the remaining 15 percent is discretionary, within parameters defined by the statute (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(3)).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> For the purposes of this formula, American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands are considered one state. Sixty-seven percent of the amount allocated goes to American Samoa, and 33 percent goes to the Northern Mariana Islands (42 U.S.C. section 3791(a)(2); 28 CFR 90.13(b)).

Funds granted to the states are then subgranted to agencies and programs, including state offices and agencies, state and local courts, units of local government, tribal governments, and nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services programs. Each state determines the process by which it awards subgrants.<sup>4</sup> STOP Program awards may support up to 75 percent of the total cost of each subgrant project. The states are responsible for ensuring compliance with the 25 percent nonfederal match requirement.<sup>5</sup>

## Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible to receive STOP Program funds, states must meet all application requirements and certify that they are in compliance with certain statutory requirements of VAWA: first, the states' laws, policies, and practices must not require victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking to incur costs related to the prosecution of these crimes or to obtaining protection orders; and, second, states must certify that a government entity incurs the full out-of-pocket costs of forensic medical exams for sexual assault victims (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-(5)(a); 3796gg-(4)(a)).

A state application for STOP Program funding must include documentation from prosecution, law enforcement, court, and victim services programs that demonstrates the need for grant funds, how they intend to use the funds, the expected results, and the demographic characteristics of the populations to be served (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg).

Within 120 days of receiving a STOP Program grant, states are required to submit implementation plans describing their identified goals and how funds will be used to accomplish these goals.<sup>6</sup> States are required to consult with nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services programs, including domestic violence and sexual assault service programs, when developing their implementation plans. States are strongly encouraged to include Indian tribal governments in their planning processes. The implementation plans should describe how states will:

- (A) Give priority to areas of varying geographic size, based on the current availability of domestic violence and sexual assault programs in the population, and the geographic area to be served in relation to the availability of such programs in other such populations and geographic areas.
- (B) Determine the amount of subgrants based on the population and geographic area to be served.
- (C) Distribute monies equitably on a geographic basis, including nonurban and rural areas of varying geographic sizes.

---

<sup>4</sup> The state official(s) designated to administer STOP Program formula funds will be referred to in this report as the "STOP administrator(s)."

<sup>5</sup> VAWA 2005, as amended, created a new provision eliminating match in certain circumstances and providing for waivers of match in other circumstances (42 U.S.C. section 13925(b)(1)).

<sup>6</sup> Beginning in fiscal year 2003, OVW permitted states to satisfy the implementation plan requirement by submitting 3-year implementation plans and annual updates.

(D) Recognize and address the needs of underserved populations (28 CFR 90.23(b)).

State implementation plans should also describe the involvement of victim services providers and advocates, major shifts in direction, how the states' approach to violence against women will build on earlier efforts, and how funds will be distributed to law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and victim services providers.

In addition to the statutory purpose areas, states are encouraged to develop and support projects that:

- Implement community-driven initiatives to address the needs of older victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking and other underserved populations of victims as defined by VAWA 2000.
- Address sexual assault through service expansion; development and implementation of protocols; training for judges, other court personnel, prosecutors, and law enforcement; and development of coordinated community responses to sexual assault.
- Support safety audits and fatality review teams at the state and local levels to develop and implement more effective police, court, and prosecutor policies, protocols, and orders.
- Enhance the role of the judiciary and other court personnel in managing offender behavior and securing victim safety through judicial education and court-related projects.

## Reporting Requirements

VAWA 1994 required that the Attorney General provide an annual report to Congress on the STOP Program no later than 180 days after the end of each fiscal year for which grants are made.<sup>7</sup> The statute requires that the annual report include the following information for each state receiving funds:

- 1) The number of grants made and funds distributed.
- 2) A summary of the purposes for which those grants were provided and an evaluation of their progress.
- 3) A statistical summary of persons served, detailing the nature of victimization and providing data on age, sex, relationship to the offender, geographic distribution, race, ethnicity, language, disability, and the membership of persons served in any underserved population.
- 4) An evaluation of the effectiveness of programs funded with STOP Program monies. (42 U.S.C. 3796gg-3(b)).

In VAWA 2000, Congress broadened existing reporting provisions to require the Attorney General to submit a biennial report to Congress on the effectiveness of activities of VAWA-funded grant programs (Public Law No. 106-386, section 1003 (codified at 42 U.S.C. 3789p)). In response to this statutory mandate, and as part of a

---

<sup>7</sup> Amendments made by VAWA 2005 require that future reports be submitted no later than one month after the end of each even-numbered fiscal year (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-3(b)).

broader effort to improve measurements of program performance, OVW worked with the VAWA Measuring Effectiveness Initiative at the Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine (Muskie School), to develop meaningful measures of program effectiveness and new progress report forms for all VAWA grant programs administered by OVW, including the STOP Program.<sup>8</sup>

Measuring the effectiveness of the STOP Program and other VAWA-funded grant programs is a uniquely challenging task. Between 1998 and 2003, states receiving STOP Program funds were required to submit data in the Subgrant Award and Performance Report reflecting how they and their subgrantees were using these funds. However, OVW was interested in gathering information about all grant-funded activities in a more uniform and comprehensive manner.

In late 2001, the Muskie School and OVW began developing progress report forms for grantees to use to collect data and report on their activities and effectiveness. This process was informed by extensive consultation with OVW grantees, experts in the field, and OVW staff about which kinds of measures would best reflect the goals of the VAWA grant programs and whether those goals were being achieved. The report forms included measures identified in the collaborative process and outcome measures identified by OVW as indicators of the effectiveness of the funded programs for purposes of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993.

The new progress report forms were designed to satisfy OVW grantees' semiannual (discretionary grant programs) and annual (the STOP Program) reporting requirements. To the extent possible, given the goals and activities authorized under each of the grant programs, uniform measures were chosen to permit the aggregation of data and reporting across grant programs. In addition to generating data for the monitoring of individual grantees' activities, the report forms enabled OVW to review the activities and achievements of entire grant programs and the aggregate achievements of numerous grant programs engaged in similar activities. This new grantee reporting system contributes to better long-term trend analysis, planning, and policy development and enhances OVW's ability to report in greater detail and depth to Congress about the programs funded by VAWA and related legislation.

## Reporting Methods

OVW finalized the new grantee and subgrantee report forms for the STOP Program in early 2005. The Muskie School provided extensive training and technical assistance to state STOP Program administrators in completing the new forms.<sup>9</sup> Administrators submit data online through the Office of Justice Programs' Grants Management System; STOP Program subgrantees complete electronic versions of the subgrantee annual report forms and submit them to their state STOP administrators.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> VAWA grant programs administered by OVW include 11 discretionary grant programs in addition to the STOP Program.

<sup>9</sup> Because of the large number of subgrantees (approximately 2,400), the Muskie School staff provided the STOP administrators with training and technical assistance with the understanding that the STOP administrators would, in turn, train their states' subgrantees in how to complete the forms.

<sup>10</sup> Numerous STOP administrators maintain databases containing data provided by subgrantees on a quarterly or semiannual basis; these administrators then use that data to prepare the annual subgrantee reports.

Currently, states are required to submit both forms to OVW by March 30 of each year.



# STOP Program 2005: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds

## Sources of Data

This report is based on data submitted by 2,418 subgrantees from all 50 states, 3 of the 5 territories, and the District of Columbia, as well as data submitted by 53 of the 56 STOP administrators about the distribution and use of program funds during calendar year 2005.<sup>11</sup> Under a cooperative agreement with DOJ, the Muskie School has analyzed this data. The data was provided to OVW from two sources: subgrantees completing the Annual Progress Report and grant administrators completing the Annual STOP Administrators Report.<sup>12</sup> In addition to these annual reports, this report features a number of STOP-funded programs visited by Muskie School staff during 2005.<sup>13</sup> During these visits, grantees (including STOP Program subgrantees and STOP administrators) were asked to describe and document how VAWA funds had affected their communities' responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

In March 2006, administrators submitted data, including the administrators' reports and the reports of all their states' subgrantees, to OVW on STOP Program grant activity for calendar year 2005. This 2006 STOP Program Report is the second report to contain data generated from the new report forms.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> The Northern Mariana Islands and Guam did not submit subgrantee data; the Northern Mariana Islands, Illinois, and Virginia did not submit STOP administrator data.

<sup>12</sup> These two report forms replaced the Subgrant Award Performance Report forms (SAPRs) originally designed by the Urban Institute in cooperation with the National Institute of Justice. State administrators and subgrantees reported on their activities on the SAPRs from 1998 through 2003. The data derived from the SAPRs formed the basis of the 2000, 2002, and 2004 STOP Program Reports.

<sup>13</sup> The Muskie School conducted site visits to all 50 states, 5 U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia between 1999 and the spring of 2007 to gather data and prepare reports demonstrating the effectiveness of VAWA-funded grant programs. Those reports (except those awaiting approval by OVW) are available at VAWA Measuring Effectiveness Initiative (2007).

<sup>14</sup> STOP administrators submitted 2005 data before there had been an opportunity for Muskie School staff to review the 2004 data and provide feedback and technical assistance on possible errors. It is expected that data submitted for calendar year 2006 will be more complete and accurate as a result of this review process.

## How STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators

The statute authorizing the STOP Program requires that each state distribute its funds according to a specific formula: 25 percent each to law enforcement and prosecution, 30 percent to victim services, and no less than 5 percent to state and local courts (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(3)).<sup>15</sup> Table 1 shows the number and distribution of subgrant awards for each of the allocation categories.

**Table 1. Number and distribution of subgrant awards**

Allocation category	Number of awards to subgrantees	Total funding in category (\$)	Percentage of total dollars awarded
Courts	229	5,371,395	5
Law enforcement	887	27,555,571	24
Prosecution	779	28,117,441	25
Victim services	1,347	39,543,870	35
Administration	NA	7,046,953	6
Other	231	6,263,409	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,473</b>	<b>113,898,639</b>	<b>100</b>

NA = not available

NOTES: Data derived from STOP Administrators Reports. Information by award category on a state-by-state basis is available in appendix A. Similar information based on Annual Progress Reports submitted by subgrantees is available on a state-by-state basis in appendix B.

## How STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees

The overwhelming majority (94 percent) of the subgrantee agencies and organizations used STOP Program monies to fund staff positions, most often professional positions providing direct services to victims. When staff allocations are translated to full-time equivalents (FTEs), staff providing direct services to victims represent 49 percent of the total STOP Program-funded FTEs.<sup>16</sup> By comparison, law enforcement officers represent 11 percent of FTEs and prosecutors 10 percent. When the number of subgrantees using funds for staff is considered without regard to FTEs, 63 percent directed funds to victim services staff positions, and 31 percent directed funds to criminal justice system staff positions.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> STOP Program funds awarded to law enforcement and prosecution agencies may be used to support victim advocates and victim witness specialists in those agencies.

<sup>16</sup> These staff categories include victim advocates, victim witness specialists, counselors, legal advocates, paralegals (nongovernmental), and civil attorneys.

<sup>17</sup> These positions include law enforcement officers, prosecutors, probation officers, and court

Another way of looking at the distribution of STOP Program funds is to consider the percentage of subgrantees reporting that funds were used for specific categories of activities.<sup>18</sup> Sixty-three percent of subgrantees reported using funds to provide services to victims, 47 percent used funds to provide training, 36 percent to develop or implement policies and/or to develop products, 16 percent for law enforcement activities, 15 percent for prosecution activities, and 1 percent each for court and probation activities.

STOP Program funds were used to carry out the fundamental activities of offering victim services, providing training, and supporting law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and probation agencies.

Services. Approximately 581,000 victims received services supported by STOP Program funds (of the 600,000 victims who sought services). Although the victims were most likely to be white (57 percent), female (89 percent), and between the ages of 25 and 59 (62 percent), close to half of the victims were identified as being of other races and ethnicities. Subgrantees reported that 22 percent of the victims they served were Black or African American, and 18 percent were Hispanic or Latino.<sup>19</sup> Twenty-five percent of the victims served were reported as living in rural areas. Victims used victim advocacy (269,000), hotline calls (234,000), and crisis intervention (206,000) in greater numbers than any other services.<sup>20</sup>

Training. From the inception of the STOP Program, states and their subgrantees have recognized the critical need to educate first responders about violence against women. The fact that nearly one-third of all people trained with STOP Program funds (more than 95,000 individuals) were law enforcement officers is a reflection of the fact that the grant program is fulfilling one of its primary and original purposes. Health and mental health professionals were the next largest category, with more than 26,000 trained.<sup>21</sup> More than 302,000 people in all were trained with STOP Program funds in 2005.

---

personnel.

<sup>18</sup> Some subgrantees receive funds to pay for a portion of a shelter advocate's salary; others may receive funding for a number of full-time advocates. This analysis considers only the number of subgrantees that used their funds in these ways, regardless of the amount of STOP Program funding they received. Because subgrantees often fund more than one category of activity, these percentages will total more than 100 percent.

<sup>19</sup> These percentages are based on the number of victims for whom race/ethnicity was known. They may be undercounting the true number of underserved, because the race/ethnicity of nearly 20 percent of victims were reported as unknown for this reporting period. Even when subgrantees improve their data collection systems, there will still be victims for whom this information will not be known. Hotline services, for example, generally do not collect this information, as it could prevent victims from seeking help. Whenever collecting demographic information on victims presents a barrier to service, or could violate confidentiality or jeopardize a victim's safety, service providers usually opt not to collect it.

<sup>20</sup> Victims were reported only once for each type of service received during the calendar year.

<sup>21</sup> Technically speaking, the second largest reported category of people trained was "multidisciplinary group." Subgrantees reported more than 30,000 people trained in this category, which is used when they are unable to identify the specific professions of people trained.

Officers. Law enforcement agencies used STOP Program funds to respond to nearly 119,000 calls for assistance, to investigate 122,000 incidents of violence, and to serve 31,000 protection orders.

The overall dual arrest rate for arrests made by STOP Program-funded officers was 3.5 percent, dramatically lower than most other reported rates (Klein, 2004).<sup>22</sup>

Prosecutors. STOP Program-funded prosecutors filed more than 178,000 new charges during calendar year 2005, 58 percent of which were domestic violence misdemeanors. During the same period, prosecutors disposed of 136,000 charges, 91,000 (or 67 percent) of which resulted in convictions.

Courts and Probation. Although the percentages of grantees who reported using funds for court and probation activities were relatively low (1 percent for each), the reach of their activities was impressive. Nearly 60 percent of the courts (14 of 24 subgrantees) receiving STOP Program funds conducted judicial monitoring activities of convicted offenders, holding an average of 1.74 hearings per offender for more than 6,600 offenders during calendar year 2005. Three-quarters of the funded courts also processed more than 39,000 new charges and disposed of 16,700 new and pending charges during 2005.

Probation programs funded by the STOP Program reported an overall average of 6 contacts per offender for more than 10,000 offenders during 2005. Although probation officers' contacting victims is a relatively new practice in the field, probation personnel contacted more than 2,000 victims an average of 3 times each during the reporting period.

## Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed

VAWA 2000 sets forth 11 purpose areas for which STOP Program funds may be used. Table 2 lists these purpose areas and reports the number of projects addressing each area during calendar year 2005. Consistent with other reported data, the purpose area most frequently addressed by subgrantees was victim services.

**Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds**

Purpose area	Subgrantees (N = 2,418 )	
	Number	Percent
Victim services projects	1,682	70
Training of law enforcement, judges, court personnel, and prosecutors	888	37
Specialized units	689	28
Policies, protocols, orders, and services	658	27

<sup>22</sup> In dual arrests, both individuals involved in an incident of domestic violence are arrested. This dual arrest rate was calculated using the number of predominant aggressor arrests reported, plus the number of incidents in which dual arrests were made as the denominator, and the number of dual arrest incidents reported as the numerator.

**Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds (continued)**

Purpose area	Subgrantees (N = 2,418 )	
	Number	Percent
Support of statewide, coordinated community responses	421	17
Development of data collection and communication systems	326	13
Stalking initiatives	308	13
Assistance to victims in immigration matters	307	13
Programs to assist older and disabled victims	275	11
Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners	153	6
Tribal populations projects	84	3

NOTE: Detail does not add to total because subgrantees could select all purpose areas addressed by their STOP Program-funded activities during calendar year 2005.

## Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds

Not surprisingly, given earlier discussions, the number of all domestic violence programs reported as receiving STOP Program funds was greater than that of any other program. Law enforcement and prosecution agencies and dual programs (e.g., programs that address both domestic violence and sexual assault), at 19 percent each, were the next most frequently reported as having received STOP Program funding. Table 3 presents a complete list of the types of organizations receiving funding, as reported by subgrantees.

**Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds**

Type of agency	Subgrantees (N = 2,418)	
	Number	Percent
Domestic violence program	777	32.1
Dual program	470	19.4
Law enforcement	465	19.2
Prosecution	456	18.9
Sexual assault program	292	12.1
Unit of local government	102	4.2
Court	77	3.2
Government agency	65	2.7
Domestic violence state coalition	47	1.9
Sexual assault state coalition	45	1.9
Probation, parole, or other correctional agency	39	1.6

**Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds (continued)**

Type of agency	Subgrantees (N = 2,418)	
	Number	Percent
University/school	35	1.5
Dual state coalition	29	1.2
Faith-based organization	23	1.0
Tribal domestic violence and/or sexual assault program	14	0.6
Tribal government	5	0.2
Tribal coalition	3	0.1
Other	183	7.6

NOTE: Detail does not add to total because subgrantees could choose more than one option.

## Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects

During the first 4 years of the STOP Program, 47 percent of projects focused on domestic violence alone, and 15 percent addressed domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.<sup>23</sup> As of 2005, the percentage of projects focused solely on domestic violence had decreased to 35 percent, and the percentage addressing domestic violence and/or sexual assault or stalking had risen to 53.6 percent (table 4). The combined percentage of projects focusing on sexual assault alone, stalking alone, or both sexual assault and stalking was 11.4 percent.

**Table 4. Types of victimization addressed by funded projects**

Type of victimization	Subgrantees (N = 2,418)	
	Number	Percent
Domestic violence only	846	35.0
Sexual assault only	262	10.8
Stalking only	6	0.3
Domestic violence and sexual assault	381	15.8
Domestic violence and stalking	91	3.8
Sexual assault and stalking	10	0.4
Domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking	822	34.0

<sup>23</sup> STOP Annual Report 2002.

# Effectiveness of the STOP Program

This section describes key areas of activity, why they are important, and how they contribute to the goals of VAWA—improving victim safety and increasing offender accountability. Accomplishments in these areas are highlighted, including specific examples of the many successful STOP-funded programs. (For a more detailed presentation of data reflecting the aggregate activities of all STOP Program-funded projects, see “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” on page 43.)

## Coordinated Community Response

Developing and/or participating in a coordinated community response (CCR) to address violence against women is an essential and fundamental component of the STOP Program and all other programs funded by OVW. CCR brings criminal and civil justice personnel, victim advocates, and social services program staff together to create a multidisciplinary, integrated response that holds offenders fully accountable, improves the system response to victims, and helps victims heal from violence. Research shows that efforts to respond to violence against women are most effective when combined and integrated as part of a CCR (Sheppard, 1999). STOP Program funds allow states to support communities in their efforts to develop and strengthen effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies to combat violent crimes against women and to develop and strengthen victim services in cases involving such crimes.

Communities generally adopt two types of CCR efforts—Sexual Assault Response Teams (SARTs) and Domestic Abuse Response Teams (DARTs)—to specifically address sexual assault and domestic violence. SARTs, often organized around Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) programs, help to foster a coordinated community victim-centered response in sexual assault cases. SARTs coordinate the efforts of medical providers, counselors, advocates, and criminal justice agencies to ensure that victims are not retraumatized (i.e., that victims only have to tell their stories once). At least 11 STOP administrators reported that their states used STOP Program funds to support SARTs in 2005.

SART programs have been found to greatly enhance the quality of health care for women who have been sexually assaulted, improve the quality of forensic evidence, improve law enforcement’s ability to collect information and to file charges, and increase the likelihood of successful prosecution (Campbell, Patterson, and Lichy, 2005; Crandall and Helitzer, 2003).

The impact of STOP funding has served to increase the level of collaboration in this state among the criminal justice, victim services, and community providers. The projects have offered the venue and the funding capability of bringing together a multitude of agencies to address sexual assault and domestic violence, produced improved services to

victims, and built long-term cooperative relationships that will enable the community to address these issues in a more holistic manner. An excellent example of this is seen in the Sexual Assault Medical-Legal Collaboration Project, a partnership between the Honolulu Prosecutor's Office and the Sex Abuse Treatment Center. The goals are the development and maintenance of a statewide medical-legal protocol for forensic examination of (female adult) sexual assault victims. This has drawn ongoing participation by all four county prosecution offices and local police departments, sexual assault providers, and the medical profession to produce a workable protocol and to continually review and update its procedures.

