Small Grants, Big Impact

How Microgrants Can Boost Community Safety and Justice

December 2025

By Amy Solomon, MPP, and Betsy Pearl, MA, Council on Criminal Justice

Key Takeaways

- The federal government has a fundamental responsibility to effectively manage taxpayer dollars, both by protecting against waste, fraud, and abuse and by investing federal resources wisely to deliver results on behalf of the public. Yet because of its complexity, **the federal grantmaking process often excludes smaller jurisdictions and organizations. Instead, funding tends to concentrate among applicants that have the capacity and resources to navigate federal requirements**—whether or not they are best poised to address public safety needs in their communities.

- To address this problem, the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs (OJP) adopted a **microgrant funding strategy that made federal public safety investments accessible to a wider array of recipients**. Through this strategy, OJP awarded funding to intermediary organizations, which in turn partnered with the office to deliver microgrants and capacity-building assistance to jurisdictions and organizations that had rarely received federal support.
- By working in close coordination with the intermediaries, **OJP provided greater support to rural law enforcement agencies**, expanding access to federal resources for violence reduction and policing equipment in some of the nation's most geographically isolated areas. Under one such program, approximately **72% of microgrants went to police departments that primarily serve rural non-**

metropolitan counties, compared to 44% of direct grants.

- Intermediaries also **expanded access to OJP resources among small community-based organizations,** which often face steep barriers to federal grants but can be particularly well-positioned to support underserved communities disproportionately affected by crime and victimization. Roughly **90% of recipients of a community violence intervention microgrant had not previously received federal grant funding**.
- While some intermediary grants remain intact, others were terminated as part of a wave of DOJ grant cancellations in April 2025. As the federal government expands efforts to streamline grantmaking, **an intermediary/microgrants strategy offers a promising path to funding for organizations that seldom receive federal support**.

The Challenge

Each year, the U.S. Department of Justice awards billions of dollars in federal grants to state, local, and tribal justice system agencies and their community-based public safety partners across the nation.[1] These grants provide a valuable infusion of resources to help jurisdictions prevent and reduce violence, serve victims of crime, and enhance the administration of justice. Yet for too many organizations, the steep barriers to accessing federal grants put DOJ dollars out of reach.

To receive federal funding, prospective grantees must navigate a complicated application process,[2] investing significant time and resources in the development and submission of a proposal. Applicants must parse through complex application materials, frequently relying on legal and financial experts and seasoned grant writers to craft proposals that conform to federal standards. In most cases, grant proposals are then evaluated against those from a pool of other applicants, all of them competing for limited resources. If selected for an award, grantees must adhere to a stringent set of financial and performance reporting requirements, which can require significant organizational capacity to manage.[3]

The requirements associated with federal grants are aimed at promoting responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars, and they provide an essential framework for protecting against waste, fraud, and abuse. In some cases, however, they can also limit access to federal assistance for smaller nonprofits and government agencies.[4] These smaller organizations may be effective and trusted to deliver local services, yet they often lack the

necessary resources to successfully apply for and administer these funds. As a result, larger and better-resourced organizations tend to receive an outsized share of federal grants, which in turn boosts their capacity to compete for funding in the future.[5]

Across party lines, leaders at the highest levels of the federal government have drawn attention to this issue. As noted by the Biden White House, "[c]ommunities most in need of assistance are often least able to navigate the complex processes of applying for grant opportunities."[6] A recent executive order from President Trump raised similar concerns, decrying the "notoriously complex" federal grant writing process in which "grant applicants that can afford legal and technical experts are more likely to receive funds."[7] The order, which is focused on the "need to strengthen oversight and coordination of, and to streamline, agency grantmaking,"[8] calls on agencies to ensure that funding announcements "include only such requirements as are necessary for an adequate evaluation of the application and are written in plain language." It also encourages agencies to award funding "to a broad range of recipients rather than to a select group of repeat players."[9]

This brief highlights a microgrant funding strategy at the Office of Justice Programs that was initiated during the first Trump administration and significantly expanded during the Biden years. It allows federal resources to flow through intermediary organizations to jurisdictions and organizations that have rarely received federal funding or support. By building on this approach, DOJ can advance the bipartisan goal of broadening the reach of federal grants nationwide.