—*Hawaii STOP administrator*

CCR has been associated with significant reductions in domestic violence homicides. In 1995, San Diego reported 13 intimate partner homicides. In 2002, the city opened a Family Justice Center that provided co-located, comprehensive justice, advocacy, and social services for victims.<sup>24</sup> By 2005, the number of homicides had decreased to five (Gwinn and Strack, 2006). In Guam, after the Attorney General implemented a pro-family, zero-tolerance policy across the island, domestic homicides fell from an average of two to three a year before 2003, to zero by February 2004 (Guam Bureau of Statistics and Plans, 2004). In Palm Beach County, Florida, the county sheriff reported more than five domestic murders per year before 2001. Since 2001, and after the DARTs and the new technology system were implemented, the county reported an average of two domestic murders per year; in 2002 and 2005, there were no murders at all (Florida Department of Law Enforcement, 2005).

Although it may be difficult to quantify or report on CCR, all subgrantees are required to report on their contact with memorandum-of-understanding partners and other groups in the community. Significant numbers of subgrantees reported daily contact with the following organizations: domestic violence organizations (928, or 38 percent of all subgrantees), law enforcement agencies (948, or 39 percent), courts (709, or 33 percent), and prosecutors (651, or 27 percent).<sup>25</sup> These interactions may involve referrals (e.g., law enforcement referring a victim to a shelter or a victim services agency, or to the courts so that victims may obtain protection orders) or consultations between victim services and law enforcement (e.g., the sharing of information on behalf of a victim about an offender's actions or whereabouts). Subgrantees reported having daily or weekly interactions with the following entities: domestic violence and sexual assault organizations, the courts, law enforcement, prosecutors' offices, and health/mental health, legal services, and social services organizations.

To some extent, these interactions are necessary, given the nature of the work that is being done. But historically, a number of these organizations had contentious relationships, worked in isolation from each other, and resisted contact. This was especially true for victim advocates and law enforcement agencies. Because community stakeholders are now working together on task forces on the local,

---

<sup>24</sup> The term "co-located services" is associated with Family Justice Centers. It is meant to refer to various agencies operating "under the same roof" (in the same location).

<sup>25</sup> Complete data on CCR activities can be found in "STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments" on page 45.



regional, and state levels, a common understanding has developed, and common ground has been identified. This change is reflected in what the STOP Program subgrantees reported about their participation in weekly and monthly meetings of task forces, work groups, or other regularly scheduled forums involving organizations that respond to and serve victims. These groups often involve decision makers who develop protocols that set out how they will respond in a coordinated fashion to ensure the safety of the victim, hold the offender accountable, and remove barriers to these outcomes in the courts and probation, in addition to other systems. These decision makers are in a position to direct the implementation of agreed-upon protocols and to promote coordination and collaboration among their agencies and other participants. The data in table 5 reflect the number of STOP Program subgrantees meeting with community agencies and organizations on a weekly or monthly basis.

**Table 5. Subgrantees reporting weekly/monthly meetings with community agencies/organizations**

Agency/organization	Subgrantees
Domestic violence organization	1,174
Law enforcement	1,052
Prosecutor's office	953
Social service organization	848
Sexual assault organization	770
Court	736

STOP funding has allowed us to establish coordinated teams that include advocates, law enforcement, prosecution, hospitals, DHHR [Department of Health and Human Resources], and other related community agencies. STOP funding has also allowed us to continue to expand much-needed services to victims.

—*Women's Resource Center, West Virginia*

One of the most important aspects of the DART project is the policy that police officers in the designated jurisdictions place a call to the . . . Battered Women's Services 24-hour hotline [Family Services, Inc.] at the time of police response to give the victim immediate access to services and safety planning. Several other police agencies in Dutchess County have expressed a desire to institute this policy in their own departments even though their jurisdictions do not have DART at this time.

—*New York subgrantee report*

## Training

As communities have developed coordinated response initiatives, the need for quality training has become evident. The STOP Program, like every other OVW grant program, supports the training of professionals to improve their response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. After victim services, training is the activity most frequently engaged in by STOP Program subgrantees: 1,142 subgrantees (47 percent of STOP Program funding recipients) used those funds to provide training. An impressive 302,473 professionals were trained with STOP Program funds. Significantly, approximately one-third of those trained with STOP Program funds were law enforcement officers. As first responders, law enforcement officers play a critical role in keeping the victim safe and ensuring offender accountability. As a result of CCR efforts, training, and the development of pro-arrest or mandatory arrest policies, there has been profound and widespread change in the law enforcement response to violence against women. Ongoing training for law enforcement is essential, as officers retire and are replaced with new officers, and as best practices develop and change over time.

The Law Enforcement Foundation, which is part of the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police, worked with experts in the field of domestic violence in order to design a “train- the-trainer” program so that Ohio law enforcement agencies can learn best practices as well as Ohio law and effective protocol for domestic violence incidents. Once certain individuals were trained, . . . [they] returned to their respective departments and conducted in-house sessions in several formats, allowing for a real and rapid difference to be made in officer preparedness.

—STOP administrator, Ohio

STOP Program funds also supported the training of health and mental health professionals. These professionals become involved in the lives of victims at critical times; it is important that they understand the dynamics of domestic violence and sexual assault to enable them to provide appropriate support and referral to other services. Training also demonstrates to these professionals how certain actions can be harmful to victims (e.g., engaging in marriage counseling with a controlling batterer and a victim, blaming the victim for her injuries, or recommending that the victim leave the batterer without understanding the dangers that presents). Other professionals receiving training were domestic violence and sexual assault staff, nongovernmental advocacy organizations (for elderly, disabled, and immigrant populations), faith-based organization staff, social services organizations, attorneys and law students, court personnel, prosecutors, and government agency staff (table 6).<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> For more detailed information on categories of people trained, see “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” on page 44.

**Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds—Selected professional positions**

Position	People trained (N = 302,473)	
	Number	Percent
Law enforcement officers	95,480	32
Health/mental health professionals	34,355	11
Domestic violence staff	21,527	7
Social service organization staff	19,901	7
Nongovernmental advocacy organization staff	12,034	4
Sexual assault staff	11,564	4
Faith-based organization staff	11,515	4
Attorney/law student/legal services staff	10,580	4
Court personnel	9,373	3
Government agency staff	5,482	2
Prosecutors	5,357	2

Without STOP funding, our services run the risk of becoming "siloed" within the community, narrower in scope for victims and lacking the resources to facilitate system change. Specifically, more than 250 nurses and doctors would not have received up-to-the-minute training on forensic techniques and developments, more than 150 law enforcement personnel and prosecutors would not be introduced to the newest advances in working with victims, and more than 200 community members and university students would not be oriented to the dynamics of sexual assault without this valuable resource.

—STOP administrator, Michigan

The City of Phoenix Police Department partnered with [the] Arizona Peace Officers Standards and Training Board to develop and implement an Interactive Distance Learning project. This is an interactive Internet training that includes standardized testing on domestic and sexual violence and stalking. This project is being developed by the city of Phoenix with the goal to offer it on a regional and, ultimately, . . . statewide [basis].

—STOP administrator, Nevada

Subgrantees addressed the following topics in their training events: domestic violence overview, dynamics, and services (867, or 76 percent of the subgrantees); issues specific to victims in underserved populations (815, or 71 percent);<sup>27</sup> law enforcement response (742, or 65 percent); and advocate response (740, or 65 percent).

<sup>27</sup> This included training in issues specifically related to victims in one or more of the following categories: victims who live in rural areas; are of races or ethnicities other than white; are homeless or living in poverty; are institutionalized or isolated; are immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; or have mental health or substance abuse issues. (For more information, see "Historically Underserved Populations" on page 36.)

Rural programs rely heavily on trained volunteers to provide services where a part- or full-time paid advocate would not be feasible. STOP funding provides a victim advocacy academy at a very affordable rate for all Montana programs.

—STOP administrator, Montana

The biggest effort in reaching the underserved in our state has been the addition of a violence against women with disabilities program manager at the state level. She has provided training and technical assistance to subgrantees. Her efforts have been to obtain TTY phones [text telephones] and training for each shelter program, ADA [Americans with Disabilities Act] access training, a review of program policies addressing underserved [groups], and offering also the expertise of the vulnerable adult program here in our state.

—STOP administrator, Wyoming

## Victim Services

The provision of services to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking represents the most frequently funded activity under the STOP Program. More than 581,000 victims received services funded under the STOP Program in 2005.

Subgrantees provided a wide range of services to these victims, including victim/survivor advocacy (to help the victim obtain needed resources or services), hotline calls, crisis intervention, legal advocacy (assistance in navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems), counseling and support, and victim-witness notification. A significantly smaller number of victims received the following critical services: shelter, hospital accompaniment, and civil legal assistance.<sup>28</sup> Subgrantees providing these services also provide safety planning, referrals, and information to victims as needed. Table 7 shows the number of individuals receiving a broad array of STOP Program-funded victim services.

**Table 7. Individuals receiving STOP Program-funded victim services**

Type of service	Individuals served
Victim advocacy	268,821
Hotline calls	233,784
Crisis intervention	206,233
Criminal justice advocacy	163,522
Civil legal advocacy	150,970
Counseling/support group	148,632

<sup>28</sup> The number of examinations by SANEs is not captured on the report form. However, 21,170 victims were accompanied to the hospital, and those accompaniments were most often for forensic exams for sexual assault victims.

**Table 7. Individuals receiving STOP Program-funded victim services (continued)**

Type of service	Individuals served
Victim witness notification	143,211
Shelter (includes transitional housing)	24,007
Civil legal assistance	23,216
Hospital accompaniment	21,170

Victim advocacy was the service most frequently provided by STOP Program subgrantees. Victim advocacy assists the survivor in navigating the systems in their community to obtain needed resources. These resources may be found in the criminal justice system, health care institutions, churches, or social services agencies. Victims of domestic violence often need a variety of services, including assistance with material goods and services and a variety of issues related to health care, education, finances, transportation, child care, employment, and housing. Recent research indicates that women who worked with advocates were more effective overall at accessing community resources (Allen, Bybee, and Sullivan, 2004). The same study concludes that it is essential that advocacy and other human service programs recognize the need for a comprehensive response to the needs of victims.

Of those receiving services, 83.4 percent were victims of domestic violence, 14.4 percent were victims of sexual assault, and 2.2 percent were victims of stalking. (See also “Sexual Assault and Stalking” on page 33.) Although it is not possible to report the percentage of victims from underserved populations (victims may be included in a number of the underserved categories, and to add them together would result in overcounting), the data does show that 97 percent of all subgrantees serving victims provided services to victims in at least one of the underserved categories.<sup>29</sup> (For more information on these populations, see “Historically Underserved Populations” on page 36.)

Research indicates that social isolation and ineffective community responses are key factors in undermining the ability of domestic violence victims to protect themselves and their children. For these victims, comprehensive and ongoing advocacy services have been found to be instrumental in reducing revictimization (Sullivan and Bybee, 2000). Early studies of shelters for battered women found that the majority of victims, upon leaving the shelters, returned to their abusers (Gondolf, Fisher, and McFerron, 1990). Subsequent studies of shelter residents indicated that if residents are connected to supportive services and assistance, most do not return to their abusers and, as a result, experience less revictimization (Klein, 2005).

<sup>29</sup> See tables B3 and B4 on pages 85 and 87 for detailed demographic information. “Underserved” as it relates to reported demographic data on victims served includes the following: people of races and ethnicities other than white (in categories established by the U.S. Census Bureau), individuals more than 60 years old, people with disabilities, people with limited English proficiency, immigrants or refugees, and those living in rural areas.

The Women's Coalition of St. Croix uses VAWA funds to pay for shelter services. This is the only domestic violence and sexual assault service provider on the island. The Coalition provides food, clothing, and a place to stay. The shelter draws from strong relationships in the community to help victims find jobs or educational opportunities, to access food banks, and to develop a plan of action tailored to their capacities and requirements. Women may stay at the shelter for up to 1 year. Funds also support a child care worker, enabling victims to take care of legal, educational, and employment needs. The coalition was able to hire an advocate to work exclusively with victims. That advocate is available to . . . accompany victims to the hospital to make the situation as comfortable as possible.

—*Virgin Islands site visit report*

New York State funds two programs with STOP money that specifically address the needs of disabled victims of domestic violence. Barrier Free Living (BFL) is a nonprofit victim services agency located in Manhattan that provides a variety of services to clients who have disabilities as defined by ADA. . . . In 1997, in response to that clearly demonstrated need, BFL established their Domestic Violence Program to serve disabled victims of domestic violence throughout the five boroughs of New York City. The BFL Domestic Violence Program provides crisis hotline services, individual and group counseling, case management, advocacy, and daily living skills training to disabled victims.

—*STOP administrator, New York*

## Law Enforcement Response

The STOP Program promotes a proactive, thorough police response to violence against women, with the aim of increasing the likelihood of arrests. Historically, intimate partner violence and related incidents did not lead to arrests. Arrest statistics show that police and sheriff's departments receiving OVW funding have higher arrest rates for intimate partner violence than other police and sheriff's departments. Law enforcement departments receiving funding through OVW's Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Program reported making arrests of predominant aggressors in an average of 49 percent of the domestic violence incidents they investigated during the first 6 months of 2005 (Muskie School of Public Service, 2005). Before VAWA funding became available, the arrest rate was generally far lower. In 1980, for example, police in Denver, Colorado, arrested only 20 percent of abusers who violated court protection orders (Klein, 2004).

Extensive research confirms that arrest deters repeat abuse, even in cases involving individuals deemed to be high-risk abusers. The research overwhelmingly shows that the arrest of an intimate partner does not increase a victim's risk, despite earlier reports to the contrary (Maxwell, Garner, and Fagan, 2001). Households in states that mandate arrest for domestic violence are less likely to suffer from domestic violence (Dugan, Nagin, and Rosenfeld, 2003).

A law enforcement officer's responsibilities begin with the initial response to the domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking call. To ensure victim safety, it is vital that an arrest be made, that the case be fully investigated to ensure effective

prosecution, that protection orders be served on offenders, and that arrests be made for violations of bail conditions and of protection orders. STOP Program subgrantees are funding law enforcement agencies that are collectively engaging in a broad range of these activities.

Law enforcement officers funded under the STOP Program in 2005 responded to approximately 119,000 calls for assistance from domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking victims. They responded and prepared incident reports in 120,600 cases, investigated more than 122,000 cases, arrested 44,500 predominant aggressors (which, when compared with 1,500 dual arrests, results in an overall average dual arrest rate of 3.4 percent), and referred more than 48,000 cases to prosecutors. Officers funded by the STOP Program served more than 31,000 protection/restraining orders, arrested offenders for 6,000 violations of court orders, and enforced more than 14,000 warrants.<sup>30</sup>

STOP funding has afforded the Fayette County Sheriff's Office [the capacity] to have specialized units and personnel to concentrate on victim safety/offender accountability. Funding allows our office to have deputies focused on service of protection orders, arrest of violators of protection orders, safety planning with victims, escorts of victims, and court monitoring of offenders ordered to counseling.

—STOP administrator, Kentucky

Overall, subgrantees engaged in the following activities designed to improve law enforcement response and arrests of offenders: 742 addressed law enforcement response and 371 addressed identifying and arresting the predominant aggressor in training; 155 addressed identifying the primary aggressor and 121 addressed pro-arrest policies in policy development/implementation. The specialized training that STOP Program-funded law enforcement agencies participate in and the policies and protocols implemented by their departments influence how they conduct their activities. Of all 385 subgrantees using funds for law enforcement activities, 232 (60 percent) also used funds for training and/or policy development/implementation. The 3.4 percent dual arrest rate for STOP Program subgrantees may be attributed to the training and policy development the Program's funds make possible in law enforcement agencies.

Without STOP grant funding our entire project would be severely hampered. Domestic violence specialists in law enforcement would not have been possible. Our baseline year there were 169 dual arrests, compared [to] 58 in 2005. So these specialists have a great impact.

—Lancaster County Justice Council, Nebraska

---

<sup>30</sup> Subgrantees may receive funds for specifically designated law enforcement activities and may not engage in other activities referred to here. For example, a subgrantee may have received STOP Program funding to support a dedicated domestic violence detective whose only activity was to investigate cases; that subgrantee would not report on calls received, or incidents responded to, unless those activities were also supported by the STOP Program.

For the first time, seventy-three state and tribal law enforcement trainers received in-depth training on the investigation of sexual assault crimes. These trainers can now repeatedly train and refresh their officers on effective investigative skills regarding sexual violence cases.

—STOP administrator, New Mexico

An appropriate law enforcement response is a critical component of an effective coordinated community response. As the first responder, the police officer is often the person who can direct the victim to appropriate services and send a clear message to the perpetrator that the community views domestic violence as a serious criminal matter.

The Virgin Islands Police Department on St. Croix hired a dedicated officer to assist victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. This specialized first responder is able to devote her/his full attention to the victim, providing a victim-centered liaison to the police department. The department also purchased digital cameras, enhancing officers' ability to collect evidence in cases where evidence-based prosecution is needed.

—Virgin Islands site visit

[In] the City of Phoenix Police Department, [a] specialized unit consisting of a detective, crime analyst, and advocate investigate and process cold sexual assault cases. A victim advocate works in conjunction with the detective in identifying and prioritizing cases, contacting the victims and providing support and services while they may face fears from dormant issues of sexual violence, and making case decisions. While this program originates with the City of Phoenix Police Department, it has far-reaching connections and interactions with other cities, towns, and states with regard to tracking and capturing serial rapists.

—STOP administrator, Arizona

## Prosecution Response

OVW Grant Programs promote the aggressive prosecution of alleged perpetrators. Prosecutors funded under the STOP Program received nearly 150,000 cases of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking for charging consideration and filed charges in approximately 115,000 (77 percent) of those cases. In contrast to this statistic, a study conducted in Minneapolis in the early 1980s showed that fewer than 2 percent of those arrested for domestic violence were ever prosecuted (Sherman and Berk, 1984).

Data reported for 2005 by STOP Program-funded prosecution offices showed a dismissal rate of 31 percent for domestic violence misdemeanors, when compared with other types of dispositions.<sup>31</sup> Studies of other localities showed that:

---

<sup>31</sup> Included as reasons for dismissal on the report form were the following subcategories: request of victim, lack of evidence, plea bargain, other. (Subgrantees were instructed to report only on the disposition of the original charges, not on the disposition of lesser charges pled to by the offender.)



- Eighty percent of domestic assault cases were dismissed in the Albuquerque, New Mexico, Metropolitan Court in 2004, compared with 34 percent of drunk-driving cases (Gallagher, 2005).
- In Bernalillo County, New Mexico, the dismissal rate was reported to be almost 90 percent (*Albuquerque Journal*, 2004).
- Dismissal rates of domestic violence cases in Florida were reported at 72 percent in the Orange and Osceola County Judicial Circuit, and 69 percent in the Polk, Highlands, and Hardee County Judicial Circuit in 2003 (Owens, 2004).
- Only 20 percent of criminal stalking cases in Utah resulted in convictions in 2002 (Bryson, 2004).

Prosecutors funded under the STOP Program filed 178,000 new charges during 2005. Eighty percent of those charges were domestic violence charges—58 percent misdemeanor domestic violence, 15 percent felony domestic violence, and 7 percent domestic violence ordinance. Table 8 shows the distribution of charges and the conviction rates for those cases disposed of by STOP Program-funded prosecutors during 2005.

**Table 8. Distribution of new charges filed by STOP Program-funded prosecutors and percentage of dispositions resulting in convictions**

Charge	Percentage of new charges filed (N = 178,016)	Percentage of dispositions resulting in convictions (N = 90,942)
All charges	100	67
Misdemeanor domestic violence	58	68
Felony domestic violence	15	69
Violation of protection order	9	72
Domestic violence ordinance	7	57
Felony sexual assault	3	69
Violation of probation/parole	3	91
Other	5	NA

NA = not available

NOTES: Of the new charges filed, 136,325 were disposed of during 2005. Dispositions resulting in convictions include deferred adjudications. "Other" includes misdemeanor sexual assault, misdemeanor stalking, violations of other court orders, other charges, violations of bail, and homicide related to domestic violence, sexual assault, and/or stalking.

Research indicates that aggressive prosecution deters repeat abuse, holds offenders accountable, and encourages law enforcement to sustain higher arrest rates. Although some studies have found that prosecution rates do not affect rates of repeat abuse, these studies examined jurisdictions in which decisions to prosecute were not based on offender risk or victim input (Belknap et al., 1999; Davis, Smith, and Nickles, 1998). Other research has documented that prosecution tied to offender risk and, in one case, victim desires, significantly reduced repeat abuse (Ford and Regoli, 1993;

Klein, 2004; Thistlewaite, Wooldredge, and Gibbs, 1998). Prosecutors' offices that adopt specialized policies and practices to deal with intimate partner abusers are more sensitive to victims' needs and, as a result, fewer homes in the jurisdiction suffer from family or intimate violence (Dugan, Nagin, and Rosenfeld, 2003).

By designating a prosecutor and victim witness coordinator for domestic violence, we are able to spend more time with the victims to understand their relationship with the abuser and to determine whether prosecuting the case is in her best interest. We are able to focus more on repeat offenders and identify situations of domestic violence that may become lethal.

—STOP administrator, North Carolina

A unique project implemented by the Prince George's County SAO [State's Attorney's Office], the STOP the Violence Volunteer/Intern Training Program, continued to enhance the efforts of its Domestic Violence Unit by using interns to assist with case review and to help prepare attorneys before trials or dispositions. This included contacting victims, witnesses, and police. The goal of increasing the successful prosecution of cases by initiating early and comprehensive contact with victims and providing tools for evidence collection in physical abuse and stalking cases was satisfied. The volunteer/intern program revived community involvement and allowed members a link to buy-in by helping victims of domestic violence within their respective communities.

—STOP administrator, Maryland

## Courts

Judges have two distinct roles in responding to domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking cases—administrative and magisterial. In their administrative role, judges are responsible for making courthouses safer and more efficient. This can be accomplished by providing separate waiting rooms for victims, special dockets, and even special courts. In their magisterial role, judges can be critical in holding offenders accountable and ensuring the safety of victims. Although in most cases judges are ratifying plea agreements, they do set the parameters of what types of sentences they will accept, including whether they will allow diversion and deferred sentences. Another critical role of courts is the monitoring of offenders to review their progress and compliance with court orders.

In some jurisdictions, judges have been at the forefront in establishing special coordinating councils for domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking cases. In an increasing number of jurisdictions, judges have used their administrative role to create specialized domestic violence courts, with the goal of enhanced coordination, more consistent intervention to protect victims, and increased offender accountability. These courts seek to link different cases involving the same offender and victim (e.g., custody cases, protection orders, and criminal charges often can be linked to the same offender and victim), so that the same judge is reviewing the cases. These courts typically have specialized intake units, victim-witness advocates, specialized calendars, and intense judicial monitoring of offenders (Klein, 2004).

The funding has allowed us to create a special hybrid court that hears domestic violence criminal cases and [also has] hearings for domestic violence protective orders. The court allows victims of domestic violence to have hearings for restraining orders and criminal cases heard at the same time, reducing the number of visits to court. From an administrative perspective, it reduces [use of] court time and resources.

—STOP administrator, North Carolina

Before STOP funds, there was no single, safe, and confidential access for victims seeking [to file] EPOs [emergency protective orders] and/or criminal complaints. If victims wanted to file an EPO, they had to go to the Family Court clerk's office in the Judicial Center. If they wanted to also file a criminal complaint based on the same incident, victims had to leave the Judicial Center and go to the Hall of Justice across the street. In both instances, the victims were subjected to a long waiting period in a public, nonsecured area. Victims had to retell the facts of the incident at each location to two different clerks. The victims had no advocates or prosecutors to meet with them at either location. When victims filed both an EPO and criminal complaint, there was no coordination to ensure simultaneous service of the EPO and arrest warrant on the criminal complaint.

—STOP subgrantee, Kentucky

Nearly 60 percent of the courts receiving STOP Program funding (14 of the 24 subgrantees that used funds for court activities) conducted judicial monitoring activities of convicted offenders, holding an average of 1.7 hearings per offender for 6,700 offenders during calendar year 2005.<sup>32</sup> These courts held offenders accountable by imposing sanctions for violations of probation conditions and other court orders, as shown in table 9.

**Table 9. Disposition of selected violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts**

Violation	Verbal/written warning (%)	Partial/full revocation of probation (%)	Conditions added (%)	Fine (%)	No action taken (%)
Protection order ( <i>N</i> = 77 )	52	30	10	0	8
New criminal behavior ( <i>N</i> = 102 )	8	69	20	0	4
Failure to attend batterer intervention program ( <i>N</i> = 890 )	43	27	29	0	1

## Probation Supervision

Probation offers the opportunity to avoid incarceration by complying with specific court-ordered conditions that are monitored by a probation officer. Following the example of police, prosecutors, and courts, probation departments funded under the

<sup>32</sup> Three-quarters of the funded courts also processed more than 39,000 new charges and disposed of 16,700 new and pending charges during 2005.

STOP Program have adopted specialized caseloads for monitoring domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking offenders. Many of these specialized probation officers enforce a more intensive supervision of their probationers, and many require attendance at batterer intervention programs (BIPs) or sex offender treatment programs.

Specialized supervision of domestic violence offenders works. A National Institute of Justice-sponsored study of Rhode Island's Department of Corrections/Probation and Parole found that a specialized probation supervision unit for individuals convicted of domestic violence significantly reduced the risk of reabuse and rearrest, and increased victim satisfaction when compared with nonspecialized supervision (Klein et al., 2005). This study builds on earlier research indicating that probationary sentences with short periods of jail, which is allowed or mandated in most states as a condition of probation, reduced recidivism over lesser sentences (Thistlewaite, Wooldredge, and Gibbs, 1998).

When offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation officers in 2005 failed to comply with court-ordered conditions, probation revocation rates ranged from 42 percent for failure to attend a BIP, to 66 percent for new criminal behavior, to 72 percent for protection order violations (table 10).

**Table 10. Disposition of selected probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments**

Violation	Verbal/ written warning (%)	Partial/full revocation of probation (%)	Conditions added (%)	Fine (%)	No action taken (%)
Protection order (N = 346 )	16	72	11	0	1
New criminal behavior (N = 581 )	6	66	14	5	9
Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 617)	44	42	6	0	8

NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Probation officers funded under the STOP Program supervised 10,400 offenders and made a total of nearly 63,000 contacts with those offenders, for an average of 6 contacts per offender. The majority of these contacts (68 percent) were face-to-face, 23 percent were by telephone, and 9 percent were unscheduled surveillance. Some probation officers have also begun to reach out to victims; officers made 6,000 contacts with 2,000 victims during 2005. Regular contact provides an opportunity to inform victims about services available in the community and lets them know that the criminal justice system is continuing to hold the offender accountable.

STOP funds support victim advocacy services as part of an Intensive Sex Offender Probation Unit in three cities: Hartford, New Haven, and New London. The Unit has provided technical assistance to other cities and states. The Unit is based on a collaborative approach to supervising sex

offenders in the community; the victim advocate works with the probation officers and treatment providers to ensure victim safety. The model was evaluated 4 years ago by [an] independent researcher who found that the victim advocate helped to support increased offender accountability by enhancing the probation officers' ability to monitor the offender.

—STOP administrator, Connecticut

STOP funding has allowed us to provide supervision to first-time offenders to ensure their participation in batterer intervention [programs] and to provide enhanced, specialized probation supervision for felony offenders. Without the extra motivation created by STOP funding, it is not very likely that each entity in the criminal justice system would continue feeling a need to participate on the Domestic Violence Court Task Force. The Task Force has served as a forum for various system improvements.

—Pinal County Domestic Violence Court, Arizona

## Protection Orders

The STOP Program funds activities that provide support to victims seeking protection orders, including providing advocacy in the courtroom, increasing police enforcement, and training advocates and judges on the effectiveness and use of orders (table 11). STOP Program subgrantees, whether they are providing victim services or engaging in criminal justice activities, are in a position to provide assistance to victims in the protection order process. In 2005, STOP Program-funded victim advocates and law enforcement and prosecution staff assisted domestic violence victims in obtaining more than 271,000 temporary and final protection orders (table 11). Courts funded under the STOP Program processed 21,749 civil protection orders, 14,153 of which were temporary and 7,596 of which were final.

**Table 11. Protection orders assisted/processed with STOP Program funds**

Provider	Total	Temporary	Final
All providers	271,310	162,044	109,266
Victim services staff	187,213	106,510	80,703
Law enforcement	52,659	35,605	17,054
Prosecution	31,438	19,929	11,509

Because of STOP funding, our county has become the leading county in the area for quick and effective service of emergency protective orders. Prior to STOP funding, our county had a successful service rate of only 36 percent in dealing with service of emergency protective orders. Most officers would stop after the initial try for service and allow the emergency protective order to expire, causing a delay in trial and reissuance of an order for an additional two weeks. This process could go on for months, clogging the system with unnecessary delays, forcing victims to return into the court system week after week only to be told

their case was to be continued. Today, our office boasts an 82 percent successful service rate of emergency protective orders, higher than any of the neighboring counties. Because our unit has been in existence for 8 years, we have become the major resource and referral place for all other agencies that need information or assistance with a domestic violence victim. None of this would have been possible without STOP grant funding for a specialized unit dealing with women and children using the court system to escape a dangerous, possibly lethal, situation.

—*City of Williamsburg, Kentucky*

With STOP funding in 2005, OAG [Office of the Attorney General] was able for the first time to create and publish two brochures, each in a number of languages, to inform victims of services and options available to them and specifically what actions to take if a civil protection order is violated.

—*Office of the Attorney General, District of Columbia*

Several major studies confirm that having protection orders in place reduces the reoccurrence of abuse (Holt et al., 2002; Keilitz, 2001). Lack of service and enforcement have long been recognized as the Achilles' heel of protection order effectiveness (Finn, 1991). Many state laws now provide for the mandatory, warrantless arrest of abusers who violate protection orders. In most cases, such violations can be aggressively prosecuted without requiring victim testimony, which protects victims from being retraumatized and increases the rate of successful prosecutions.

STOP Program subgrantees have used funds to improve data collection systems for seamless access to information about protection orders. Others have addressed the issues of protection order enforcement in training and in the development of protocols. Policies addressing protection order enforcement, immediate access to protection orders, violation of protection orders, full faith and credit, and policies against mutual restraining orders were developed and/or implemented by 259 subgrantees.

The Personal Protection Order [PPO] Office dramatically increased . . . access by victims to legal protection. Before the Personal Protection Order Office, a victim in need of protection would have had to go to the court to get papers, been provided with written instructions and, if they would have needed assistance, they would have needed to go elsewhere to get help. If there were any problems with the personal protection order, the survivor would . . . need to have an attorney help them with motions, and most did not know their rights in regards to holding the other party accountable. The PPO Office provides assistance with any motions the petitioner may need to modify, terminate, or extend the order. The PPO Office provides victims with follow-up after violations of the order. If a police report is filed, that report is faxed to the PPO Office, and the PPO Office follows up with the survivor to inform them of their options in regards to holding the abuser accountable. By establishing a public location, the office is able to reach a greater number of victims who otherwise may not have accessed these services.

—*STOP administrator, Maryland*

## Sexual Assault and Stalking

Over time, STOP-funded programs have expanded their focus beyond only responding to and serving domestic violence victims, but now include a focus on sexual assault and stalking victims as well (see “Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds” on page 15). Several initiatives have contributed to this shift:

- OVW’s requirement that sexual assault coalitions and advocacy organizations be included in the process of developing the STOP implementation plan.
- STOP Program funding of SANE training and programs to address stalking.
- Training that has helped increase understanding of the intersection of domestic violence, sexual violence, and stalking.
- Policies and protocols that have led to better responses and improved services to victims of sexual assault and stalking.

Notwithstanding these efforts and changes, it remains true that crimes of sexual assault and stalking have not received the same level of recognition and response as crimes of domestic violence. This applies both to society at large and to the systems (e.g., criminal justice, social services) designed to respond to violent acts. Reporting rates for sexual violence and stalking and charging rates for the prosecution of these crimes are still low; dismissal rates where charges are brought are still high. Congressional leaders recognized these challenges when they included the following specific purpose areas in the STOP Program (42 U.S.C. 3796gg):

- Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners in the collection and preservation of evidence, analysis, [and] prevention.
- Providing expert testimony and treatment of trauma related to sexual assault.
- Programs to address stalking.

The specialized training of medical personnel is designed not only to improve the quality of the examination and of the evidence collected, but also to provide victims of sexual trauma with compassionate treatment during the examination process. This training is critical, because a victim’s decision to appear at a medical facility to be examined is the necessary, first step in the process of holding offenders accountable. Historically, victims of sexual assault were often retraumatized by their experiences in hospitals. Triage usually left victims waiting hours for a forensic exam. Physicians were often untrained in forensic evidence collection and disinclined to become involved in a procedure that could require them to appear in court. Lack of training compromised the ability of the criminal justice system to prosecute perpetrators successfully. In SANE programs, trained nurse examiners provide prompt, sensitive, supportive, and compassionate care; the nurses also follow forensic protocols, ensuring the highest quality evidence.

Programs that include SANEs and SARTs have been found to greatly enhance the quality of health care provided to women who have been sexually assaulted, improve the quality of forensic evidence, improve law enforcement’s ability to collect information and to file charges, and increase the likelihood of successful prosecution (Crandall and Helitzer, 2003; Campbell, Patterson, and Lichty, 2005).

Prior to STOP funding for statewide training there were no SARTs in the state. Now we have about 20. Before we received STOP funding to enable us to establish a statewide SANE advisory board, there was one hospital in the state with SANEs. Now there are 33 medical facilities and 2 college campuses. We coordinated a national pilot mobile SANE project with four hospitals in four counties. Without SARTs and SANEs, this would not have been possible.

—*West Virginia Foundation for Rape Information and Services*

As a result of the increase in SANE programs throughout the state, New Mexico has a state-funded, statewide SANE coordinator. The STOP Grant Program is partnering with this project to provide increased training and coordination among all New Mexico SANE programs, resulting in a more consistent and effective delivery of services.

—*STOP administrator, New Mexico*

Six percent of all subgrantees (153 of 2,418) reported that they used funds for SANE training. Numerous states used STOP Program funds to support staff positions for SANEs.<sup>33</sup> More significantly, in terms of the Program's broader impact, funds supported training for more than 3,000 SANEs. In addition to the SANEs, an unknown number of additional medical personnel, reported as trained under the category "health professionals," may also have been conducting forensic exams on sexual assault victims.

More than 300 sexual assault organizations—292 programs and 45 sexual assault coalitions—received STOP Program funds, and sexual assault victims made up 14.4 percent of all victims served with Program funds in 2005. Although it is not possible to know exactly what services were provided to sexual assault survivors, subgrantees did report that more than 21,000 victims were accompanied to the hospital; those hospital visits are most often for forensic exams. In addition to providing services to sexual assault victims, 672 subgrantees—an impressive 60 percent of those using funds for training—provided training on topics related specifically to sexual assault: sexual assault dynamics, services, statutes and codes, and forensic examination. Felony sexual assault charges made up 3 percent of all new charges filed during 2005 by STOP Program-funded prosecutors. Of those that were disposed of during 2005, 69 percent resulted in convictions. This conviction rate compares favorably with the conviction rates for domestic violence misdemeanors (66 percent) and domestic violence felonies (67 percent).

STOP Program funding has allowed the three grant prosecutors to effectively review cases faster than they were able to before STOP Program funding, despite the fact that the unit received twice as many adult sex crimes cases this year than it did the year before receiving STOP Program funding. STOP funds have allowed adult sex crimes

---

<sup>33</sup> There was no specific staff category for a SANE on the STOP Annual Progress Report form; subgrantees reported 18 FTEs for SANE, sexual assault forensic examiner (SAFE), forensic nurse examiner (FNE), nurse examiner, etc., in the "other" category for 2005. More than half of the 305 subgrantees who reported directing 75 percent or more of their funds to sexual assault also reported FTEs (101) in the program coordinator category. It is possible that some of these FTEs were SANE program coordinators.



attorneys to better prepare for trial because of their manageable caseloads. It has allowed adult sex crimes attorneys to plead more cases with better results because of their early case preparation. Furthermore, the funds will enable the three grant attorneys to effectively prosecute the deluge of "cold hit" adult sexual assault cases that we will receive this year as a result of Missouri's all-felon DNA statute cited in our 2005 grant application. The bottom line is that the Sex Crimes/Child Abuse Unit at the Jackson County Prosecutor's Office is a MASH Unit for some of the most serious crimes in Jackson County. STOP Program funding has allowed us to more effectively prosecute perpetrators of adult sex crimes cases in Jackson County.

—*Jackson County Prosecutor's Office, Missouri*

Sexual Assault Support Services in Child and Family Service (Maui), funded through the STOP Program, provided crisis services to 169 female victims/survivors of sexual assault and face-to-face crisis intervention to 15 victims/survivors, and met 4 victims/survivors at the hospital to support them through a forensic exam in a rural area and on small islands from fiscal years 2004 to 2005. Without VAWA funding, they could not provide crisis services to victims/survivors who have little or no access to crisis support.

—*Hawaii site visit report*

The National Violence Against Women (NVAW) survey found that 59 percent of women who reported being stalked were stalked by their current or former intimate partners. Of those, 81 percent were also physically assaulted by that partner, and 31 percent were sexually assaulted by that partner (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). This helps to explain the low percentage (2.2 percent) of stalking victims reported as receiving services funded under the STOP Program; a significant number of the domestic violence and sexual assault victims could also have been victims of stalking, but would not have been reported as stalking victims by STOP subgrantees.<sup>34</sup> The survey also found that half of all stalking victims report the stalking to the police, and a quarter of those cases result in arrests. The survey reported that state stalking laws vary widely in their definitions of stalking, in the number of acts necessary to constitute the crime of stalking, and in their threat and fear requirements.

Prosecution offices funded under the STOP Program reported filing a total of 3,620 new stalking charges in 2005, which constituted 2 percent of all new charges. Twenty-nine percent of those charges were for felony stalking. The conviction rates for ordinance, misdemeanor, and felony-level stalking charges disposed of during 2005 were 89 percent, 71 percent, and 75 percent, respectively. Training on stalking issues was provided by 547 subgrantees (nearly half of those using funds for training); the training included an overview of stalking and information about the dynamics of stalking, available services, and relevant statutes and codes.

---

<sup>34</sup> Subgrantees were instructed to report an *unduplicated* count of victims and to select only *one primary victimization* for each victim served during calendar year 2005. Given the results of the NVAW survey, it is safe to assume that a significant number of domestic violence and sexual assault victims were also victims of stalking, even though they were not reported as stalking victims on the STOP Annual Progress Report form.

Since 1996, the number of stalking cases that the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office had to prosecute increased 67 percent. With STOP funding, the . . . Office has been able to increase the number of stalking crimes prosecuted and not plea bargained because of lack of staff time and resources.

—*STOP administrator, California*

STOP Program funding has allowed us: to develop an [anti-stalking] project involving campuses all over Ohio; to create resources for students and campus law enforcement and safety/security officers; to offer awareness sessions for students, faculty, and administrators about the increased likelihood of stalking occurring on campus; to empower students to limit their likelihood of being stalked and to provide them with ways to take action to protect themselves and assist law enforcement in the prosecution of stalkers; to provide training events for campus law enforcement and safety/security officers; to help law enforcement and safety/security officers learn how to work with victims to increase their safety and collect evidence to establish a case of stalking; to offer service learning opportunities to students to educate their peers about stalking, thereby fortifying their understanding of stalking and challenging them to help others seek services and increase their personal safety.

—*STOP administrator, Ohio*

## Historically Underserved Populations

Rates of victimization are not uniform across ethnic, racial, geographical, and other groups. Although national surveys generally do not include enough representatives of all the distinct categories of women across the United States to generate rates for all demographic groups, certain identifiable groups appear to be at greater risk than others for victimization by domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. These populations include American Indians/Alaska Natives, women living in rural jurisdictions, older adults, women who are disabled, people of color and other racial minorities, immigrants, and refugees. These populations often face unique challenges and barriers to receiving assistance and support. VAWA and OVW require states to specify in their implementation planning process how they will use STOP funds to address the needs of underserved victims. The statutory purpose areas of the STOP program include specific references to delivery of services (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) to underserved populations, addressing the needs of American Indian tribes, addressing the needs of older and disabled victims, and assisting victims in immigration matters.