History of Intermediaries in the Federal Government

The intermediary model initially gained traction among federal agencies in the 1990s and early 2000s, particularly during the administration of President George W. Bush. In 2001, President Bush established the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives and tasked it with leading "a comprehensive effort to enlist, equip, enable, empower, and expand the work of faith-based and other community organizations."[10] In support of this work, several federal agencies implemented intermediary programs as a tool to "reach out to the smallest front-line organizations" and build bridges to federal support.[11] The Department of Labor, for example, used an intermediary model to expand partnerships with grassroots faith- and community-based organizations, an "often under-utilized" resource for engaging jobseekers that public sector workforce agencies traditionally struggled to reach.[12] Likewise, between FY 2002 and FY 2007, the Department of Health and Human Services invested $155 million in intermediary organizations that delivered support to roughly 4,100 grassroots

service providers.[13] A rigorous evaluation of this program concluded that intermediary support produced significant improvements across multiple measures of organizational capacity among microgrant recipients.[14] Although the Department of Justice supported two small-scale and short-term intermediary grants during this period, with mixed results, DOJ's usage of intermediaries remained limited until the early 2020s.[15]

The Intermediary-Microgrant Approach

The Role of the Intermediary

Through the microgrant model, OJP invests in intermediary organizations that in turn deliver financial assistance to smaller entities that might otherwise struggle to access federal resources. OJP conducts a rigorous, competitive application process to select intermediary organizations, which then enter into "cooperative agreements" with the federal government—a type of grantmaking instrument that requires a substantial degree of federal involvement in carrying out the project funded by the grant.[16] This structure allows OJP to work closely with intermediaries to manage and monitor implementation, helping to ensure that microgrants effectuate program goals and are deployed with the highest standards of financial integrity.

Intermediaries pair funding with hands-on training and technical assistance for microgrant recipients, support that is designed to help build organizational capacity to scale and sustain their work. While the nature of this assistance varies based on organizational needs, intermediaries often work with micrograntees to improve administrative and financial management practices, support staff and leadership development, boost capacity to collect data and measure outcomes, and improve program outcomes.

Intermediary organizations are typically larger nonprofits that wear many hats. They must be equipped to serve as both a training and technical assistance provider and a grant administrator, monitoring performance and facilitating compliance with funding requirements. Intermediaries also act as a "translator." In this role, they help micrograntees understand federal rules and expectations while ensuring federal staff understand the needs of recipient organizations. Finally, intermediaries serve as a vital connector, facilitating relationships and building trust between microgrant organizations and government agencies.[17]

To fill these roles, an intermediary must have strong financial management and oversight practices, as well as experience delivering hands-on capacity-building support. An effective intermediary also has relevant subject matter expertise and an established history of working with the stakeholder groups it seeks to reach, whether that's rural sheriffs, culturally specific victim service providers, or community organizations focused on youth. With firsthand understanding of the field, intermediaries are equipped to identify organizations with significant potential but limited capacity—the types of organizations that make strong candidates for intermediary support. Such experience is also essential for serving as a credible bridge between micrograntees and the government, and for developing training and technical assistance that is responsive to organizational needs and delivered in a manner that resonates with the target stakeholders.

The Impact of DOJ Grant Cuts on Intermediaries/Microgrants

Intermediaries are a valuable tool for breaking down barriers to federal funding and diversifying the pool of funding recipients. But many of OJP's investments in intermediaries were canceled in April 2025, when the administration abruptly terminated hundreds of OJP grants, initially valued at about $820 million.[18] Although some intermediary grants remain intact, DOJ terminated grants to intermediaries worth roughly $95 million.[19] The effects of intermediary grant cancellations have been passed on to small community-based organizations and rural policing agencies, who lose access to promised microgrant dollars and capacity-building assistance.[20]

Piloting Microgrants: Small, Rural, and Tribal Agencies

OJP initially piloted its microgrant model in fiscal year (FY) 2020 as part of the Body Worn Camera Program, a funding opportunity launched in 2015 to help law enforcement agencies buy and deploy camera technology for officers.[21] In the initiative's early years, OJP's Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) solicited applications only from law enforcement agencies themselves.[22] But based on feedback from law enforcement stakeholders, BJA added a new category of funding in FY 2020 to help bridge the gap to resources for smaller policing agencies that may lack the capacity to navigate the grant application process or compete for grants against larger departments with more resources.[23]

That year, OJP invested in Justice & Security Strategies, an intermediary organization that has

since awarded roughly $23.7 million in microgrants to 850 law enforcement agencies serving small towns, rural areas, and tribal communities.[24] Although these microgrants have ranged significantly in value—from around $740 to $380,000—most have been for relatively small dollar amounts, with a median value of $20,000.[25] Rather than navigating an intensive application process for a comparatively small grant, law enforcement agencies can apply for funding from the intermediary through a streamlined and user-friendly process. In addition to funding, microgrant recipients receive on-demand training and technical assistance to help develop body worn camera policies and protocols, navigate common implementation challenges, and successfully meet federal grant requirements.[26]

The use of an intermediary allowed the Body Worn Camera Program to increase its geographic footprint among rural jurisdictions across the country. For example, law enforcement agencies in rural counties received about 14% of the direct grants under the Body Worn Camera Program, with the remainder awarded to agencies in metropolitan areas. By contrast, 42% of microgrants went to agencies in non-metropolitan areas, including roughly 50 agencies serving some of the most geographically isolated counties in the nation.[27]