Of the STOP Program subgrantees providing victim services in 2005, 97 percent reached underserved victims. In addition to providing direct services, subgrantees used STOP Program funds for training, products (e.g., brochures, manuals, training curricula, and training materials), and the development and implementation of policies addressing issues specific to the needs of underserved victims. Training was provided to more than 5,600 staff of advocacy organizations for older, disabled, and immigrant populations. These nongovernmental, community-based groups are in the best position to reach specific underserved populations and to assist them with referrals to appropriate services and agencies. Nearly 800 subgrantees—69 percent of all subgrantees offering training—provided training on issues specific to underserved

populations. Similarly, 335 subgrantees—55 percent of subgrantees using funds for policy development—established and/or implemented policies regarding appropriate responses to underserved populations in victim services, the criminal justice system, and health care. Taken together, the use of STOP Program funds in these areas demonstrates the commitment of states and their subgrantees to better understand the particular challenges faced by victims in underserved populations and to improve their responses to the needs of these victims.

## American Indians and Alaska Natives

American Indian and Alaska Native women report the highest rates of rape and physical assault (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). For sexual assault, their average annual rate is 3.5 times higher than the rate for non-Indians (Lee, Thompson, and Mechanic, 2002). They also are stalked at a rate that is at least twice that of women in any other ethnic group in the United States. The NVAW survey found that 17 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women are stalked during their lifetimes, compared with 8.2 percent of white women, 6.5 percent of African American women, and 4.5 percent of Asian/Pacific Islander women (Tyiska, 1998). Complicating efforts to protect these victims is the fact that most live in isolated communities and may not have access to telephones, transportation, or emergency services. Also, criminal justice resources and legal assistance often are limited in those communities.

Eight subgrantees receiving STOP Program funding identified themselves as tribal coalitions or tribal governments.<sup>35</sup> Seventy-four subgrantees reported that their projects were focused specifically on tribal populations and cited more than 100 tribes and nations they served or intended to serve. Nearly 11,000 (2.2 percent) of the victims served with STOP Program funds were reported as American Indian or Alaska Native. Training on issues specific to victims who are American Indian or Alaska Native was provided by 117 subgrantees, and approximately 500 tribal coalition and tribal government staff were trained with STOP funds.

Projects addressing Indian country issues included civil legal assistance projects [that] provided direct legal services to assist in the obtainment of orders of protection in tribal court. Training for tribal law enforcement officers enhanced the response to and the investigation of the crimes of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Training for tribal prosecutors enhanced the efforts to successfully prosecute the[se] crimes. . . . SANE programs increased outreach efforts to tribal communities. Judicial education on domestic violence was provided to tribal court judges.

—STOP administrator, New Mexico

The Inter-Tribal Council received funding to develop a curriculum and to provide training and technical assistance in enhancing and expanding the capacity of tribal and other law enforcement agencies to respond to American Indian victims of domestic violence. [The] American Indian

<sup>35</sup> The STOP Violence Against Indian Women grant program provides funding to tribal governments and agencies and is separate from the STOP Program. Activities supported by that grant program are reported on separately.

Shelter Program-California is now funding three American Indian projects in order to meet the special needs of American Indian women who live on reservations and have experienced domestic violence.

—STOP administrator, California

### **Victims with Disabilities and Victims Who Are Older**

Approximately 54 million Americans live with a wide array of physical, cognitive, and emotional disabilities (Tyiska, 1998). Victimization rates for women with disabilities are far greater than for those who are currently not disabled, suggesting that offenders specifically target the most vulnerable. An early study suggested that women with disabilities were one and one-half times more likely to have been sexually abused than women without disabilities (Doucette, 1986). After reviewing numerous studies, Stimpson and Best (1991) suggested that more than 70 percent of women with a wide variety of disabilities have been victims of violent sexual encounters at some time in their lives.

Law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and courts may not be accustomed to working with women who have cognitive impairments (such as limitations in learning, social skills, and intellect), making criminal investigation and prosecution procedures challenging (Cole et al., 1991; Valenti-Hein and Schwartz, 1993). Disability service providers and advocates often fail to address violence against women with disabilities (Elman, 2005). Historically, advocates lack the experience and training necessary to understand and effectively deal with the unique vulnerabilities to abuse in disability-specific contexts (Nosek et al., 2001).

There is a consensus that family members, including spouses, are responsible for most (up to 90 percent) of elder abuse, excluding self-neglect (Tatara et al., 1998). Similarly, studies of elder sexual abuse suggest that most victimizers are family members (Ramsey-Klawnsnik, 1991; Teaster et al., 2000). These studies agree that nearly all reported perpetrators were male and most victims were female.

Although intimate partner violence is covered by states' general domestic and family violence statutes and sexual assaults are covered by broader criminal statutes, the general political, policy, and law enforcement focus on younger victims has resulted in less attention to elder victimization. As a result, social service and criminal justice agencies have largely failed to develop responses tailored to the needs of elder victims. Battered women's shelters may not even be able to accommodate older victims.

STOP funding has allowed advocates to reach out to the elderly population through speaking engagements in churches and senior centers. The STOP team has conducted and sponsored a training on elder abuse to law enforcement, advocates, and other professionals in the state. This training was given in conjunction with the W[est] V[irginia] Policing Institute.

—Rape and Domestic Violence Center, West Virginia

STOP subgrantees reported serving approximately 26,000 victims with disabilities and more than 15,000 victims over the age of 60—4.4 percent and 3.2 percent, respectively, of all victims served.<sup>36</sup> More than 13 percent of all subgrantees reported that their programs assisted criminal justice agencies and others in addressing the needs of older and disabled victims of domestic violence or sexual assault. STOP Program subgrantees used their funds to provide training to develop and implement policies on improving the appropriateness and effectiveness of the criminal justice response and the provision of services to older and disabled victims. Training that addressed issues specific to these victims was provided by 422 subgrantees, including 4,000 staff members trained in disability and elder advocacy organizations. Policies addressing the needs of victims who are elderly or who have disabilities were developed or implemented by 215 subgrantees.

In January 2000, the Kings County District Attorney's Office (KCDA) implemented Barrier Free Justice, the first program within a prosecutor's office to address violence against women with disabilities. The goal of the project is to improve access to the criminal justice system for disabled women through early intervention with victims and the provision of training to the professionals who deal with these victims. Without a specialized program run by professionals who understand the special needs of disabled victims, the criminal justice system itself can pose significant obstacles for these women.

South Brooklyn Legal Services provides legal representation to women with disabilities in obtaining Family Court orders of protection. Barrier Free Justice has resulted in the establishment of disability policies and protocols in the Domestic Violence and Sex Crimes Bureaus of the KCDA, and the program has proven to be a resource for social service and law enforcement agencies in Kings County who work with disabled victims.

—STOP administrator, New York

Utah used VAWA funds to support Segó Lily Center for the Abused Deaf. This Center provided crisis intervention, counseling, and group support to this special population. The Center also provided training, brochures, and equipment for domestic violence shelters.

—STOP administrator, Utah

## Women Who Are Immigrants or Refugees

Although violence against women is universal, the trauma of sexual and domestic violence is often intensified for women who also face problems associated with immigration and acculturation. Although some cultures teach respect for women, other cultures devalue women's roles, increasing the likelihood of victimization. Cultural background can also shape how women experience and respond to violence. Immigrant and refugee women often are isolated because of their immigration/refugee experience, language barriers, legal status, lack of education, and the lack of

<sup>36</sup> Because data is collected at the program level and not at the victim level, it is not known how many of these victims were both disabled and over the age of 60. Also, the report form used to collect data for this report used the category 60+. The next breakdown was ages 25–59.

job skills necessary for working in the United States. Immigrant women, especially those who are undocumented, may be afraid to seek help following victimization. They may not know what their rights are or that services exist. When they do seek assistance, resources such as legal services, housing, and health care can be difficult to obtain. Homicide data from New York City found that immigrant women are overrepresented among female victims of male partner-perpetrated homicide (Frye et al., 2005).

VAWA 2000 attempted to remove barriers for victims seeking help by including the provision of assistance in immigration matters among the purpose areas authorized by the STOP Program. Subgrantees reported serving more than 24,500 victims who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers. These victims represent 4.2 percent of all victims served. Training on issues specific to these victims was provided by 284 subgrantees. This training is critical, because the social, cultural, and legal issues these victims face are complex, and the consequences of reporting domestic violence incidents are often more serious for them than for other victims. Subgrantees also used STOP Program funds to provide language services specifically designed to remove barriers to accessing critical services and effectively dealing with the criminal justice system. These services were provided by 166 STOP Program subgrantees and included interpreters, language lines, and the translation of forms, documents, and informational materials into languages other than English. Subgrantees used STOP Program funds to develop, translate, and/or distribute at least 381 different products in 32 different languages.

Utah is one of the primary refugee relocation areas in the nation. The largest groups of refugees come from Bosnia, Iraq, Iran, Sudan, Russia, and Somalia, with other refugees arriving from other parts of Africa (Cameroon, Chad, Gambia, Rwanda), Asia (Vietnam), Eastern Europe (Serbia, Croatia, Kosovo, Ukraine), and the Middle East (Turkey). With the use of VAWA funds, Utah has developed and enhanced the services and supports available to immigrant, migrant, and refugee victims as well as other ethnic groups. Services include: training, legal representation, counseling, access to referrals, protective orders, enhanced shelter services, and legal representation in administrative immigration providing for self-petitioning, cancellation of removal, and U-visas.

—STOP administrator, Utah

The Refugee Family Violence Prevention Project provided comprehensive community outreach, education, counseling, and intervention services to battered refugee and immigrant women. During the reporting period, over 100 clients from 17 different countries were served. The staff trained more than 250 professionals from law enforcement, the Division of Family and Children Services, and the courts. The International Women's House is the only culturally and linguistically appropriate shelter for battered refugee and immigrant women in the Southeast. The shelter primarily serves the Atlanta area, but due to the unique services, women often travel not only from across the state, but across the nation to seek shelter.

—Refugee Family Service, Inc., Clarkson, Georgia

## Victims Who Live in Rural Areas

Although some studies suggest that women in urban areas are victimized at a higher rate than women in rural areas, smaller, specific studies found higher rates in rural communities (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006). A comparison of women patients at family practice clinics in the Midwest, for example, found that women in rural settings reported having violent partners at twice the rate—25 percent as compared with 12 percent—as those in larger, midsized communities (Elliot, 1997). Two studies of adult sexual victimization found that sexual assault rates were higher in certain rural counties (Lewis, 2003; Ruback and Ménard, 2001). Studies on domestic violence and sexual assault in rural areas offer other important findings on related issues such as the victim-offender relationship, reporting, and funding. These studies confirm the important influence the victim-offender relationship has on whether incidents of violence are reported; they argue that lower reporting rates in rural areas are due to the closeness of the victim-offender relationship, which in turn has to do with the geographical isolation and the resulting physical and emotional dependency of the victim on the offender. They found that rural counties had higher rates of victimization, but urban counties had higher rates of reporting (Ruback and Ménard, 2001).

When victimized in a rural community, victims often find that opportunities for medical, legal, or emotional services are very limited, or even nonexistent. Their economic situation and physical isolation may further limit their options. Because of strong community ties, the victim, the perpetrator, and service providers are more likely to be acquainted with each other than they would be in urban settings. Finally, rural culture tends to be close-knit, self-contained, and unlikely to turn to “outsiders” for assistance. Together, these characteristics result in low rates of reporting, limited opportunities for victim services, and difficulties for service providers. A victim of sexual or domestic violence in a rural community is not likely to report to police or to locate or access services (Lewis, 2003).

The prevalence of firearms makes violence against women more lethal in rural areas. Women who have been physically abused by current or former intimate partners were found to be at a fivefold risk of being murdered by that partner when the partner owned a firearm (Campbell et al., 2003). Other research has shown that firearm ownership among young men in rural communities may be as much as three times higher than it is in urban communities (Weisheit and Wells, 1996).

More than 144,000 victims, or one-quarter of all victims served with STOP Program funds during 2005, were reported as living in rural areas (including reservations and Indian country). Training in issues specific to victims who live in rural areas was provided by 534 subgrantees (47 percent of those using funds for training). Programs seeking to reach and to serve rural victims must work harder to inform them about services and to deliver those services. Developing effective community partnerships is critical to accomplishing these goals.

The state and its subgrantees work hard to reach our underserved populations (including immigrant victims, rural victims and communities, and victims with limited English proficiency) throughout the state. The various training programs provide vital updated information to first responders who serve rural areas where many of our underserved reside. These programs ensure that these victims have access to the same

essential services provided by well-trained responders as those available to victims in urban areas. STOP funds provide programs that do legal outreach to rural victims and provide pro bono legal representation to many of these victims. They provide legal and advocacy services to battered immigrant women, which include services in many languages other than English. The funds also allow subgrantees to provide appropriate literature to victims in many languages.

—STOP administrator, Alaska

STOP funds have been used throughout the state to address the identified needs of rural communities. Shelters in each of the Highway Patrol districts are currently providing services to victims in rural communities. Services provided include community outreach and education [about] available resources; domestic violence shelters providing additional shelter services in rural communities (satellite shelters); satellite sexual assault programs in neighboring counties to address the needs of sexual assault victims; SANE nurses and training of medical staff in rural hospitals and clinics; and transportation and legal assistance.

—STOP administrator, Mississippi



# STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments

This section presents aggregate data reflecting the activities and accomplishments funded by the STOP Program in all states, U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia. STOP Program staff provide training, victim services, law enforcement, prosecution, court services, and probation to increase victim safety and offender accountability (table 12).

- Number of subgrantees using funds for staff: 2,285 (94 percent of all subgrantees).

**Table 12. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program**

Staff	Number	Percent
All staff	3,550	100.0
Victim advocate	1,127	31.7
Program coordinator	440	12.4
Law enforcement officer	402	11.3
Prosecutor	367	10.3
Counselor	210	5.9
Support staff	204	5.7
Legal advocate	184	5.2
Administrator	136	3.8
Civil attorney	96	2.7
Victim-witness specialist	86	2.4
Trainer	80	2.3
Probation officer	41	1.2
Paralegal	35	1.0
Court personnel	28	0.8
Information technology specialist	11	0.3
Other	103	2.9

## Training

STOP Program subgrantees provide coalition members, law enforcement officers, prosecutors, court personnel, mental health specialists, and other professionals with training in issues of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking (table 13). Subgrantees train professionals to improve their response to victims and to increase offender accountability.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for training: 1,142 (47 percent of all subgrantees).
- Total number of people trained: 302,473.
- Total number of training events: 16,770.

**Table 13. People trained using STOP Program funds**

People trained	Number	Percent
All people trained	302,473	100.00
Law enforcement officers	95,480	31.60
Multidisciplinary group	30,384	10.00
Health professionals	26,335	8.70
Social service organization staff	19,901	6.60
Domestic violence program staff	15,564	5.10
Volunteers	14,842	4.90
Faith-based organization staff	11,515	3.80
Court personnel	9,373	3.10
Attorneys/law students	9,085	3.00
Mental health professionals	8,020	2.70
Sexual assault program staff	7,358	2.40
Community advocacy organization staff	6,347	2.10
Correction personnel	6,064	2.00
Government agency staff	5,482	1.80
Prosecutors	5,357	1.80
Victim-witness specialists	4,075	1.30
Sexual assault forensic examiners	3,139	1.00
Elder organization staff	2,052	0.70
Disability organization staff	1,949	0.60
Domestic violence coalition staff	1,888	0.60
Immigrant organization staff	1,686	0.60
Legal services staff	1,495	0.50
Batterer intervention program staff	1,431	0.50
Sexual assault coalition staff	1,067	0.40

**Table 13. People trained using STOP Program funds (continued)**

People trained	Number	Percent
Tribal government/tribal government agency	425	0.10
Supervised visitation and exchange center staff	381	0.10
Tribal coalition staff	57	0.02
Other	11,721	3.90

The most common topics of training events were overviews of domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault; law enforcement response; advocate response; safety planning; domestic violence statutes/codes; confidentiality; protection orders; coordinated community response; and criminal court procedures.

## Coordinated Community Response

STOP administrators engage in an inclusive and collaborative planning process to improve their states' response to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking (table 14). STOP Program subgrantees closely interact with other community agencies or organizations; these CCR activities include providing and receiving victim/survivor referrals, engaging in consultation, providing technical assistance, and/or attending meetings with other agencies or organizations.

**Table 14. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies**

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Batterer intervention program	178	323	448	136	429	308
Community advocacy organization	81	175	324	32	387	213
Corrections	166	389	531	90	489	349
Domestic violence organization	929	538	319	379	795	393
Faith-based organization	76	290	513	33	313	301
Court	802	647	260	221	515	373
Law enforcement	948	637	287	355	717	422
Prosecutor's office	651	578	383	308	645	390
Government agency	274	399	387	57	307	241
Health/mental health organization	294	658	596	88	638	384

**Table 14. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies (continued)**

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Legal services organization	345	587	473	75	452	348
Sexual assault organization	375	413	504	195	575	339
Social service organization	523	664	381	129	719	327
Tribal government/tribal government agency	17	42	164	10	84	94
Other	59	89	70	29	141	76

## Policies

STOP Program subgrantees develop and implement policies and procedures specifically directed at more effectively preventing, identifying, and responding to domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking against women (table 15).

- Number of subgrantees using funds for policies/protocols: 614 (25 percent of all subgrantees).

**Table 15. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols**

Policy/protocol	Subgrantees using funds (N = 614)	
	Number	Percent
Appropriate response to underserved populations	335	55
Mandatory training	313	51
Protection order	259	42
Providing information to victims about victim services	238	39
Confidentiality	216	35
Appropriate response to victims who are elderly or have disabilities	215	35
Informing victims about crime victims compensation and victim impact statements	205	33

## Products

STOP Program subgrantees develop and/or revise a variety of products for distribution, including brochures, manuals, and training curricula and materials (table 16). The products are designed to provide standardized information about available victim services to professionals, community agencies/organizations, and victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for products: 635 (26 percent of all subgrantees).

**Table 16. Use of STOP Program funds to develop or revise products for distribution**

Product	Number developed or revised	Number used or distributed
All products	2,233	1,443,145
Brochures	744	832,409
Manuals	240	70,223
Training curricula	339	33,094
Training materials	432	72,355
Other	478	435,064

STOP Program subgrantees developed or revised products in 32 languages:

<b>Amharic</b>	<b>Gujarati</b>	<b>Russian</b>
<b>Arabic</b>	<b>Hindi</b>	<b>Serbian</b>
<b>ASL</b>	<b>Hmong</b>	<b>Serbo-Croatian</b>
<b>Bengali</b>	<b>Inupiat</b>	<b>Somali</b>
<b>Bosnian</b>	<b>Japanese</b>	<b>Spanish</b>
<b>Cambodian</b>	<b>Korean</b>	<b>Swahili</b>
<b>Cape Verdean</b>	<b>Kurdish</b>	<b>Thai</b>
<b>Chinese</b>	<b>Laotian</b>	<b>Urdu</b>
<b>Creole</b>	<b>Marathi</b>	<b>Vietnamese</b>
<b>French</b>	<b>Portuguese</b>	<b>Yupik</b>
<b>German</b>	<b>Punjabi</b>	

## Data Collection and Communication Systems

STOP Program subgrantees develop, install, or expand data collection and communication systems relating to domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking against women (tables 17 and 18). These systems link police, prosecution, and the courts for the purposes of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for data collection and communication systems: 411 (17 percent of all subgrantees).

**Table 17. Use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems**

Activity	Subgrantees using funds (N = 411)	
	Number	Percent
Develop/install/expand data collection/communication systems	239	58
Link existing data collection/communication systems	64	16
Share information with other community partners	198	48
Manage data collection and communication	272	66
Purchase computers/other equipment	108	26

**Table 18. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems**

Purpose	Subgrantees reporting
Case management	246
Protection orders	194
Arrest	181
Violation of protection orders	168
Evaluation/outcome measures	163
Prosecutions	160

## Specialized Units

STOP Program subgrantees develop, train, and/or expand specialized units of law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges (or other court staff), and probation officers who are specifically responsible for handling domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking cases (table 19).

- Number of subgrantees using funds for specialized units: 673 (28 percent of all subgrantees).

**Table 19. Use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities**

Activity	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Develop a new unit	47	23	7	7
Support, expand, or coordinate an existing unit	321	339	44	32
Train a specialized unit	72	43	10	9
Other	9	11	6	2

## System Improvement

To more effectively respond to the needs of victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, STOP Program subgrantees engage in system improvement activities, including convening meetings between tribal and nontribal entities, making available language lines, translating forms and documents, and making facilities safer (table 20).

- Number of subgrantees using funds for system improvement: 331 (14 percent of all subgrantees).

**Table 20. Use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities**

Activity	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Evaluation	116	55	49	29	21
Interpreters	85	26	17	12	6
Language lines	28	3	6	2	0
Meetings between tribal and nontribal entities	15	9	4	4	3
Safety audits	16	13	8	8	4
Security personnel or equipment	16	15	4	1	1
Translation of forms and documents	89	19	18	12	0
Other	54	35	30	20	19

## Victim Services

Communities with demonstrable success in reducing domestic homicide use comprehensive approaches to domestic violence (DOJ, 2005). For many victims, leaving the community does not necessarily guarantee safety; leaving often requires giving up support systems that are essential to the victim's emotional, financial, and psychological survival. A one-dimensional focus on leaving as a solution to domestic violence does not take into account the areas of a woman's life that are unaffected by the violence, or relationships that women do not want to leave behind (Krenek, 2000). Therefore, an array of victim services is fundamental to an effective community response to domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

During the 12-month report period, a total of 1,633 subgrantees (68 percent of all subgrantees) used funds for victim services. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 581,529 victims (97 percent of those seeking services) to help them become and remain safe from violence. Only 3 percent of victims seeking services from funded programs did not receive services from those programs. (See tables 21 and 22 for information on the level of service provided and the types of victims served by subgrantees, and table 23 for the most frequently reported reasons victims were not served or were partially served.)

- Number of subgrantees using funds for victim services: 1,633 (68 percent of all subgrantees).

**Table 21. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees, by level of service and type of victimization**

Level of service	All victims		Domestic violence victims		Sexual assault victims		Stalking victims	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All seeking services	599,232	100	501,557	100	84,903	100	12,772	100
Not served	17,703	3	16,322	3	1,130	1	251	2
Served	540,711	90	451,973	90	78,378	92	10,360	81
Partially Served	40,818	7	33,262	7	5,395	7	2,161	17

NOTES: Partially served victims received some, but not all, of the services they sought through STOP Program-funded programs. Some of these victims may have received other requested services from other agencies.

**Table 22. Victims receiving full or partial service from STOP Program subgrantees, by type of victimization**

Type of victimization	Victims served	
	Number	Percent
All victimizations	581,529	100.0
Domestic violence	485,235	83.4
Sexual assault	83,773	14.4
Stalking	12,521	2.2

**Table 23. Most frequently reported reasons victims were not served or were partially served**

Reason	Subgrantees reporting
Did not meet eligibility or statutory requirements	295
Services not appropriate for victim/survivor	259
Program reached capacity	253
Program rules not acceptable to victim/survivor	145
Transportation problems	142
Conflict of interest	138
Services inappropriate or inadequate for victims/survivors with mental health problems	130
Services inappropriate or inadequate for victims/survivors with substance abuse problems	128
Geographic or other isolation of victim/survivor	119
Need not documented	109



## Demographics of Victims Served

Of the more than 581,529 victims served during the 12-month report period, those who were served or partially served were most likely to be white (57.2 percent), female (89.2 percent), ages 25–59 (61.7 percent), and victimized by a current or former spouse or intimate partner (68.5 percent) (tables 24 and 25).

**Table 24. Demographic characteristics of victims served**

Characteristic	Victims receiving services	
	Number	Percent
Race/ethnicity		
Black/African American	105,561	22.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	10,708	2.2
Asian	8,141	1.7
Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander	1,610	0.3
Hispanic/Latino	86,362	18.0
White	273,994	57.2
Unknown	102,254	na
Gender		
Female	488,307	89.2
Male	59,058	10.8
Unknown	34,164	na
Age		
0–17	45,006	9.3
18–24	124,822	25.8
25–59	298,375	61.7
60+	15,401	3.2
Unknown	97,925	na
Other		
Disability	25,676	4.4
Limited English proficiency	45,942	7.9
Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	24,536	4.2
Resident of rural area	144,178	24.8

na = not applicable

NOTES: STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 581,529 victims. Because some victims identify with more than one race/ethnicity, data reported may be higher than the total number of victims served. Due to a prorating formula used to adjust demographic data when secondary victims have been misreported and no data are provided on the gender of those victims, the percentage of female victims reported may be lower and the percentage of male victims may be higher than actual numbers would reflect.

**Table 25. Victim's relationship to offender**

Relationship to offender	Domestic violence		Sexual assault		Stalking	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Current/former spouse or intimate partner	308,975	72.1	14,908	21.6	6,561	50.1
Other family or household member	48,138	11.2	15,173	22.0	630	4.8
Dating relationship	61,150	14.3	8,650	12.5	2,986	22.8
Acquaintance	6,176	1.4	21,440	31.1	2,346	17.9
Stranger	1,247	0.3	8,068	11.7	567	4.3
Unknown	71,836	na	24,447	na	2,722	na
Other	2,873	0.7	803	1.2	17	0.1
Total	428,559	100.0	69,042	100.0	13,107	100.0

na = not applicable

NOTES: The percentages in each victimization category are based on the total number of victim relationships to offender, minus the number of unknown relationships, reported in that category. Because victims may have been abused by more than one offender and may have experienced more than one type of victimization, the number of reported relationships may be higher than the total number of victims served.

### Types of Services Provided to Victims

STOP Program subgrantees provide an array of services to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking (table 26). These services include victim advocacy (actions designed to help the victim/survivor obtain needed resources or services), crisis intervention, counseling/support groups, and legal advocacy (assistance navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems). Safety planning, referrals, and information are routinely provided to victims as needed.

**Table 26. Services provided by STOP Program subgrantees**

Type of service	Victims served (N = 581,529)	
	Number	Percent
Victim advocacy	268,821	46
Hotline calls	233,784	40
Crisis intervention	206,233	35
Criminal justice advocacy	163,522	28
Civil legal advocacy	150,970	26
Counseling/support group	148,632	26
Victim witness notification	143,211	25
Shelter (includes transitional housing)	24,007	4
Civil legal assistance	23,216	4
Hospital response	21,170	4
Other	10,141	2

NOTE: Detail does not add to total because an individual victim/survivor may receive more than one service.

**Number of victims receiving shelter services:**

- 23,311 victims and 24,773 family members received a total of 801,926 emergency shelter bed days.
- 696 victims and 958 family members received a total of 182,349 transitional housing bed days.

**Protection orders:**

- Of the protection orders for which victim advocates provided assistance, 144,530 were granted.

**Criminal Justice**

The STOP Program promotes a coordinated community approach that includes law enforcement, prosecution, courts, probation, victim services, and public and private community resources. Criminal justice data in this report reflect only those activities supported with STOP Program funds.

**Law Enforcement**

The response and attitude of law enforcement officers influence whether victims will report domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking offenses, and whether appropriate evidence will be collected to enable prosecutors to bring successful cases. Law enforcement's approach to violence against women must be proactive and rigorous. Arrest, accompanied by a thorough investigation and meaningful sanctions, demonstrates to offenders that they have committed a serious crime and communicates to victims that they do not have to endure an offender's abuse. It has been suggested that "good police work, starting with arrest, may be the first step in preventing domestic violence and reducing overall abuse. It may be that every domestic violence arrest, starting with the simple misdemeanor, is a homicide prevention measure" (Klein, 2004, p. 113).

Table 27 summarizes STOP Program-funded law enforcement activities during 2005.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for law enforcement: 385 (16 percent of all subgrantees).

**Table 27. Law enforcement activities funded by STOP Program**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Subgrantees responding</b>	<b>Total activities</b>
Cases/incidents investigated	333	122,605
Incident reports	277	120,587
Calls for assistance	242	119,174
Referrals of cases to prosecutor	269	48,114
Arrests of predominant aggressor	267	44,556
Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served	172	31,070
Protection orders issued	138	15,916
Enforcement of warrants	192	14,195

**Table 27. Law enforcement activities funded by STOP Program (continued)**

Activity	Subgrantees responding	Total activities
Arrests for violation of protection order	213	5,992
Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutor	57	3,304
Dual arrests	141	1,549
Arrests for violation of bail bond	79	1,204

NOTE: Of the protection orders for which law enforcement personnel provided assistance, 43,380 were granted.

### Prosecution

Prosecution of offenders varies by state, although city or county officials in municipal or district courts usually handle misdemeanor offenses, and county prosecutors in superior courts generally handle felony offenses. After police arrest a suspect, it is usually up to the prosecutor to decide whether to charge the offender and prosecute the case. “Rigorous criminal prosecution” that includes “early and repeated contacts with victims, providing them access to supportive, protection, legal, and other resources, inform and reassure victim regularly throughout the course of a prosecution, and increase the likelihood of conviction and reduce recidivism” (Klein, 2004, p. 143). Close cooperation between law enforcement, victim advocates, and specialized prosecution units; specialized training for prosecutors; and vertical prosecution all have contributed to higher prosecution and conviction rates (Klein, 2004).

Table 28 presents data on STOP Program-funded prosecutions of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking charges during 2005.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for prosecution: 358 (15 percent of all subgrantees).

**Table 28. Prosecution of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking charges**

Charge	New charges filed		Charges disposed	Dispositions resulting in convictions	
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
All charges	178,016	100	136,325	90,942	67
Misdemeanor domestic violence	102,640	58	84,288	55,343	66
Felony domestic violence	26,090	15	13,366	8,933	67
Violation of protection order	15,767	9	11,864	8,517	72
Domestic violence ordinance	12,735	7	8,422	4,815	57
Felony sexual assault	5,512	3	4,110	2,833	69
Violation of probation/parole	4,821	3	5,553	5,054	91

NOTES: 358 subgrantees (15 percent) used funds for prosecution. Of the protection orders for which prosecution personnel provided assistance, 26,489 were granted. Ten tribal grantees referred 611 cases to a federal or state entity for prosecution. Detail does not add to total because not all charges are shown.

## Courts

Judges have two distinct roles in responding to violence against women—administrative and magisterial. In their administrative role, judges are responsible for making courthouses safer and user friendly for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. In their magisterial role, they can be critical in holding offenders accountable and ensuring the safety of victims. Although frequently judges are ratifying plea agreements, they set the parameters as to what type of sentences they will accept, including whether they will allow diversion and deferred sentences. Courts monitor offenders to review progress and compliance with court orders. The data in table 29 reflect the consequences imposed for violations of court orders.

- Number of grantees using funds for court: 24 (1 percent of all subgrantees).

**Table 29. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders**

Violation	Verbal/written warning		Partial/full revocation of probation		Conditions added		Fine		No action taken	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Protection order (N = 77)	40	52	23	30	8	10	0	0	6	8
New criminal behavior (N = 102)	8	8	70	69	20	20	0	0	4	4
Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 890)	384	43	238	27	256	29	0	0	12	1
Other (N = 682)	48	7	347	51	284	42	0	0	3	0

### Judicial Monitoring:

- 6,677 offenders were monitored.
- 11,602 judicial review hearings were held.

### Civil Protection Orders:

- 15,212 civil protection orders were granted by STOP Program-funded courts.

## Probation

Probation officers monitor offenders to review progress and compliance with court orders. They may meet with offenders in person, by telephone, or via unscheduled surveillance (table 30). If a probationer violates any terms of the probation, the officer has the power to return the probationer to court for a violation hearing, which could result in a verbal reprimand or warning, a fine, additional conditions, or revocation of probation (table 31). As arrests of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking offenders have increased, probation and parole officers have adopted policies and practices specifically targeted to offenders who commit violent crimes against women.

In addition to offender monitoring, probation officers also contact victims as an additional strategy to increase victim safety. A total of 2,019 victims received 6,042 contacts from probation officers funded under the STOP Program.

**Total number of probation cases: 10,422.**

- Offenders completing probation without violations: 811 (56 percent of those completing probation).
- Offenders completing probation with violations: 635 (44 percent).
- Number of grantees using funds for probation: 27 (1 percent of all subgrantees).

**Table 30. Offender monitoring by STOP Program subgrantees, by type and number of contacts**

Type of contact	Number of offenders	Number of contacts
Face-to-face	6,846	42,728
Telephone	3,641	14,358
Unscheduled surveillance	1,913	5,806

**Table 31. Disposition of probation violations**

Violation	Verbal/written warning		Partial/full revocation of probation		Conditions added		Fine		No action taken	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Protection order (N = 346)	55	16	250	72	38	11	1	0	2	1
New criminal behavior (N = 581)	32	6	383	66	84	14	31	5	51	9
Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 617)	273	44	260	42	36	6	0	0	48	8
Other (N = 1,044)	229	22	590	57	158	15	14	1	53	5

NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 because of rounding.

## References

- Albuquerque Journal*. 2004. Officials Push Domestic Violence Initiatives. 15 November, p. A10.
- Allen, N., Bybee, D., and Sullivan, C. 2004. Battered Women's Multitude of Needs: Evidence Supporting the Need for Comprehensive Advocacy. *Violence Against Women* 10(9):1015–35.
- Belknap, J., Graham, D., Hartman, J., Lippen, V., and Sutherland, J. 1999. Predicting Court Outcomes in Intimate Partner Violence Cases: Preliminary Findings. *Domestic Violence Report* 5(1):1–16.
- Bryson, A.J. 2004. A Tide of Violence. *Deseret Morning News* (Salt Lake City, UT), 16 August, p. A01.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2006. *A National Crime Victimization Survey, 2005*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Campbell, R., Patterson, D., and Lichty, L. 2005. The Effectiveness of Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) Programs: A Review of Psychological, Medical, Legal, and Community Outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse* 6(4):313–29.
- Campbell, J.C., et al. 2003. Risk Factors for Femicide in Abusive Relationships: Results from a Multisite Case Control Study. *American Journal of Public Health* 93(7):1089–97.
- Cole, M.G., Fenton, F.R., Engelsmann, F., and Mansouri, I. 1991. Effectiveness of Geriatric Psychiatry Consultation in an Acute Care Hospital: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Journal of American Geriatric Society* 39(12):1183–88.
- Crandall, C., and Helitzer, D. 2003. *Impact Evaluation of a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) program*. Albuquerque, NM: Albuquerque SANE Collaborative.
- Davis, R., Smith, B., and Nickles, L. 1998. The Deterrent Effect of Prosecuting Domestic Violence Misdemeanors. *Crime and Delinquency* 44(3):434–42.
- Doucette, J. 1986. *Violent Acts Against Disabled Women*. Toronto, Canada: Disabled Women Network.
- Dugan, L., Nagin, D.S., and Rosenfeld, R. 2003. Do Domestic Violence Services Save Lives? *National Institute of Justice Journal* 250:20–25.

Elliot, J. 1997. Domestic Violence Among Family Practice Patients in Midsized and Rural Communities. *Journal of Family Practice* 44(4):391–400.

Elman, A. 2005. *Confronting the Sexual Abuse of Women with Disabilities*. Enola, PA: National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, VAWnet Applied Research Forum. [http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc\\_Files\\_VAWnet/AR\\_SVDisability.pdf](http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/AR_SVDisability.pdf).

Finn, P. 1991. Civil Protection Orders: A Flawed Opportunity for Intervention. In *Women Battering: Policy Responses*, ed. M.K. Steinman. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co., pp.155–90.

Florida Department of Law Enforcement. 2005. Florida Statistical Analysis Center, County and Jurisdictional Domestic Violence Offenses Data, 1996–2005. [http://www.fdle.state.fl.us/fsac/Crime\\_Trends/download/excel/dvoff\\_jur02.xls](http://www.fdle.state.fl.us/fsac/Crime_Trends/download/excel/dvoff_jur02.xls).

Ford, D., and Regoli, M. 1993. *The Indianapolis Domestic Violence Prosecution Experiment*. Final Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Frye, V., Hosein, V., Waltermaurer, E., Blaney, S., and Wilt, S. 2005. Femicide in New York City 1990 to 1999. *Homicide Studies* 9(3):204–228.

Gallagher, M. 2005. 8 of 10 Assault Cases Dismissed. *Albuquerque Journal*, 1 May.

Gondolf, E.W., Fisher, E., and McFerron, J.R. 1990. The Helpseeking Behavior of Battered Women: An Analysis of 6,000 Shelter Interviews. In *The Victimology Handbook: Research Findings, Treatment and Public Policy*, ed. E. Viano. New York, NY: Garland.

Guam Bureau of Statistics and Plans. 2004. *Guam's FY 2004–2007 Multi Year Strategy for Drug Control, Violence Prevention, and System Improvement*. [www.bsp.guam.gov/Socio\\_Econ/2004-07%20Multiyear%20Strategy.pdf](http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Socio_Econ/2004-07%20Multiyear%20Strategy.pdf).

Gwinn, C., and Strack, G. 2006. *Hope for Hurting Families: Creating Family Justice Centers Across America*. Volcano, CA: Volcano Press.

Holt, V.L., Kernic, M.A., Lumley, T., Wolf, M.E., and Rivara, F.P. 2002. Civil Protection Orders and Risk of Subsequent Police-Reported Violence. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 288:589–94.

Keilitz, S. 2001. *Specialization of Domestic Violence Case Management in the Courts: A National Survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/186192.pdf>.

Klein, A. 2004. *The Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Klein, A. 2005. *Rhode Island Domestic Violence Shelter and Advocacy Services: An Assessment*. Sudbury, MA: Advocates for Human Potential.



- Klein, A., Wilson, D., Crow, A., and DeMichele, M. 2005. *Evaluation of the Rhode Island Probation Specialized Domestic Violence Supervision Unit*. American Probation and Parole Association and BOTEC Analysis Corporation (National Institute of Justice Study).
- Krenek, K. 2000. The Battered Women's Movement—Transforming Our Vision to Meet Women's Needs: Reflections on Wisconsin's Experience. National Resource Center on Domestic Violence.
- Lee, R., Thompson, V., and Mechanic, M. 2002. Intimate Partner Violence and Women of Color: A Call for Innovations. *American Journal of Public Health* 92(4).
- Lewis, S. H. 2003. *Sexual Assault in Rural Communities*. Enola, PA: National Resource Center on Domestic Violence.  
[http://new.vawnet.org/category/Main\\_Doc.php?docid=419](http://new.vawnet.org/category/Main_Doc.php?docid=419).
- Maxwell, C., Garner, J., and Fagan, J. 2001. *The Effects of Arrest on Intimate Partner Violence: New Evidence from the Spouse Assault Replication Program*. Research in Brief. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Muskie School of Public Service. 2005. Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Summary Data Reports: January 1 through June 30, 2005. <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/arrestgraphs.htm>.
- Nosek, M., Foley, C., Hughes, R., and Howland, C. 2001. Vulnerabilities for Abuse Among Women with Disabilities. *Sexuality and Disability* 19(3):177–89.
- Owens, S. 2004. Domestic Violence Cases Fuel Dispute. *Orlando Sentinel*, 26 November, p. B1.
- Ramsey-Klawnsnik, H. 1991. Elder Sexual Abuse: Preliminary Findings. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect* 3(3):73–90.
- Ruback, B.R., and Ménard, K. S. 2001. Rural-Urban Differences in Sexual Victimization and Reporting: Analyses using UCR and Crisis Center Data. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 28(2):131–55.
- Shepard, M. 1999. *Evaluating Coordinated Community Responses to Domestic Violence*. Enola, PA: National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, VAWnet Applied Research Forum. [http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc\\_Files\\_VAWnet/AR\\_ccr.pdf](http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/AR_ccr.pdf).
- Sherman, L., and Berk, R. 1984. The Specific Deterrent Effects of Arrest on Domestic Assault. *American Sociological Review* 49:261–72.
- Stimpson, L., and Best, M. 1991. *Courage Above All: Sexual Assault Against Women With Disabilities*. Toronto: Disabled Women's Network.
- Sullivan, C., and Bybee, D. 2000. *Using a Longitudinal Data Set to Further Understanding of the Trajectory of Intimate Violence Over Time*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

- Tatara, T., Kuzmeskos, L., Duckhorn, E., Bivens, L., Thomas, C., Gettig, J., Jay, K., Hartley, A., Rust, K., and Cross, J. 1998. *The National Elder Abuse Incident Study*. Final Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families and Administration on Aging.
- Teaster, P., Roberto, K., Duke, J., and Myenonghwan, K. 2000. Sexual Abuse of Older Adults: Preliminary Findings of Cases in Virginia. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect* 12(3/4):1–16.
- Thistlewaite, A., Wooldredge, J., and Gibbs, D. 1998. Severity of Dispositions and Domestic Violence Recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency* 44(3):388–95.
- Tjaden, P., and Thoennes, N. 1998. *Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Research in Brief. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Tyiska, C. 1998. *Working With Victims of Crime with Disabilities*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime.
- U.S. Department of Justice. 2005. Responding to Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking: Report of the National Advisory Committee on Violence Against Women. <http://www.usdoj.gov/ovw/nac/welcome.html>.
- Valenti-Hein, D., and Schwartz, L. 1993. Witness Competency in People With Mental Retardation: Implications for Prosecution of Sexual Abuse. *Sexuality and Disability* 11(4):287–94.
- VAWA Measuring Effectiveness Initiative. 2007. Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine. <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/stprofiles.htm#stprofiles>.
- Weisheit, R., and Wells, L. 1996. Rural Crime and Rural Policing: Implications for Theory and Research. *Crime and Delinquency* 42:379–97.