Figure 1. Body Worn Camera Program: Microgrants Helped Reach a Higher Share of Rural Counties

Intermediary support has enabled small and rural law enforcement agencies to deploy body worn cameras as a tool for promoting safe and effective policing practices. Among other benefits, agencies report that body worn camera footage has helped facilitate prompt reviews and resolutions of citizen complaints, enhancing agencies' efforts to ensure officers meet professional standards while allowing them to avoid the costs of lengthy internal investigations.[28] Microgrant recipients have also relied on body worn camera footage in the wake of officer-involved shootings and other critical incidents. Following a major incident in McCall, ID, local police reported that such footage was an "invaluable" resource, allowing the agency to recognize the ways in which officers performed well, and to identify opportunities for improvement.[29] The footage helped pinpoint specific training needs within the department, some of which would have otherwise gone undetected.[30] Body worn camera footage has also helped many microgrant recipients recognize the contributions of officers who have demonstrated exemplary service to their communities.[31]

Expanding the Model to Rural Violent Crime Reduction

In 2021, OJP expanded its use of microgrants into the Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative, a program administered by BJA. In addition to direct awards to law enforcement agencies, the initiative funded two intermediary organizations that in turn delivered microgrants and technical assistance to 45 small, rural, and tribal police departments, sheriffs, and prosecutors' offices in 28 states.[32] The intermediaries—the National Policing Institute and Local Initiatives Support Corporation—successfully expanded the reach of OJP resources in rural areas.[33] Roughly 72% of microgrants went to law enforcement agencies that primarily serve rural non-metropolitan counties, compared to 44% of direct awards made under the program.[34]

Figure 2. Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative: Microgrants Helped Reach a Higher Share of Rural Counties

Support from intermediaries has also helped rural law enforcement agencies develop and deploy strategies for reducing violent crime. Some used the resources to fill gaps in personnel, including shortages of officers and civilian personnel. In Shawano, WI, for example, microgrant funding enabled the police department to hire a detective dedicated to violent crime and narcotics trafficking investigations. In Duson, LA, microgrant dollars helped the police department onboard a new patrol officer trained in crime analysis.[35] And in Frederick, CO, the police department used microgrant funding to employ a victim advocate, who has helped expand access to services for crime survivors.[36]

Agencies have also leveraged these resources to boost the capacity of their workforce. In Bethel, AK, a rural city that is only accessible by plane, it can be cost-prohibitive to send officers to participate in trainings. The Bethel Police Department sought intermediary support to train officers in suicide prevention and violence prevention strategies, who could in turn provide trainings to other members of the department and the broader community.[37]

Intermediaries have helped other agencies upgrade policing equipment and technology. Several agencies have used microgrants to purchase automated license plate readers, a tool that can facilitate real-time comparisons with databases of stolen vehicles and missing persons alerts.[38] Among these agencies was the police department in Three Rivers, MI, which has used the technology to safely locate a missing elderly resident with disabilities, identify a vehicle involved in a hit-and-run incident, and detect a fugitive from a state correctional

facility.[39] Intermediaries have also helped agencies develop policies and procedures for implementing automated license plate readers, including guidance on the appropriate use and retention of sensitive data, and tools for facilitating transparency and communication to the public.[40]

Some agencies have used microgrant funding to strengthen multi-sector partnerships and community engagement initiatives. Awards to the police department in Tamaqua, PA, and the Vernon County (WI) Sheriff's Office, for example, were used to prevent and address incidents of intimate partner and sexual violence, projects undertaken in collaboration with local social service providers and community-based organizations.[41] And several rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies received microgrants to partner with local violence prevention and intervention service providers, with an emphasis on supporting community outreach efforts that de-escalate conflicts and facilitate connections to supportive services.[42]

Microgrants for Community-Based Organizations

Building on lessons from the rural policing context, OJP used the intermediary model to expand its reach among small community organizations as well. Like rural law enforcement, these small nonprofits often lack the capacity to successfully navigate the federal grant application process, and they struggle to compete against larger organizations that can devote substantial resources to grant writing and administration. Survey data from 2023 showed that nonprofits with an annual budget of less than $100,000 were substantially less likely to receive federal grants when compared to their higher-budget peers: only 11% of these small nonprofits received a federal grant, compared to 40% of nonprofits with budgets over $1 million and 58% of those with annual funding exceeding $10 million.[43]

Why Invest in Community-Based Organizations?

Community-based organizations (CBOs) play a valuable role in addressing crime and violence at the local level.[44] In an analysis of more than 20 years of data from 264 American cities, researchers concluded that nonprofit organizations directly contributed to reductions in violent crime in the 1990s and 2000s.[45] The study determined that the addition of 10 new community safety and development organizations reduced homicide rates by 9% and overall violent crime rates by 6% in a city of 100,000 residents.[46] Another study of government investments in New York-based CBOs found evidence that the increased presence of and

funding for local nonprofits yielded reductions in crime in the surrounding area. Each new neighborhood organization was associated with a decrease of 5.6 crimes per 100,000 people, with the most substantial reductions occurring in neighborhoods with the highest rates of crime.[47]

CBOs can be particularly well-positioned to support communities that have been disproportionately affected by crime, victimization, and incarceration. Research suggests that involvement in the justice system can shape perceptions of government as a whole, diminishing trust in public institutions and deterring engagement with traditional social service providers.[48] CBOs with deep roots in the community may face fewer barriers to trust-building, opening the door to engage residents who may otherwise avoid services. Likewise, service providers that are grounded in the culture of the people they serve have shown promising outcomes. Studies of culturally-specific behavioral health programs, for example, report significantly lower participant drop-out rates and increased length of engagement in treatment compared to clients served by traditional providers.[49] For more discussion of the rationale for investing in CBOs as a key part of the public safety infrastructure, see Reimagining Justice at Justice: Investing in Communities as Co-Producers of Public Safety.[50]

OJP integrated the microgrant model into a range of opportunities for CBOs (see Appendix for additional examples), including grants that support violence intervention models, community-based reentry services, trauma recovery approaches for victims of crime, and hate crimes prevention. As with microgrants for rural law enforcement agencies, the amount of funding awarded to CBOs varied based on the scope and goals of the initiative and the needs of the recipient. For some programs, intermediaries provided microgrants of $5,000 or less; for others, microgrants exceeded $250,000.[51] Regardless of the amount, however, the core role of the intermediary remained consistent across programs: providing financial and technical assistance to build organizational capacity among small CBOs.

Community Violence Intervention

Launched in 2022, the Community Violence Intervention and Prevention Initiative (CVIPI) is the leading source of federal funding for community violence intervention (CVI) models that seek to interrupt shootings through targeted engagement with individuals at the highest risk of violence.[52] An outsized percentage of violence within a community can be traced back to this small subset of residents, who are at imminent risk of engaging in or being victimized by violent crime.[53] To reach this population, CVI programs typically deploy “credible

messengers." These individuals are trained professionals whose lived experiences and relationships in the community lend them the authority to de-escalate conflicts and facilitate connections to supportive services among the highest risk people.[54]

Many CVI programs are operated by small nonprofits, which often have close connections to the communities they serve. While such organizations tend to be well-situated to authentically engage high-risk residents, they are often ill-equipped to apply for and administer grants, limiting their ability to scale and sustain services.[55] With these challenges in mind, OJP invested in intermediaries that could engage grassroots CVI providers, bridging the gap to federal resources through a combination of microgrants and hands-on organizational support.

In total, OJP awarded roughly $50 million in CVIPI funding to 11 intermediary organizations,[56] which in turn delivered assistance to smaller CBOs in at least 15 states.[57] Some of these intermediaries funded grassroots organizations scattered across the country, while others zeroed in on a particular state or region. Still others took a more localized approach, concentrating on organizations within one city or even a specific neighborhood. Regardless of their geographic focus, the intermediaries helped expand the reach of OJP resources among organizations that have lacked access to federal support. Roughly 91% of organizations in the first cohort of microgrants had never previously received a grant from the federal government.[58] The intermediary model also helped channel funding to smaller CBOs with fewer financial resources: The median annual revenue for direct grant recipients was roughly four times greater than that of micrograntee organizations.[59]

of CVIPI micrograntees had never before received a federal grant
0 %
Direct grantees had an annual revenue 4x greater than micrograntees
4 X

Many microgrant recipients used their awards to address gaps in staffing and professional development, challenges that can constrain service delivery and hinder the implementation of effective violence intervention models.[60] For example, microgrant resources provided by intermediary Equal Justice USA enabled two Louisiana nonprofits, Silence is Violence and Beyond Harm, to hire the staff necessary to expand services for survivors of violent crime.[61] Likewise, Heal 901, a Memphis-based CVI provider, used a 2022 microgrant from the Local Initiative Support Corporation to hire program staff, provide ongoing training and development opportunities, and strengthen workforce retention.[62] Two years later, in FY 2024, Heal 901 successfully applied for and received its first direct grant from OJP to further

enhance its violence intervention services.[63]