## Appendix A. STOP Program Funding Allocation and Distribution



**Table A1. STOP Program allocations, by state: 1999–2005**

State	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Alabama	12,135,144	NA	2,159,000	1,871,000	2,150,144	2,138,000	1,922,000	1,895,000
Alaska	1,569,000	NA	NA	NA	785,000	784,000	NA	NA
American Samoa	855,590	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	427,460	428,130
Arizona	6,515,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,294,000	2,056,000	2,165,000
Arkansas	5,325,350	NA	NA	NA	1,454,450	1,370,700	1,253,700	1,246,500
California	21,720,751	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	10,929,751	10,791,000
Colorado	3,952,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,080,000	1,872,000	NA
Connecticut	6,447,650	NA	NA	NA	1,700,500	1,691,000	1,533,300	1,522,850
Delaware	2,578,000	NA	NA	NA	874,000	871,000	833,000	NA
District of Columbia	3,107,000	NA	NA	751,000	800,000	798,000	NA	758,000
Florida	5,020,889	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,790,058	2,230,831	NA
Georgia	12,805,000	NA	NA	2,867,000	3,461,000	3,438,000	3,039,000	NA
Guam	1,948,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	654,000	646,000	648,000
Hawaii	2,754,741	NA	NA	NA	971,841	918,000	864,900	NA
Idaho	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	2,387,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,387,000
Iowa	4,531,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,614,000	1,471,000	1,446,000
Kansas	2,566,400	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,326,200	1,240,200
Kentucky	7,608,000	NA	NA	NA	2,013,000	2,002,000	1,805,000	1,788,000
Louisiana	9,988,000	NA	NA	1,870,000	2,157,000	2,144,000	1,927,000	1,890,000
Maine	926,833	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	48,433	878,400
Maryland	6,804,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,436,000	2,177,000	2,191,000
Massachusetts	4,930,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,492,000	2,438,000
Michigan	7,585,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,034,000	3,551,000	NA
Minnesota	6,393,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,291,000	2,053,000	2,049,000
Mississippi	3,178,000	NA	NA	NA	1,593,000	1,585,000	NA	NA
Missouri	7,352,000	NA	NA	NA	2,552,000	2,536,000	2,264,000	NA
Montana	849,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	849,000
Nebraska	1,147,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	40,000	1,107,000	NA
Nevada	5,026,000	NA	NA	NA	1,291,000	1,285,000	1,189,000	1,261,000
New Hampshire	1,996,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,028,000	968,000	NA
New Jersey	6,625,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,518,000	3,107,000	NA
New Mexico	4,534,000	NA	NA	NA	1,177,000	1,172,000	1,092,000	1,093,000
New York	18,130,100	NA	7,053,750	5,592,650	NA	NA	NA	5,483,700
North Carolina	12,162,123	NA	NA	2,802,977	NA	3,363,000	2,974,146	3,022,000
North Dakota	1,511,049	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	738,990	772,059
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	21,750,000	NA	4,780,000	3,878,000	4,570,000	4,538,000	3,984,000	NA
Oklahoma	4,966,000	NA	NA	NA	1,713,000	1,704,000	1,549,000	NA
Oregon	4,999,719	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,773,719	1,608,000	1,618,000
Pennsylvania	8,420,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,263,000	4,157,000
Puerto Rico	5,388,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,654,000	1,734,000	NA
Rhode Island	2,784,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	963,000	912,000	909,000
South Carolina	1,802,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,802,000
South Dakota	3,129,300	NA	NA	NA	800,850	798,950	766,650	762,850
Tennessee	4,585,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,572,000	2,295,000	2,290,000
Texas	21,618,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	7,807,000	6,793,000	7,018,000
Utah	3,996,000	NA	NA	NA	1,372,000	1,366,000	1,258,000	NA
Vermont	2,370,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	811,000	781,000	778,000
Virgin Islands	2,543,000	NA	NA	635,000	638,000	638,000	632,000	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	7,302,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,616,000	2,333,000	2,353,000
West Virginia	4,718,000	NA	NA	NA	1,232,000	1,227,000	1,139,000	1,120,000
Wisconsin	6,804,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,448,000	2,188,000	2,168,000
Wyoming	1,486,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	744,000	742,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>311,624,639</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>13,992,750</b>	<b>20,267,627</b>	<b>33,305,785</b>	<b>79,219,427</b>	<b>90,878,361</b>	<b>73,960,689</b>

NA = not available

<sup>a</sup>Years 1999–2005 are federal fiscal years.

NOTE: Illinois, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Virginia did not submit STOP administrator data.

**Table A2. STOP Program funding awarded to subgrantees, by state: 1999–2005**

State	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Alabama	1,866,116	NA	5,900	NA	16,007	31,500	264,680	1,548,029
Alaska	784,500	NA	NA	NA	392,500	392,000	NA	NA
American Samoa	770,031	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	384,714	385,317
Arizona	1,814,744	NA	NA	NA	NA	156,804	1,548,720	109,220
Arkansas	1,247,760	NA	NA	NA	56,882	117,162	298,280	775,436
California	9,333,333	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	154,409	9,178,924
Colorado	3,675,360	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,934,400	1,740,960	NA
Connecticut	1,208,219	NA	NA	NA	62,250	84,000	383,325	678,644
Delaware	508,549	NA	NA	NA	11,131	53,761	443,657	NA
District of Columbia	836,156	NA	NA	84,412	64,522	5,022	NA	682,200
Florida	4,791,299	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,729,462	2,061,837	NA
Georgia	3,235,785	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,041,714	2,194,071	NA
Guam	1,753,200	NA	NA	NA	NA	588,600	581,400	583,200
Hawaii	817,301	NA	NA	NA	NA	604,609	212,692	NA
Idaho	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	2,128,252	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,128,252
Iowa	1,463,460	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,020	85,740	1,373,700
Kansas	1,204,743	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	209,885	994,858
Kentucky	1,976,680	NA	NA	NA	17,068	104,156	233,318	1,622,138
Louisiana	1,684,617	NA	NA	61,508	102,458	156,649	1,129,501	234,501
Maine	686,004	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	48,433	637,571
Maryland	1,714,580	NA	NA	NA	NA	26,219	1,389,082	299,279
Massachusetts	2,265,330	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	2,265,330
Michigan	3,796,526	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,370,864	2,425,662	NA
Minnesota	1,615,686	NA	NA	NA	NA	40,125	1,225,817	349,744
Mississippi	1,355,893	NA	NA	NA	491,821	864,072	NA	NA
Missouri	2,544,389	NA	NA	NA	162,543	339,197	2,042,649	NA
Montana	764,100	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	764,100
Nebraska	1,044,431	NA	NA	NA	NA	48,131	996,300	NA
Nevada	999,861	NA	NA	NA	NA	17,996	139,005	842,860
New Hampshire	984,919	NA	NA	NA	NA	388,007	596,912	NA
New Jersey	2,704,222	NA	NA	NA	NA	209,092	2,495,130	NA
New Mexico	740,540	NA	NA	NA	8,834	15,813	115,092	600,801
New York	1,667,717	NA	71,500	2,500	NA	NA	NA	1,593,717
North Carolina	3,097,568	NA	NA	15,000	NA	236,590	87,349	2,758,629
North Dakota	1,631,522	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	909,904	721,618
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	4,362,507	NA	95,869	205,925	311,235	228,967	3,520,511	NA
Oklahoma	1,445,553	NA	NA	NA	49,955	94,170	1,301,428	NA
Oregon	1,478,286	NA	NA	NA	NA	22,031	207,977	1,248,278
Pennsylvania	4,303,956	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	566,309	3,737,647
Puerto Rico	4,324,110	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,729,666	1,594,444	NA
Rhode Island	1,859,744	NA	NA	NA	NA	447,794	912,000	499,950
South Carolina	1,957,094	NA	NA	NA	NA	155,094	NA	1,802,000
South Dakota	929,143	NA	NA	NA	189,948	325,502	371,586	42,107
Tennessee	1,456,900	NA	NA	NA	NA	268,300	2,900	1,185,700
Texas	7,109,503	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	545,589	6,563,914
Utah	1,291,082	NA	NA	NA	28,821	690,706	571,555	NA
Vermont	765,785	NA	NA	NA	NA	23,141	111,864	630,780
Virgin Islands	1,005,556	NA	NA	150,813	303,050	151,525	400,168	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	2,251,017	NA	NA	NA	NA	86,420	481,821	1,682,776
West Virginia	1,220,063	NA	NA	NA	41,058	41,335	1,059,270	78,400
Wisconsin	2,242,530	NA	NA	NA	NA	202,238	957,646	1,082,646
Wyoming	813,516	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	196,891	616,625
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>97,942,194</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>173,269</b>	<b>369,345</b>	<b>1,937,154</b>	<b>15,831,489</b>	<b>33,421,268</b>	<b>46,209,669</b>

NA = not available

<sup>a</sup>Years 1999–2005 are federal fiscal years.

NOTE: Illinois, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Virginia did not submit STOP administrator data.

**Table A3. STOP Program funding returned unused by subgrantees, by state: 1999–2005**

State	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Alabama	15,251	NA	5,915	1,492	498	1,133	6,213	NA
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Samoa	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Arizona	142,665	NA	NA	NA	NA	142,665	NA	NA
Arkansas	99,708	NA	NA	NA	5,246	65,630	28,832	NA
California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Colorado	10,082	NA	NA	NA	NA	10,082	NA	NA
Connecticut	4	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	1
Delaware	40,438	NA	NA	NA	11,131	29,307	NA	NA
District of Columbia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	57,596	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	57,596	NA
Georgia	127,261	NA	NA	2,587	71,875	52,799	NA	NA
Guam	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hawaii	14,103	NA	NA	NA	14,103	NA	NA	NA
Idaho	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Iowa	73,787	NA	NA	NA	NA	38,745	35,042	NA
Kansas	61,479	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	27,206	34,273
Kentucky	36,916	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	36,916	NA
Louisiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maryland	277,569	NA	NA	NA	NA	117,819	93,101	66,649
Massachusetts	895,859	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	895,859	0
Michigan	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	22,678	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	22,678	NA
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	160,873	NA	NA	NA	1,918	19,788	139,167	NA
Montana	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1
Nebraska	8,131	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,131	NA	NA
Nevada	33,326	NA	NA	NA	107	18,219	15,000	NA
New Hampshire	67,489	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	67,488	NA
New Jersey	13,600	NA	NA	NA	NA	13,600	NA	NA
New Mexico	166	NA	NA	NA	166	NA	NA	NA
New York	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	1,342	NA	NA	1,342	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Dakota	41,074	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	41,074	NA
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	121,981	NA	6,239	5,617	37,766	72,359	NA	NA
Oklahoma	19,003	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	19,003	NA
Oregon	105,363	NA	NA	NA	NA	22,031	83,332	NA
Pennsylvania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Carolina	155,094	NA	NA	NA	NA	155,094	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	179,900	NA	NA	NA	NA	34,500	145,400	NA
Texas	363,717	NA	NA	NA	NA	54,560	296,854	12,303
Utah	29,999	NA	NA	NA	2,332	9,762	17,905	NA
Vermont	95,806	NA	NA	NA	NA	23,141	72,665	NA
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	358,397	NA	NA	NA	NA	116,160	242,237	NA
West Virginia	84,853	NA	NA	NA	2,310	82,543	NA	NA
Wisconsin	52,029	NA	NA	NA	NA	47,686	4,343	NA
Wyoming	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,767,540</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>12,154</b>	<b>11,038</b>	<b>147,453</b>	<b>1,135,756</b>	<b>2,347,912</b>	<b>113,227</b>

NA = not available

<sup>a</sup>Years 1999–2005 are federal fiscal years.

NOTE: Illinois, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Virginia did not submit STOP administrator data.

**Table A4. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to victim services, by state: 1999–2005**

State	Number of awards									Amount allocated (\$)								
	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		
Alabama	21	NA	1	NA	1	NA	2	17	655,461	NA	5,900	NA	16,007	NA	25,500	608,054		
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	229,469	NA	NA	NA	117,749	111,720	NA	NA		
American Samoa	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	3	321,053	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	158,307	162,746		
Arizona	25	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	10	3	791,252	NA	NA	NA	NA	65,313	636,627	89,312		
Arkansas	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	7	519,905	NA	NA	NA	NA	12,308	16,250	491,347		
California	123	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	123	3,553,241	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,553,241		
Colorado	67	NA	NA	NA	NA	35	32	NA	1,481,265	NA	NA	NA	NA	788,397	692,868	NA		
Connecticut	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	678,644	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	678,644		
Delaware	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	NA	160,192	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	160,192	NA		
District of Columbia	10	NA	NA	2	4	NA	NA	4	310,654	NA	NA	10,524	34,830	NA	NA	265,300		
Florida	24	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	12	NA	1,988,206	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,192,465	795,741	NA		
Georgia	26	NA	NA	NA	NA	10	16	NA	1,466,206	NA	NA	NA	NA	415,009	1,051,197	NA		
Guam	19	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	6	7	525,961	NA	NA	NA	NA	176,580	174,421	174,960		
Hawaii	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	2	NA	503,451	NA	NA	NA	NA	386,555	116,896	NA		
Idaho	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	35	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	35		
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Indiana	37	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	37	884,744	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	884,744		
Iowa	28	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	27	622,185	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,020	NA	618,165		
Kansas	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	8	450,764	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5,693	445,071		
Kentucky	12	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	11	584,766	NA	NA	NA	5,479	NA	NA	579,287		
Louisiana	29	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	26	2	525,005	NA	NA	NA	NA	18,331	474,356	32,318		
Maine	11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	11	252,120	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	252,120		
Maryland	40	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	20	20	561,508	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	417,889	143,619		
Massachusetts	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	16	679,743	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	679,743		
Michigan	94	NA	NA	NA	NA	47	47	NA	1,422,800	NA	NA	NA	NA	507,220	915,580	NA		
Minnesota	17	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	13	3	539,594	NA	NA	NA	NA	22,395	335,545	181,654		
Mississippi	21	NA	NA	NA	2	19	NA	NA	512,557	NA	NA	NA	26,275	486,282	NA	NA		
Missouri	32	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	28	NA	830,802	NA	NA	NA	NA	81,902	748,900	NA		
Montana	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	8	236,480	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	236,480		
Nebraska	13	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	13	NA	298,890	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	298,890	NA		
Nevada	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	14	343,279	NA	NA	NA	NA	6,770	NA	336,509		
New Hampshire	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	1	NA	322,523	NA	NA	NA	NA	247,523	75,000	NA		
New Jersey	21	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	21	NA	837,242	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	837,242	NA		
New Mexico	11	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	9	227,909	NA	NA	NA	NA	6,443	NA	221,466		
New York	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	16	603,399	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	603,399		
North Carolina	7	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	6	746,194	NA	NA	15,000	NA	NA	NA	731,194		
North Dakota	38	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	19	19	446,716	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	230,099	216,617		
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Ohio	65	NA	1	7	10	4	43	NA	1,662,101	NA	14,219	92,249	116,923	31,575	1,407,135	NA		
Oklahoma	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	15	NA	418,730	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,788	409,942	NA		
Oregon	39	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	38	683,304	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24,392	658,912		
Pennsylvania	92	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	46	46	1,941,099	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	272,702	1,668,397		
Puerto Rico	23	NA	NA	NA	NA	16	7	NA	1,445,825	NA	NA	NA	NA	860,412	585,413	NA		
Rhode Island	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	737,505	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	369,360	368,145		
South Carolina	17	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	NA	14	619,644	NA	NA	NA	NA	73,050	NA	546,594		
South Dakota	52	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	26	26	244,890	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	202,783	42,107		



**Table A4. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to victim services, by state: 1999–2005 (continued)**

State	Number of awards									Amount allocated (\$)						
	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Tennessee	29	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	27	922,500	NA	NA	NA	NA	27,200	2,900	892,400
Texas	49	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	49	2,808,215	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,808,215
Utah	15	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	10	NA	388,370	NA	NA	NA	NA	175,618	212,752	NA
Vermont	14	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	3	8	262,500	NA	NA	NA	NA	16,366	29,321	216,813
Virgin Islands	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	NA	226,648	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	226,648	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	45	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	9	33	861,959	NA	NA	NA	NA	5,290	243,242	613,427
West Virginia	18	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	NA	373,059	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	373,059	NA
Wisconsin	12	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	4	7	621,836	NA	NA	NA	NA	23,158	391,398	207,280
Wyoming	23	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	23	211,470	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	211,470
<b>TOTAL</b>	1,347	NA	2	10	18	199	465	653	39,543,870	NA	20,119	117,773	317,263	5,750,690	12,918,240	20,419,785

NA = not available

<sup>a</sup>Years 1999–2005 are federal fiscal years.

NOTE: Illinois, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Virginia did not submit STOP administrator data.

**Table A5. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to law enforcement, by state: 1999–2005**

State	Number of awards								Amount allocated (\$)							
	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Alabama	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	6	478,373	NA	NA	NA	NA	32,716	20,000	425,657
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	191,225	NA	NA	NA	98,125	93,100	NA	NA
American Samoa	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	192,599	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	95,517	97,082
Arizona	13	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	6	1	480,818	NA	NA	NA	NA	44,181	416,729	19,908
Arkansas	7	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	1	5	352,062	NA	NA	NA	56,882	NA	11,091	284,089
California	30	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	27	2,697,271	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	154,409	2,542,862
Colorado	17	NA	NA	NA	NA	9	8	NA	922,210	NA	NA	NA	NA	486,970	435,240	NA
Connecticut	2	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	62,250	NA	NA	NA	62,250	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	NA	139,388	NA	NA	NA	NA	53,761	85,627	NA
District of Columbia	3	NA	NA	1	1	NA	NA	1	290,174	NA	NA	73,888	26,786	NA	NA	189,500
Florida	24	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	12	NA	1,241,789	NA	NA	NA	NA	610,346	631,443	NA
Georgia	13	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	10	NA	618,943	NA	NA	NA	NA	102,945	515,998	NA
Guam	14	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	6	2	438,299	NA	NA	NA	NA	147,150	145,349	145,800
Hawaii	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	NA	NA	99,447	NA	NA	NA	NA	99,447	NA	NA
Idaho	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	25	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	25
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	14	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	14	557,737	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	557,737
Iowa	28	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	26	421,035	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	77,610	343,425
Kansas	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	7	445,602	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	204,192	241,410
Kentucky	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	1	5	570,980	NA	NA	NA	NA	104,156	79,350	387,474
Louisiana	24	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	13	8	492,489	NA	NA	NA	NA	79,795	293,519	119,175
Maine	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	101,308	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	101,308
Maryland	23	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	13	7	353,509	NA	NA	NA	NA	957	297,853	54,699
Massachusetts	28	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	28	566,630	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	566,630
Michigan	96	NA	NA	NA	NA	48	48	NA	1,090,256	NA	NA	NA	NA	397,551	692,705	NA
Minnesota	28	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	10	395,759	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	283,629	112,130
Mississippi	10	NA	NA	NA	8	2	NA	NA	330,101	NA	NA	NA	228,202	101,899	NA	NA
Missouri	14	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	14	NA	592,924	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	592,924	NA
Montana	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	214,700	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	214,700
Nebraska	11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	11	NA	249,075	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	249,075	NA
Nevada	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	8	241,922	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	30,000	211,922
New Hampshire	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	4	NA	281,487	NA	NA	NA	NA	90,484	191,003	NA
New Jersey	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	13	NA	826,164	NA	NA	NA	NA	154,092	672,072	NA
New Mexico	7	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	6	178,423	NA	NA	NA	NA	6,897	NA	171,526
New York	12	NA	3	1	NA	NA	NA	8	429,344	NA	71,500	2,500	NA	NA	NA	355,344
North Carolina	10	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	9	867,825	NA	NA	NA	NA	93,912	NA	773,913
North Dakota	44	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	23	21	448,974	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	279,584	169,390
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	41	NA	2	4	9	6	20	NA	1,138,580	NA	20,000	46,723	97,189	183,162	791,506	NA
Oklahoma	13	NA	NA	NA	1	1	11	NA	354,959	NA	NA	NA	23,930	4,972	326,057	NA
Oregon	12	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	9	335,292	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	102,869	232,423
Pennsylvania	94	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	46	48	979,169	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	128,330	850,839
Puerto Rico	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	1	NA	1,257,974	NA	NA	NA	NA	867,824	390,150	NA
Rhode Island	10	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	5	NA	429,097	NA	NA	NA	NA	223,897	205,200	NA
South Carolina	14	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	NA	9	542,469	NA	NA	NA	NA	82,044	NA	460,425
South Dakota	5	NA	NA	NA	1	4	NA	NA	214,786	NA	NA	NA	113,551	101,235	NA	NA
Tennessee	13	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	NA	10	592,200	NA	NA	NA	NA	108,000	NA	484,200

**Table A5. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to law enforcement, by state: 1999–2005 (continued)**

State	Number of awards								Amount allocated (\$)							
	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Texas	24	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24	1,761,618	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,761,618
Utah	12	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	10	NA	286,600	NA	NA	NA	NA	52,635	233,965	NA
Vermont	12	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	4	6	194,501	NA	NA	NA	NA	665	30,256	163,580
Virgin Islands	1	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	151,525	NA	NA	NA	151,525	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	39	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	34	638,730	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	98,806	539,924
West Virginia	30	NA	NA	NA	1	7	22	NA	318,678	NA	NA	NA	24,000	29,201	265,477	NA
Wisconsin	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	3	1	313,658	NA	NA	NA	NA	24,379	202,935	86,344
Wyoming	10	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	8	184,618	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,393	176,225
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>887</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>27,555,571</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>91,500</b>	<b>123,111</b>	<b>882,440</b>	<b>4,378,373</b>	<b>9,238,863</b>	<b>12,841,284</b>

NA = not available

<sup>a</sup>Years 1999–2005 are federal fiscal years.