Other microgrant recipients focused on bolstering operational and financial management functions. RVA League for Safer Streets, a microgrant recipient located in Richmond, VA, brought on a part-time administrative staffer to manage tasks related to procurement, hiring, and scheduling, responsibilities that had previously fallen to the program's outreach workers.[64] RVA League for Safer Streets also strengthened financial management by contracting with a nonprofit accounting service, and engaged a part-time grant writer to help promote long-term financial sustainability.[65] Intermediaries also helped build capacity among micrograntees to collect and analyze data, and to measure program impacts.[66]

Reentry Services

In 2023, OJP launched the Second Chance Act Community-Based Reentry Incubator Initiative, using the intermediary/microgrant model to build capacity among small community and faith-based reentry service providers.[67] Over the course of two years, OJP invested $12 million across three intermediaries[68] focused on strengthening the infrastructure of community-based services for people returning home from incarceration.[69] The inaugural cohort included the Latino Coalition for Community Leadership, an intermediary organization founded in 2003 to help bring government resources to nonprofits in historically marginalized communities.[70] The Latino Coalition's approach combines microgrant funding with individualized technical assistance to help organizations strengthen programmatic and financial management practices, track and report data, support staff and leadership development, and improve program outcomes.[71] OJP awarded $4 million to the Latino Coalition to deliver support for up to 20 small reentry service providers; the awards prioritized those with fewer than 10 full-time paid staff and/or total assets of less than $500,000, a group that could most benefit from an infusion of capacity-building assistance and other resources.[72]

Another intermediary, Impact Justice, concentrated its grantmaking efforts on addressing the challenge of housing instability among people returning home from incarceration, who are 10 times more likely to experience homelessness than the general public.[73] In 2024, Impact Justice began delivering assistance to six small CBOs working to expand reentry housing solutions within their communities.[74] In addition to microgrants of $140,000 each, the intermediary provided the CBOs with hands-on assistance in developing implementation and sustainability plans, enhancing collaborations with justice system and housing agencies, building staff capacity to deliver effective reentry services, and establishing systems for measuring and communicating program impact.[75] Among the inaugural cohort of microgrant

recipients was Abe Brown Ministries, a faith-based nonprofit providing supportive services to formerly incarcerated people in Hillsborough County, FL. With intermediary support, Abe Brown Ministries proposed to expand its yearlong transitional living program, which pairs housing with job readiness and case management services, to accommodate six additional residents returning home from incarceration.[76]

Trauma Recovery Centers

OJP leveraged the intermediary model to expand the reach of federal resources for trauma recovery centers (TRCs), a type of one-stop-shop staffed by a multidisciplinary team designed to assist crime survivors in underserved communities.[77] TRCs employ an integrated case management model to support victims with multiple service needs, offering wraparound supports to help clients stabilize their lives in the wake of victimization. The model pairs comprehensive mental health services with individualized assistance to help clients secure safe housing, procure food, access medical care, navigate legal proceedings, apply for victim compensation, and more.[78] Research has found that TRCs cost about 34% less than traditional care and produce better outcomes for clients, who were 87% more likely to utilize mental health services, 56% more likely to return to work, and 44% more likely to cooperate with law enforcement than victims receiving standard services.[79]

Despite the promise of the model, TRCs have struggled to secure funding for their work and expand their footprint. A national survey of TRCs laid bare the financial challenges facing these organizations, one-third of which had to scale back services in 2022 due to insufficient funds.[80] Nine in 10 TRCs expressed concern that funding limitations would force similar cutbacks in the future.[81] The survey also revealed that few TRCs receive direct funding from the federal government, in part due to the complex application and reporting requirements, as well as narrow eligibility and implementation criteria that may not align with the TRC's multidisciplinary service delivery model.[82]

With these challenges in mind, OJP's Office for Victims of Crime piloted a demonstration program in 2024 aimed at closing the gap limiting financial and technical assistance for TRCs.[83] OJP invested in an intermediary, the National Alliance of Trauma Recovery Centers, which began seeking applications in late 2025 from organizations poised to stand up TRCs within their communities.[84] In addition to funding, organizations will receive training and technical assistance to implement core program elements that help TRCs successfully reach victims who might otherwise fall through the cracks of traditional service systems. The alliance will also support program evaluations of each selected site, helping organizations

measure their impact and identify data-driven opportunities for improvement.[85]

Looking Forward

The intermediary model offers a tangible solution to a challenge that has been highlighted by both sides of the aisle: Federal grantmaking favors applicants with the capacity and resources to navigate the complex application process, often at the expense of smaller organizations that are well-poised to fulfill the goals of the grant.

The experience of the Office of Justice Programs illustrates how intermediaries can help overcome these barriers, expanding both the reach and impact of federal investments. By channeling resources through credible and effective intermediaries, OJP has been able to reach organizations on the ground that are best-positioned to benefit from an infusion of support and directly assist their communities. Intermediaries open the door to funding for these groups, which would otherwise face steep barriers to scaling up their work.

The intermediary model also creates efficiencies for government agencies, many of which face capacity constraints in the wake of recent reductions to budgets and staffing. Administering hundreds or thousands of small-dollar grants is a resource-intensive task. This is especially true for recipients who are new to federal funding and need enhanced oversight and training to ensure compliance with grant requirements. The microgrant model shifts much of that responsibility to intermediary organizations, which are in turn held accountable by the federal government for providing the hands-on support and rigorous monitoring that smaller organizations need to succeed.

As the federal government streamlines grantmaking, intermediaries offer a promising path to funding for organizations that have too often stood outside of the reach of federal support.

About the Authors

Amy L. Solomon is a senior fellow at the Council on Criminal Justice and former assistant attorney general at the U.S. Department of Justice. Her expertise spans federal justice funding, criminal justice policy and administration, corrections and reentry reform, and the use of research and data to advance community safety.

Betsy Pearl is a policy consultant with the Council on Criminal Justice and previously served

at the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs as deputy chief of staff and senior adviser to the assistant attorney general. Her expertise includes federal criminal justice policy, justice grantmaking, and community-centered approaches to public safety and reform.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Brian Edsall, Erik Opsal, Jenifer Warren, and Rachel Yen for their support in the design and communications efforts for this report.

This report was produced with support from The Just Trust, Public Welfare Foundation, Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Philanthropies, and Fund for a Safer Future, as well as the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Southern Company Foundation, and other CCJ general operating contributors.

About Justice in Perspective

Justice in Perspective is a nonpartisan series examining the complexities of federal justice funding, policy, research, and operations. It is led by CCJ Senior Fellow Amy L. Solomon, former assistant attorney general in charge of the Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs.

Suggested Citation

Solomon, A. & Pearl, B. (2025). *Small grants, big impact: How microgrants can boost community safety and justice*. Council on Criminal Justice. https://councilоncj.org/small-grants-big-impact-how-microgrants-can-boost-community-safety-and-justice/

Appendix

Below are examples of OJP grant programs that incorporated an intermediary/microgrant

model.

Advancing Women Officers in State and Local Law Enforcement: Technical Assistance and Microgrant Program

Fiscal Year(s): FY2023
Program Office: Bureau of Justice Assistance
Summary: Microgrant program to support state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies implementing the 30×30 Initiative to advance women in policing in state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies.

Community and Schools Youth Drug Prevention Program

Fiscal Year(s): FY2024
Program Office: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Summary: Microgrants for local nonprofits, working in collaboration with law enforcement and community coalitions, to deliver substance use prevention programming to youth in schools and extracurricular settings.

Community-Based Approaches to Prevent and Address Hate Crime

Fiscal Year(s): FY2024
Program Office: Bureau of Justice Assistance
Summary: Microgrants to support nonprofits implementing programs to prevent and address hate crimes.

Community-Based Violence Intervention and Prevention Initiative

Fiscal Year(s): FY2022, FY2023, FY2024
Program Office: Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime
Summary: Microgrant program to support nonprofits implementing community violence intervention strategies.

Enhancing Prison Practices to Protect Vulnerable People

Fiscal Year(s): FY2024
Program Office: Bureau of Justice Assistance
Summary: Microgrant program to help state, local, and tribal agencies protect vulnerable people in prisons, jails, and other confinement facilities, and reduce the use

of overly punitive or restrictive measures to keep them safe.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Outreach and Education Subgrants Program

Fiscal Year(s): FY2023
Program Office: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Summary: Microgrants for public agencies, nonprofits, and faith-based organizations to conduct public education and awareness activities related to preventing juvenile delinquency and promoting youth justice.

Law Enforcement-Based Victim Services Technical Assistance Program

Fiscal Year(s): FY2022
Program Office: Office for Victims of Crime
Summary: Microgrants to state, local, or tribal law enforcement agencies to develop or enhance direct victim service programs focused on assisting and supporting victims in high-crime areas and communities particularly affected by violence.

National Center for Culturally Responsive Victim Services

Fiscal Year(s): FY2022
Program Office: Office for Victims of Crime
Summary: Microgrants to build capacity among victim-serving organizations run by and for historically underserved communities.

National Center on Restorative Justice

Fiscal Year(s): FY2023
Program Office: Bureau of Justice Assistance
Summary: Microgrant program to support criminal justice agencies, stakeholders, and nonprofit organizations in planning for and/or establishing restorative justice programs.

National Crime Victims' Rights Week Community Awareness Projects

Fiscal Year(s): FY2024
Program Office: Office for Victims of Crime
Summary: Microgrants for nonprofits and victim assistance agencies to conduct public education and awareness activities on crime victims' rights and services in their jurisdictions during the 2025–2027 National Crime Victims' Rights Weeks.