NOTE: Illinois, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Virginia did not submit STOP administrator data.

**Table A6. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to prosecution, by state: 1999–2005**

State	Number of awards								Amount allocated (\$)							
	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Alabama	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	9	545,548	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	545,548
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	191,225	NA	NA	NA	98,125	93,100	NA	NA
American Samoa	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	192,599	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	95,517	97,082
Arizona	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	4	370,444	NA	NA	NA	NA	35,000	335,444	NA
Arkansas	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	5	NA	375,793	NA	NA	NA	NA	104,854	270,939	NA
California	29	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	29	1,990,141	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,990,141
Colorado	25	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	13	NA	920,603	NA	NA	NA	NA	483,635	436,968	NA
Connecticut	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	383,325	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	383,325	NA
Delaware	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	197,837	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	197,837	NA
District of Columbia	4	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	2	197,428	NA	NA	NA	2,906	5,022	NA	189,500
Florida	34	NA	NA	NA	NA	17	17	NA	1,243,704	NA	NA	NA	NA	869,980	373,724	NA
Georgia	10	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	5	NA	660,221	NA	NA	NA	NA	298,760	361,461	NA
Guam	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	438,300	NA	NA	NA	NA	147,150	145,350	145,800
Hawaii	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	NA	168,503	NA	NA	NA	NA	72,707	95,796	NA
Idaho	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	25	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	25
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	22	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	22	554,333	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	554,333
Iowa	11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	10	351,555	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,130	343,425
Kansas	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	225,945	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	225,945
Kentucky	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	8	416,196	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	416,196
Louisiana	16	NA	NA	1	NA	3	8	4	353,755	NA	NA	1,116	NA	58,523	211,108	83,008
Maine	7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	6	259,275	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	39,675	219,600
Maryland	15	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	9	408,631	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	343,377	65,254
Massachusetts	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	8	566,835	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	566,835
Michigan	96	NA	NA	NA	NA	48	48	NA	1,051,554	NA	NA	NA	NA	383,842	667,712	NA
Minnesota	21	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	15	5	415,712	NA	NA	NA	NA	12,328	359,158	44,226
Mississippi	9	NA	NA	NA	5	4	NA	NA	385,096	NA	NA	NA	166,161	218,935	NA	NA
Missouri	12	NA	NA	NA	2	1	9	NA	676,310	NA	NA	NA	43,526	98,440	534,344	NA
Montana	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	214,607	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	214,607
Nebraska	12	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	11	NA	257,206	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,131	249,075	NA
Nevada	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	3	168,603	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78,500	90,103
New Hampshire	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	8	NA	323,907	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	323,907	NA
New Jersey	12	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	11	NA	730,427	NA	NA	NA	NA	55,000	675,427	NA
New Mexico	7	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	2	4	241,569	NA	NA	NA	8,834	NA	65,956	166,779
New York	10	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	10	634,974	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	634,974
North Carolina	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	603,185	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	603,185
North Dakota	41	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	21	20	490,676	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	299,477	191,199
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	38	NA	4	2	5	1	26	NA	1,297,444	NA	61,650	36,953	58,933	3,980	1,135,928	NA
Oklahoma	7	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	6	NA	367,315	NA	NA	NA	9,156	NA	358,159	NA
Oregon	15	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	14	352,659	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17,283	335,376
Pennsylvania	94	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	46	48	979,170	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	133,677	845,493
Puerto Rico	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	1	NA	1,257,974	NA	NA	NA	NA	867,824	390,150	NA
Rhode Island	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	429,097	NA	NA	NA	NA	223,897	205,200	NA
South Carolina	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	405,450	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	405,450
South Dakota	18	NA	NA	NA	NA	9	9	NA	238,950	NA	NA	NA	NA	72,685	166,265	NA
Tennessee	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	5	431,800	NA	NA	NA	NA	71,700	NA	360,100

**Table A6. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to prosecution, by state: 1999–2005 (continued)**

State	Number of awards								Amount allocated (\$)							
	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Texas	34	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	34	2,223,493	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,223,493
Utah	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	NA	NA	249,664	NA	NA	NA	NA	249,664	NA	NA
Vermont	11	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	5	5	269,885	NA	NA	NA	NA	6,110	52,287	211,488
Virgin Islands	3	NA	NA	1	NA	1	1	NA	602,383	NA	NA	150,813	151,525	151,525	148,520	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	42	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	9	33	669,198	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	139,773	529,425
West Virginia	19	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	16	NA	300,137	NA	NA	NA	NA	10,531	289,606	NA
Wisconsin	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	4	526,487	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	127,180	399,307
Wyoming	11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	8	310,288	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	134,063	176,225
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>801</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>28,117,441</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>61,650</b>	<b>188,882</b>	<b>539,166</b>	<b>4,603,323</b>	<b>9,850,298</b>	<b>12,874,122</b>

NA = not available

<sup>a</sup>Years 1999–2005 are federal fiscal years.

NOTE: Illinois, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Virginia did not submit STOP administrator data.

Table A7. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to court, by state: 1999–2005

State	Number of awards										Amount allocated (\$)							
	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		
Alabama	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	94,750	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	94,750		
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	38,245	NA	NA	NA	19,625	18,620	NA	NA		
American Samoa	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	42,780	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	21,373	21,407		
Arizona	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	3	NA	172,230	NA	NA	NA	NA	12,310	159,920	NA		
Arkansas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
California	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	512,573	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	512,573		
Colorado	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	3	NA	189,372	NA	NA	NA	NA	100,481	88,891	NA		
Connecticut	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	84,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	84,000	NA	NA		
Delaware	1	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	11,131	NA	NA	NA	11,131	NA	NA	NA		
District of Columbia	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	37,900	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	37,900		
Florida	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	317,601	NA	NA	NA	NA	56,671	260,930	NA		
Georgia	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	69,968	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	69,968	NA		
Guam	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	87,659	NA	NA	NA	NA	29,430	29,069	29,160		
Hawaii	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	45,900	NA	NA	NA	NA	45,900	NA	NA		
Idaho	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5		
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Indiana	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	99,045	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	99,045		
Iowa	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	68,685	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	68,685		
Kansas	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	82,432	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	82,432		
Kentucky	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Louisiana	4	NA	NA	1	1	NA	2	NA	217,018	NA	NA	60,392	102,458	NA	54,168	NA		
Maine	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	87,975	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	44,055	43,920		
Maryland	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	2	80,601	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	72,346	8,255		
Massachusetts	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	112,169	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	112,169		
Michigan	90	NA	NA	NA	NA	45	45	NA	231,893	NA	NA	NA	NA	82,252	149,641	NA		
Minnesota	7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	1	86,364	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	74,629	11,735		
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Missouri	6	NA	NA	NA	4	2	NA	NA	192,872	NA	NA	NA	119,017	73,855	NA	NA		
Montana	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	50,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	50,000		
Nebraska	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	9	NA	49,815	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	49,815	NA		
Nevada	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	78,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	11,226	30,505	36,269		
New Hampshire	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	57,002	NA	NA	NA	NA	50,000	7,002	NA		
New Jersey	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	139,814	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	139,814	NA		
New Mexico	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	16,213	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,473	13,740	NA		
New York	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
North Carolina	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	112,331	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	112,331		
North Dakota	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	1	87,393	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	51,290	36,103		
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Ohio	13	NA	NA	1	4	1	7	NA	264,382	NA	NA	30,000	38,190	10,250	185,942	NA		
Oklahoma	4	NA	NA	NA	1	3	NA	NA	61,885	NA	NA	NA	4,073	57,812	NA	NA		
Oregon	7	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	3	3	107,031	NA	NA	NA	NA	22,031	63,433	21,567		
Pennsylvania	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	229,058	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	31,600	197,458		
Puerto Rico	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	169,182	NA	NA	NA	NA	91,152	78,030	NA		
Rhode Island	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	81,945	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	41,040	40,905		
South Carolina	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	81,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81,000		
South Dakota	2	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	NA	41,004	NA	NA	NA	99	40,905	NA	NA		

Table A7. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to court, by state: 1999–2005 (continued)

State	Number of awards									Amount allocated (\$)								
	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		
Tennessee	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	2	140,400	NA	NA	NA	NA	61,400	NA	79,000		
Texas	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	316,178	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	316,178		
Utah	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	67,477	NA	NA	NA	NA	27,956	39,521	NA		
Vermont	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	38,900	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	38,900		
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Washington	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	78,280	NA	NA	NA	NA	78,280	NA	NA		
West Virginia	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	3	NA	53,206	NA	NA	NA	NA	243	52,963	NA		
Wisconsin	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	25,743	NA	NA	NA	NA	25,743	NA	NA		
Wyoming	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	61,988	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	61,988	NA		
<b>TOTAL</b>	229	NA	NA	2	12	73	105	37	5,371,395	NA	NA	90,392	294,593	982,990	1,871,673	2,131,747		

NA = not available

<sup>a</sup>Years 1999–2005 are federal fiscal years.

NOTE: Illinois, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Virginia did not submit STOP administrator data.

**Table A8. STOP Program amount allocated to administration, by state: 1999–2005**

State	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Alabama	123,500	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	123,500
Alaska	39,226	NA	NA	NA	19,626	19,600	NA	NA
American Samoa	85,559	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	42,746	42,813
Arizona	134,563	NA	NA	NA	NA	128,642	5,921	NA
Arkansas	138,500	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	138,500
California	539,550	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	539,550
Colorado	276,640	NA	NA	NA	NA	145,600	131,040	NA
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	43,550	NA	NA	NA	NA	43,550	NA	NA
District of Columbia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	229,590	NA	NA	NA	NA	60,596	168,994	NA
Georgia	156,450	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	156,450
Guam	64,800	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	64,800
Hawaii	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Idaho	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	238,700	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	238,700
Iowa	72,300	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	72,300
Kansas	40,038	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	40,038	NA
Kentucky	89,400	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	89,400
Louisiana	96,350	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	96,350	NA
Maine	97,900	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	97,900	NA
Maryland	302,766	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	302,766	NA
Massachusetts	170,660	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	170,660
Michigan	124,754	NA	NA	NA	NA	44,703	80,051	NA
Minnesota	160,933	NA	NA	NA	NA	9,852	133,157	17,924
Mississippi	71,840	NA	NA	NA	3,070	21,073	47,697	NA
Missouri	85,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	85,000	NA	NA
Montana	84,900	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	84,900
Nebraska	259,400	NA	NA	NA	NA	79,000	70,700	109,700
Nevada	126,100	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	126,100
New Hampshire	197,066	NA	NA	NA	NA	100,266	96,800	NA
New Jersey	247,286	NA	NA	NA	NA	91,535	155,751	NA
New Mexico	55,310	NA	NA	NA	NA	31,338	22,140	1,832
New York	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	151,100	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	151,100
North Dakota	43,010	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	43,010	NA
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	199,200	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	199,200	NA
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	129,440	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	129,440
Pennsylvania	207,850	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	207,850
Puerto Rico	195,155	NA	NA	NA	NA	42,454	152,701	NA
Rhode Island	182,100	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	91,200	90,900
South Carolina	180,200	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	180,200
South Dakota	26,577	NA	NA	NA	NA	26,577	NA	NA
Tennessee	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Texas	651,642	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	292,744	358,898
Utah	94,098	NA	NA	NA	55,338	38,760	NA	NA
Vermont	58,969	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	58,969
Virgin Islands	31,600	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	31,600
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	173,981	NA	NA	NA	NA	173,981	NA	NA
West Virginia	78,400	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78,400
Wisconsin	216,800	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	216,800
Wyoming	74,200	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	74,200
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,046,953</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>78,034</b>	<b>1,142,527</b>	<b>2,270,906</b>	<b>3,555,486</b>

NA = not available

<sup>a</sup>Years 1999–2005 are federal fiscal years.

NOTE: Illinois, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Virginia did not submit STOP administrator data.



Table A9. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to Other, by state: 1999–2005

State	Number of awards								Amount allocated (\$)							
	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Alabama	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	95,110	NA	NA	NA	39,250	55,860	NA	NA
American Samoa	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	1	21,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	14,000	7,000
Arizona	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Arkansas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
California	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	16	580,107	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	580,107
Colorado	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	2	NA	161,910	NA	NA	NA	NA	74,917	86,993	NA
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
District of Columbia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Georgia	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	NA	420,447	NA	NA	NA	NA	225,000	195,447	NA
Guam	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	262,981	NA	NA	NA	NA	88,290	87,211	87,480
Hawaii	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Idaho	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	10	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	10
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	32,393	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	32,393
Iowa	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kansas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kentucky	5	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	2	2	404,738	NA	NA	NA	11,589	NA	153,968	239,181
Louisiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	29,381	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,758	20,623
Maryland	27	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	10	12	310,330	NA	NA	NA	NA	25,262	243,158	41,910
Massachusetts	12	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	339,953	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	339,953
Michigan	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	5	NA	178,259	NA	NA	NA	NA	5,402	172,857	NA
Mississippi	2	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	NA	128,139	NA	NA	NA	71,183	56,956	NA	NA
Missouri	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	NA	166,481	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	166,481	NA
Montana	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	48,313	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	48,313
Nebraska	14	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	14	NA	149,445	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	149,445	NA
Nevada	7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7	168,058	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	168,058
New Hampshire	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Jersey	12	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	6	NA	170,575	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	170,575	NA
New Mexico	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	76,426	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	35,396	41,030
New York	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	11	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	1	7	768,033	NA	NA	NA	NA	142,678	87,349	538,006
North Dakota	31	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17	14	223,149	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	114,840	108,309
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oklahoma	2	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	NA	35,393	NA	NA	NA	12,796	22,597	NA	NA
Oregon	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pennsylvania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Carolina	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	128,331	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	128,331

**Table A9. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to Other, by state: 1999–2005 (continued)**

State	Number of awards								Amount allocated (\$)							
	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total	1999 <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
South Dakota	3	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	NA	162,936	NA	NA	NA	76,298	84,100	2,538	NA
Tennessee	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Texas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Utah	6	NA	NA	NA	1	3	2	NA	217,972	NA	NA	NA	28,822	103,832	85,318	NA
Vermont	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Virgin Islands	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	25,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	25,000	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	2,850	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,850	NA	NA
West Virginia	9	NA	NA	NA	4	1	4	NA	96,583	NA	NA	NA	17,058	1,360	78,165	NA
Wisconsin	22	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	3	13	754,484	NA	NA	NA	NA	128,636	236,133	389,715
Wyoming	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	104,622	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	104,622
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>6,263,409</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>256,996</b>	<b>1,017,740</b>	<b>2,113,632</b>	<b>2,875,041</b>

NA = not available

<sup>a</sup>Years 1999–2005 are federal fiscal years.

NOTE: Illinois, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Virginia did not submit STOP administrator data.

**Table A10. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2005**  
(Percent)

<b>State</b>	<b>Sexual assault</b>	<b>Domestic violence</b>	<b>Stalking</b>	<b>Total</b>
Alabama	20	80	0	100
Alaska	30	60	10	100
American Samoa	45	45	10	100
Arizona	20	75	5	100
Arkansas	18	77	5	100
California	32	61	7	100
Colorado	25	73	2	100
Connecticut	30	70	0	100
Delaware	25	75	0	100
District of Columbia	39	52	9	100
Florida	14	86	0	100
Georgia	26	71	3	100
Guam	26	69	5	100
Hawaii	21	78	1	100
Idaho	15	80	5	100
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	20	75	5	100
Iowa	23	75	2	100
Kansas	24	68	8	100
Kentucky	25	65	10	100
Louisiana	16	80	4	100
Maine	36	63	1	100
Maryland	15	80	5	100
Massachusetts	24	75	1	100
Michigan	19	75	6	100
Minnesota	49	49	2	100
Mississippi	43	54	3	100
Missouri	20	79	1	100
Montana	20	75	5	100
Nebraska	15	84	1	100
Nevada	19	74	7	100
New Hampshire	20	70	10	100
New Jersey	75	25	0	100
New Mexico	36	57	7	100
New York	40	58	2	100
North Carolina	14	85	1	100
North Dakota	10	89	1	100
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	13	81	6	100
Oklahoma	7	93	0	100
Oregon	25	75	0	100
Pennsylvania	36	60	4	100
Puerto Rico	2	95	3	100
Rhode Island	35	60	5	100
South Carolina	38	57	5	100
South Dakota	24	75	1	100
Tennessee	7	90	3	100
Texas	21	75	4	100
Utah	25	69	6	100
Vermont	40	50	10	100
Virgin Islands	14	77	9	100
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	40	50	10	100
West Virginia	14	78	8	100
Wisconsin	42	53	5	100
Wyoming	10	87	3	100

NOTE: Illinois, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Virginia did not submit STOP administrator data.