Peer-to-Peer Support for Survivors of Crime

Fiscal Year(s): FY2023
Program Office: Office for Victims of Crime
Summary: Microgrant program to support victim-serving organizations in establishing or expanding trauma-informed peer-to-peer support programs for crime survivors.

Pilot Program for Community-Based Organizations in Underserved Communities to Build Capacity and Serve Adolescent and Youth Victims of Trafficking

Fiscal Year(s): FY2024
Program Office: Office for Victims of Crime
Summary: Microgrant program to build the capacity of nonprofits to provide services to adolescent and youth human trafficking victims in underserved communities, prioritizing rural communities.

Protecting Futures: Building Capacity to Serve Children and Youth Impacted by America's Drug Crisis

Fiscal Year(s): FY2022
Program Office: Office for Victims of Crime
Summary: Microgrants for service providers to expand or enhance direct services for young victims of crime who have been impacted by drug use among parents, caregivers, or other persons in positions of trust.

Reimagining Justice: Testing a New Model of Community Safety

Fiscal Year(s): FY2022, FY2023, FY2024
Program Office: Bureau of Justice Assistance
Summary: Microgrant program to support collaborative networks of nonprofits and local agencies that are implementing alternative strategies to address less serious/lower-level crimes through delivery of coordinated programs and services.

Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative

Fiscal Year(s): FY2021
Program Office: Bureau of Justice Assistance
Summary: Microgrant program to help small law enforcement agencies in rural areas address violent crime challenges within their communities.

Second Chance Act Community-Based Reentry Incubator Initiative

Fiscal Year(s): FY2023, FY2024
Program Office: Bureau of Justice Assistance
Summary: Microgrant program to build capability, capacity, and sustainability among nonprofit and faith-based organizations serving people returning home from incarceration.

Services to Support Victims of Hate Crime and Strengthen Communities

Fiscal Year(s): FY2021
Program Office: Office for Victims of Crime
Summary: Microgrants to support organizations in serving victims of hate crimes, promoting awareness of these crimes, facilitating healing and reconciliation, and/or developing related resources.

Supporting Children, Youth, and Families Affected by the Drug Crisis: Recruiting and Developing Peer Recovery Coaches

Fiscal Year(s): FY2023
Program Office: Office for Victims of Crime
Summary: Microgrants to help service providers recruit, train, and deploy paid peer recovery coaches who assist caregivers and family members in recovery from substance use disorders, supporting the well-being of youth who have experienced victimization as a result of the drug use.

Supporting Small, Rural, and Tribal Law Enforcement Agency Body-Worn Camera Policy and Implementation Program

Fiscal Year(s): FY2020, FY2023
Program Office: Bureau of Justice Assistance
Summary: Microgrant program to support small, rural, and tribal law enforcement agencies seeking to initiate or expand a body-worn camera program.

Transforming America's Response to Older Victims: Developing and Supporting Statewide Elder Justice Coalitions and Training and Technical Assistance Program

Fiscal Year(s): FY2022
Program Office: Office for Victims of Crime
Summary: Microgrants to support statewide efforts to develop or expand Elder Justice

Coalitions, which bring together elder justice advocates, legal aid professionals, and victim service providers to identify and address gaps in services to older victims of abuse and financial exploitation.

Trauma Recovery Center Demonstration Project

Fiscal Year(s): FY2024
Program Office: Office for Victims of Crime
Summary: Microgrants to establish trauma recovery centers in underserved communities most affected by violent crime.

Endnotes

[1] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. (n.d.). *Grants/Funding*. https://www.ojp.gov/funding

[2] See U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. (n.d.). *OJP Grant Application Resource Guide.* https://www.ojp.gov/funding/apply/ojp-grant-application-resource-guide

[3] U.S. Department of Justice. (2025). *DOJ Grants Financial Guide*. https://www.ojp.gov/doj-financial-guide-2024. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. (2020, December 15). *Legal Overview for Awards*. https://www.ojp.gov/funding/explore/legal-overview-awards

[4] Arkin, J. (2023). Grants Management: Observations on challenges with access, use, and oversight. *U.S. Government Accountability Office* (GAO-23-106797). https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-23-106797.pdf. Hermans, A., & Rajninger, T. (2024, May 6). *Local governments with more staff and bigger budgets are more likely to win federal infrastructure grants*. Urban Institute. https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/local-governments-more-staff-and-bigger-budgets-are-more-likely-win-federal. Foster, N. L. (2023). Barriers to federal funding for underserved communities: Legal and policy perspective. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM), 11*(08), 5058–5070. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsrm/v11i08.em06. Thompson, D. (2023). *Improving access to federal grants for underserved communities*. National Council of Nonprofits.

https://www.councilofnonprofits.org/files/media/documents/2023/ncn-federal-grants-hearing-testimony-5-2-2023.pdf