## Appendix B. STOP Program-Funded Activities and Victims Served: 2005



**Table B1. Number of awards reported by activities funded, by state**

State	Data collection and communication systems												
	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole		
Alabama	33	18	10	9	8	10	4	21	10	10	0	0	
Alaska	6	5	2	4	1	0	3	3	0	0	1	0	
American Samoa	3	5	4	0	4	1	5	3	1	1	0	0	
Arizona	25	13	8	9	3	7	7	20	4	1	0	1	
Arkansas	28	7	4	3	1	12	0	22	7	3	0	0	
California	167	36	1	7	0	37	0	149	22	23	0	7	
Colorado	60	34	26	8	8	14	18	53	2	8	0	2	
Connecticut	8	7	2	4	1	5	1	3	2	1	0	0	
Delaware	11	4	1	4	2	3	2	11	0	1	0	1	
District of Columbia	9	5	1	4	2	1	3	8	0	1	0	0	
Florida	41	16	20	12	13	25	7	16	15	11	1	0	
Georgia	51	37	21	28	14	17	19	34	8	10	0	0	
Guam	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Hawaii	16	8	5	3	3	7	4	10	2	3	0	0	
Idaho	8	6	4	5	2	3	3	5	2	0	0	0	
Illinois	16	15	1	4	7	7	6	17	5	6	1	4	
Indiana	61	31	19	14	8	22	1	38	9	19	0	0	
Iowa	68	49	20	17	5	29	7	32	18	10	0	0	
Kansas	23	13	6	2	4	7	3	19	2	6	1	1	
Kentucky	27	10	8	7	1	8	2	20	6	2	1	0	
Louisiana	65	25	12	9	14	26	2	43	22	8	1	0	
Maine	65	25	12	9	14	26	2	43	22	8	1	0	
Maryland	59	29	16	17	8	14	10	34	7	6	0	0	
Massachusetts	62	31	19	20	4	7	6	48	2	2	0	0	
Michigan	48	32	19	13	13	5	9	46	4	4	0	1	
Minnesota	29	21	15	13	10	5	17	13	0	0	0	0	
Mississippi	34	6	1	2	1	12	2	21	9	4	1	0	
Missouri	67	24	15	11	11	23	4	41	13	11	1	0	
Montana	21	6	1	2	1	4	1	10	2	1	1	1	
Nebraska	16	10	6	3	2	6	3	14	3	5	0	1	
Nevada	37	17	10	11	5	10	4	28	2	3	1	1	
New Hampshire	19	12	11	8	7	6	3	10	3	6	0	0	
New Jersey	53	39	23	31	6	5	10	42	1	1	0	0	
New Mexico	37	21	11	15	4	9	5	25	2	4	1	1	
New York	120	78	49	48	31	31	17	98	11	24	1	3	
North Carolina	50	32	32	18	21	23	15	27	15	8	4	0	
North Dakota	34	11	5	3	11	2	0	29	2	1	0	0	
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Ohio	97	41	21	20	14	34	14	71	17	16	1	0	
Oklahoma	39	12	3	4	5	9	4	19	10	3	3	1	
Oregon	70	21	8	14	4	8	5	61	4	3	1	1	
Pennsylvania	48	44	26	16	13	35	7	46	31	39	0	0	
Puerto Rico	11	3	4	2	1	2	0	9	1	1	0	0	
Rhode Island	4	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	
South Carolina	35	15	10	9	6	8	3	27	7	4	0	1	
South Dakota	37	9	8	5	3	5	2	29	0	9	0	0	

**Table B1. Number of awards reported by activities funded, by state (continued)**

<b>State</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Training</b>	<b>Policies</b>	<b>Products</b>	<b>Data collection and communication systems</b>	<b>Specialized units</b>	<b>System improvement</b>	<b>Victim services</b>	<b>Law enforcement</b>	<b>Prosecution</b>	<b>Courts</b>	<b>Probation and parole</b>
Tennessee	57	31	15	19	14	22	6	33	17	7	1	0
Texas	116	54	24	26	23	57	20	79	16	21	1	0
Utah	35	19	8	14	4	6	8	28	4	2	0	0
Vermont	8	7	6	4	1	6	2	8	5	5	0	0
Virgin Islands	5	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	0	1	0	0
Virginia	96	70	29	76	38	31	23	64	16	14	0	0
Washington	85	29	10	18	18	10	9	60	12	10	0	0
West Virginia	27	16	4	10	7	9	2	19	16	13	0	0
Wisconsin	43	31	13	14	12	11	12	15	7	5	0	0
Wyoming	33	12	6	6	5	2	2	33	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,323</b>	<b>1,155</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>688</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>1,663</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>27</b>

NA = not available

NOTE: Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands did not submit subgrantee data.



**Table B2. Number of subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state**

State	Subgrantees using funds for		Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
	Subgrants	victim services	Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Alabama	35	21	7,546	7,039	359	148	7,398	6,511	783	104
Alaska	6	3	798	722	11	65	733	418	307	8
American Samoa	6	3	234	234	0	0	234	234	0	0
Arizona	25	20	7,217	6,865	136	216	7,001	6,562	362	77
Arkansas	28	22	7,236	6,421	677	138	7,098	6,227	782	89
California	189	149	17,005	14,737	1,759	509	16,496	7,638	8,680	178
Colorado	62	53	21,824	20,277	388	1,159	20,665	17,944	2,427	294
Connecticut	10	3	7,017	7,017	0	0	7,017	6,259	758	0
Delaware	13	11	2,720	2,557	138	25	2,695	2,116	575	4
District of Columbia	9	8	5,900	5,545	85	270	5,630	2,955	2,675	0
Florida	42	16	3,379	3,064	309	6	3,373	1,355	1,889	129
Georgia	52	34	20,412	18,029	1,860	523	19,889	13,348	5,477	1,064
Guam	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hawaii	17	10	1,969	1,890	56	23	1,946	1,298	648	0
Idaho	11	5	1,940	1,276	391	273	1,667	1,500	120	47
Illinois	26	17	14,465	12,399	1,932	134	14,331	12,240	2,087	4
Indiana	62	38	17,643	14,540	1,368	1,735	15,908	14,690	1,069	149
Iowa	68	32	4,178	3,919	256	3	4,175	3,667	483	25
Kansas	23	19	10,697	10,490	156	51	10,646	9,143	1,049	454
Kentucky	28	20	12,034	11,825	182	27	12,007	11,441	478	88
Louisiana	73	43	18,193	17,827	160	206	17,987	13,985	3,461	541
Maine	28	13	3,352	3,145	60	147	3,205	3,044	155	6
Maryland	64	34	5,459	4,968	216	275	5,184	4,348	730	106
Massachusetts	65	48	15,027	14,091	595	341	14,686	13,731	923	32
Michigan	48	46	19,979	19,734	118	127	19,852	15,929	2,840	1,083
Minnesota	29	13	2,778	2,615	150	13	2,765	2,572	98	95
Missouri	67	41	14,552	12,920	521	1,111	13,441	11,125	2,013	303
Mississippi	34	21	8,392	8,162	156	74	8,318	7,472	837	9
Montana	22	10	2,478	2,478	0	0	2,478	1,844	436	198
Nebraska	16	14	5,319	5,254	61	4	5,315	4,791	502	22
Nevada	43	28	11,961	11,246	691	24	11,937	10,222	946	769
New Hampshire	21	10	3,037	2,505	418	114	2,923	2,383	313	227
New Jersey	58	42	13,767	12,043	274	1,450	12,317	11,679	611	27
New Mexico	40	25	2,817	2,570	159	88	2,729	2,402	280	47
New York	122	98	39,485	35,262	3,078	1,145	38,340	34,086	4,126	128
North Carolina	58	27	9,936	9,120	689	127	9,809	8,835	824	150
North Dakota	43	29	1,686	1,636	41	9	1,677	1,409	243	25
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	102	71	41,209	38,351	1,944	914	40,295	32,758	5,238	2,299
Oklahoma	40	19	4,892	4,056	426	410	4,482	3,796	519	167
Oregon	70	61	17,103	13,919	613	2,571	14,532	11,366	2,818	348
Pennsylvania	48	46	33,840	29,322	3,799	719	33,121	23,237	9,139	745
Puerto Rico	12	9	7,124	6,296	812	16	7,108	6,733	139	236
Rhode Island	4	3	9,987	9,987	0	0	9,987	9,987	0	0
South Carolina	39	27	9,783	8,628	1,101	54	9,729	7,647	2,041	41
South Dakota	37	29	7,216	6,867	281	68	7,148	6,295	694	159

**Table B2. Number of subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state (continued)**

State	Subgrantees using funds for		Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
	Subgrants	victim services	Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Tennessee	57	33	7,374	6,558	738	78	7,296	6,595	559	142
Texas	118	79	45,334	36,031	8,700	603	44,731	40,638	3,629	464
Utah	37	28	13,107	11,043	1,740	324	12,783	11,264	1,327	192
Vermont	9	8	3,596	3,583	13	0	3,596	2,739	841	16
Virgin Islands	6	3	839	836	3	0	839	791	36	12
Virginia	97	64	19,039	17,201	1,204	634	18,405	15,844	2,189	372
Washington	89	60	17,694	16,839	535	320	17,374	15,587	1,441	346
West Virginia	30	19	5,769	5,613	73	83	5,686	5,119	444	123
Wisconsin	47	15	8,878	7,253	1,284	341	8,537	6,084	2,316	137
Wyoming	33	33	4,016	3,906	102	8	4,008	3,352	416	240
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,418</b>	<b>1,633</b>	<b>599,232</b>	<b>540,711</b>	<b>40,818</b>	<b>17,703</b>	<b>581,529</b>	<b>485,235</b>	<b>83,773</b>	<b>12,521</b>

NOTE: Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands did not submit subgrantee data.

Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving services, by state

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	0-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown
	Alabama	3,028	12	19	8	79	3,986	279	6,366	809	223	318	1,378	3,596	181
Alaska	9	40	24	2	32	84	542	709	20	4	39	22	142	1	529
American Samoa	0	0	0	227	0	0	7	32	1	201	0	13	19	1	201
Arizona	218	381	28	1	2,220	2,257	1,905	4,780	1,388	833	405	1,018	3,926	183	1,469
Arkansas	2,308	14	17	0	211	4,285	279	5,769	1,129	200	462	1,952	3,810	420	454
California	960	430	315	95	3,826	4,278	6,658	10,428	1,028	5,040	2,988	2,695	4,372	165	6,276
Colorado	1,002	526	153	37	5,025	10,766	3,292	17,686	2,288	691	1,738	3,590	9,883	614	4,840
Connecticut	1,972	16	43	14	2,256	2,628	88	5,362	1,654	1	1,364	1,223	3,992	293	145
Delaware	610	6	16	3	303	1,547	227	2,508	163	24	214	587	1,678	105	111
District of Columbia	1,817	32	31	31	439	211	3,098	3,775	1,100	755	77	726	1,806	79	2,942
Florida	399	18	10	38	275	721	1,920	1,514	64	1,795	94	298	920	115	1,946
Georgia	9,102	10	308	31	2,514	6,345	1,590	16,545	2,349	995	2,149	3,312	10,851	309	3,268
Guam	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hawaii	32	17	259	522	62	360	724	1,921	25	0	27	234	938	25	722
Idaho	11	28	8	3	71	1,159	387	1,247	39	381	24	282	962	17	382
Illinois	4,773	122	152	3	2,138	6,460	1,069	12,790	1,528	13	1,801	4,435	7,364	411	320
Indiana	3,404	46	53	5	760	7,816	4,383	12,153	1,012	2,743	594	3,259	7,044	182	4,829
Iowa	192	22	30	5	699	3,176	72	3,749	424	2	539	924	2,452	58	202
Kansas	1,835	63	88	5	1,123	6,871	738	8,625	1,649	372	1,191	2,833	5,756	178	688
Kentucky	2,542	9	69	23	393	8,897	132	10,229	1,772	6	384	3,561	7,488	370	204
Louisiana	5,936	64	54	3	205	9,083	2,656	14,363	1,743	1,881	1,854	3,426	9,631	371	2,705
Maine	100	67	8	1	22	1,847	1,160	3,034	171	0	65	473	1,442	66	1,159
Maryland	1,118	34	84	4	684	2,529	838	4,461	0	723	45	1,046	2,847	144	1,102
Massachusetts	1,177	46	473	4	3,126	5,699	4,208	12,964	1,695	27	1,084	2,898	6,997	490	3,217
Michigan	4,790	163	96	16	595	12,963	1,352	17,803	1,904	145	1,336	5,612	10,732	516	1,656
Minnesota	575	700	43	13	61	1,246	159	2,665	100	0	172	676	1,731	30	156
Missouri	3,293	55	55	8	359	7,376	3,163	12,000	1,145	296	1,112	2,991	7,599	398	1,341
Mississippi	3,252	186	24	2	234	3,529	1,368	6,589	1,146	583	1,221	1,394	3,904	106	1,693
Montana	13	331	11	0	55	1,830	251	2,243	134	101	226	956	1,171	23	102
Nebraska	186	92	36	12	630	3,172	1,188	4,038	519	758	539	1,132	2,295	66	1,283
Nevada	1,389	128	227	23	2,828	6,028	1,327	8,836	2,252	849	591	2,860	6,902	625	959
New Hampshire	101	3	35	3	186	1,843	792	2,119	524	280	148	708	1,533	70	464
New Jersey	3,235	9	484	10	3,034	3,491	2,094	10,645	664	1,008	289	1,838	7,551	204	2,435
New Mexico	48	255	11	1	1,469	862	109	2,397	329	3	178	629	1,767	74	81
New York	9,958	168	1,805	37	6,727	14,826	5,368	34,835	3,111	394	3,047	7,904	20,982	1,267	5,140
North Carolina	2,397	64	43	5	669	3,533	3,119	6,952	1,112	1,745	294	1,610	4,299	208	3,398
North Dakota	21	272	4	3	33	1,319	27	1,552	125	0	148	516	965	37	11
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	7,528	30	67	9	1,020	16,651	15,325	31,755	4,083	4,457	1,565	7,123	15,926	690	14,991
Oklahoma	247	624	16	4	332	2,925	656	3,712	418	352	393	1,076	2,281	104	628
Oregon	209	420	98	60	2,195	7,843	3,816	12,959	1,295	278	851	2,249	6,632	570	4,230
Pennsylvania	3,394	35	177	17	5,238	19,962	5,462	29,219	2,818	1,084	3,221	6,927	18,713	779	3,481
Puerto Rico	0	0	1	0	4,954	52	2,108	7,090	0	18	116	1,187	4,183	171	1,451
Rhode Island	890	79	99	0	1,234	6,203	1,482	7,686	1,991	310	790	4,772	4,036	381	8
South Carolina	2,818	30	32	4	435	4,633	1,796	9,197	523	9	437	2,564	5,943	179	606
South Dakota	67	3,432	8	0	84	2,201	1,385	5,649	924	575	1,769	1,876	2,021	233	1,249
Tennessee	1,830	16	56	11	284	4,641	492	6,518	515	263	202	1,495	4,732	221	646
Texas	7,812	152	323	24	19,303	13,073	4,583	40,067	4,501	163	4,151	10,997	25,514	1,005	3,064
Utah	258	258	139	101	2,847	7,520	1,993	11,314	1,360	109	1,313	2,758	6,303	764	1,645

**Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving services, by state (continued)**

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	0-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown
Vermont	103	83	149	4	125	2,084	1,139	3,228	314	54	369	575	1,521	50	1,081
Virgin Islands	451	0	40	0	219	133	4	664	175	0	460	76	269	31	3
Virginia	5,681	21	305	9	1,356	10,351	780	16,420	1,825	160	841	4,003	12,180	438	943
Washington	1,157	700	594	184	2,444	11,695	811	15,862	964	548	16	4,685	11,352	497	824
West Virginia	254	16	9	3	24	4,582	888	4,889	797	0	388	1,259	2,349	485	1,205
Wisconsin	969	204	881	4	481	3,268	2,843	5,209	686	2,642	716	1,232	3,158	191	3,240
Wyoming	90	179	31	7	444	3,154	122	3,185	753	70	651	957	1,915	210	275
<b>TOTAL</b>	105,561	10,708	8,141	1,639	86,362	273,994	102,254	488,307	59,058	34,164	45,006	124,822	298,375	15,401	97,925

NA = not available

NOTE: Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands did not submit subgrantee data.

**Table B4. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving services, by state**

<b>State</b>	<b>Disabled</b>	<b>Limited English proficiency</b>	<b>Immigrants/refugees/ asylum seekers</b>	<b>Live in rural areas</b>
Alabama	317	55	130	2,393
Alaska	10	38	63	729
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Arizona	113	698	442	2,670
Arkansas	264	113	53	1,131
California	887	1,596	113	1,911
Colorado	1,433	1,272	681	8,873
Connecticut	241	631	52	144
Delaware	143	245	205	1,345
District of Columbia	129	378	349	0
Florida	97	190	251	462
Georgia	691	2,861	1,283	4,641
Guam	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hawaii	62	40	47	462
Idaho	155	19	17	474
Illinois	292	1,118	87	218
Indiana	911	578	176	2,284
Iowa	221	461	391	2,856
Kansas	327	561	114	3,352
Kentucky	476	393	492	3,654
Louisiana	993	75	30	7,124
Maine	195	56	36	1,755
Maryland	251	707	359	1,636
Massachusetts	583	1,966	1,403	574
Michigan	888	179	28	3,724
Minnesota	143	37	47	630
Missouri	1,021	412	275	5,155
Mississippi	308	31	6	2,461
Montana	265	0	3	705
Nebraska	105	295	161	2,247
Nevada	337	1,704	483	1,524
New Hampshire	42	21	3	259
New Jersey	481	1,833	1,026	660
New Mexico	106	590	452	1,500
New York	1,723	5,274	5,210	5,839
North Carolina	357	739	278	1,886
North Dakota	219	3	7	724
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	1,210	685	236	6,676
Oklahoma	157	280	33	3,738
Oregon	961	1,307	771	7,213
Pennsylvania	1,937	3,278	2,506	7,886
Puerto Rico	305	0	208	633
Rhode Island	0	585	0	0
South Carolina	315	283	111	2,775
South Dakota	104	26	20	5,577
Tennessee	329	162	156	2,647
Texas	1,160	8,993	2,362	8,262
Utah	722	1,348	1,049	1,710
Vermont	410	62	10	3,392
Virgin Islands	21	55	6	166
Virginia	1,250	1,109	640	4,958
Washington	873	1,439	672	5,551
West Virginia	508	35	9	4,091
Wisconsin	195	1,036	968	880
Wyoming	433	90	26	2,021
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25,676</b>	<b>45,942</b>	<b>24,536</b>	<b>144,178</b>

NA = not available

NOTE: Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands did not submit subgrantee data.

**Table B5. Victim's relationship to offender, by state**

State	Current/former spouse or intimate partner	Other family or household member	Dating	Acquaintance	Stranger	Relationship unknown	Other
Alabama	4,529	591	1,017	212	87	1,369	0
Alaska	667	8	69	9	1	17	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	234	0
Arizona	3,477	873	917	128	289	1,354	0
Arkansas	4,269	904	858	320	70	957	4
California	2,534	2,162	1,281	3,140	1,541	7,073	442
Colorado	13,543	1,943	1,960	1,036	327	2,479	30
Connecticut	2,441	1,769	826	307	79	1,619	0
Delaware	1,817	274	148	225	72	197	1
District of Columbia	1,666	473	571	168	83	2,745	44
Florida	1,053	165	42	123	45	2,160	1
Georgia	10,700	4,316	1,297	2,214	852	1,887	29
Guam	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hawaii	1,315	89	27	132	23	619	0
Idaho	1,344	183	106	108	61	379	0
Illinois	6,121	1,836	4,695	1,023	311	1,660	0
Indiana	8,244	940	1,760	646	123	5,134	0
Iowa	3,020	570	177	238	50	240	1
Kansas	6,101	1,365	2,436	495	120	575	0
Kentucky	5,836	1,778	4,079	169	38	154	0
Louisiana	8,277	1,298	3,802	1,063	399	4,221	6
Maine	2,658	187	279	73	6	10	0
Maryland	3,464	298	716	168	173	655	0
Massachusetts	8,391	2,047	3,819	287	95	1,141	101
Michigan	12,323	1,688	3,326	1,548	356	1,366	13
Minnesota	2,369	120	288	82	2	92	1
Missouri	7,300	1,216	746	723	314	3,826	279
Mississippi	5,969	552	1,264	603	96	105	0
Montana	1,481	70	260	189	63	468	0
Nebraska	2,083	572	407	684	5	1,716	0
Nevada	7,158	1,187	1,398	208	78	2,208	10
New Hampshire	1,527	647	445	111	28	300	0
New Jersey	7,924	827	1,239	381	111	2,259	147
New Mexico	1,764	338	417	132	49	90	0
New York	22,521	3,932	6,229	1,829	701	4,404	16
North Carolina	5,095	977	1,075	395	151	2,739	0
North Dakota	1,128	262	205	143	25	14	2
Northern Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	19,182	3,254	2,103	1,409	161	14,757	23
Oklahoma	2,661	371	502	279	81	722	0
Oregon	8,671	1,477	1,678	905	172	2,978	504
Pennsylvania	17,876	3,983	4,780	2,093	649	5,258	66
Puerto Rico	5,424	264	352	102	64	919	0
Rhode Island	9,197	790	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	7,162	709	874	657	92	287	4
South Dakota	4,787	588	381	236	27	1,158	121
Tennessee	5,034	624	839	93	293	705	3
Texas	26,095	8,439	4,860	1,188	534	4,816	1,793
Utah	7,876	1,015	724	711	65	2,861	0
Vermont	1,869	509	512	291	192	926	28
Virgin Islands	744	52	12	24	0	6	1
Virginia	13,262	1,536	2,601	930	298	918	17
Washington	12,186	1,372	2,399	563	162	1,019	0
West Virginia	3,578	903	733	207	92	725	0
Wisconsin	2,292	939	495	565	135	4,192	6
Wyoming	2,439	659	760	397	41	292	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>330,444</b>	<b>63,941</b>	<b>72,786</b>	<b>29,962</b>	<b>9,882</b>	<b>99,005</b>	<b>3,693</b>

NA = not available

NOTE: Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands did not submit subgrantee data.