[5] Clerkin, C., Koob, A., & Wolcheck, D. (2025, February 6). *How reliant are nonprofits on government grants?* Candid. https://candid.org/blogs/how-many-nonprofits-rely-on-government-grants-data/. Martin, H., Boris, E. T., Tomasko, L., Lecy, J., Faulk, L., & Kim, M. (2024). *Nonprofit Trends and Impacts 2021–2023: National Findings on Government Grants and Contracts from 2019 to 2023*. Urban Institute. https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/2024-10/Nonprofit_Trends_and_Impacts_2021-2023_National_Findings_on_Government_Grants_and_Contracts.pdf. Kelley, A., Isom, D., Seeman, B., Silverman, J., Cuevas-Ferreras, A., & Frei-Herrmann, K. (2024, June 20). A new look at how US nonprofits get really big. Stanford Social Innovation Review. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/big-nonprofits-funding-revenue

[6] Office of Management and Budget. (2024, April 4). *The Biden-Harris administration finalizes guidance to make grants more accessible and transparent for families, communities, and small businesses*. The White House. https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/omb/briefing-room/2024/04/04/the-biden-harris-administration-finalizes-guidance-to-make-grants-more-accessible-and-transparent-for-families-communities-and-small-businesses/

[7] Executive Order 14332, 90 FR 38929 (2025). https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2025-08-12/pdf/2025-15344.pdf

[8] Some aspects of the Executive Order, including those highlighted in the text, promote strategies for expanding access to federal resources. Other elements of the order are focused on operationalizing the administration's policy agenda.

[9] Executive Order 14332.

[10] Executive Order 13199, 66 FR 8499 (2001). https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2001-01-31/pdf/01-2852.pdf

[11] The White House. (2008). *The Quiet Revolution: The President's Faith-Based and Community Initiative: a seven-year progress report*. https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/government/fbci/The-Quiet-Revolution.pdf

[12] DeRocco Stover, E. (2004). *Building partnerships with faith-based and community-based organizations and a new grant opportunity for Workforce Investment Boards* (Training and Employment Notice No. 15-03). U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. https://oui.doleta.gov/dmstree/ten/ten2k3/ten_15-03.htm. Paulsell, D., Max, J., Derr, M., & Burwick, A. (2007). *Collaborating with faith-based and community-based organizations: Lessons learned from 12 Workforce Investment Boards*. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/ETA/publications/2007-16%20Collaborating%20with%20Faith%20-%20and%20Community%20Organizations%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf

[13] The White House, 2008.

[14] Abt Associates, Inc. (2010). *Building non-profit capacity: Findings from the Compassion Capital Fund Evaluation*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. https://acf.gov/sites/default/files/documents/opre/ccf_impact_study_rsrch_brief.pdf

[15] Markovitz, C., Magged, L., Florez, M., & Klein, S. (2008). *HOPE II: Faith-Based and Community Organization Program evaluation study* (NCJ 224988). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/224988.pdf. Klein, A., Brown, M., Small, M., Tucker, D., Fischer, R., & Walsh, C. (2009). *Evaluation of the Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Grant Program Special Initiative: Faith-Based and Community Organization Pilot Program* (NCJ 228192). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/228192.pdf

[16] State Justice Institute and Rulo Strategies. (n.d.). What is the difference between a grant award and a cooperative agreement? The Funding Toolkit for State Courts and Justice System Partners. https://fundingtoolkit.sji.gov/faq/what-is-the-difference-between-a-grant-award-and-a-coopera

tive-agreement/

[17] Bae, J. (2023). *Building reentry ecosystems: A blueprint for innovation* (NCJ 306489). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived July 10, 2024, at https://web.archive.org/web/20240710110642/https://bja.ojp.gov/doc/building-reentry-ecosystems.pdf

[18] Solomon, A. & Pearl, B. (2025). *DOJ funding update: A deeper look at the cuts*. Council on Criminal Justice. https://councilоncj.org/doj-funding-update-a-deeper-look-at-the-cuts/

[19] For a full list of terminated grants, see Solomon & Pearl, 2025.

[20] McShane, J. (2025, November 4). How Trump's DOJ wiped out a pioneering anti-violence nonprofit. *Mother Jones*. https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2025/11/how-trumps-doj-wiped-out-a-pioneering-anti-violence-nonprofit. Nabours, S., & Hing, G. (2025, September 5). Federal cuts disrupt local justice programs, but communities push forward. *The Marshall Project*. https://www.themarshallproject.org/2025/09/05/trump-grant-local-justice-programs. Salzman, N. (2025, May 27). After years on the front lines of violence prevention, Englewood group faces layoffs as DOJ shifts priorities. *Chicago Tribune*. https://www.chicagotribune.com/2025/05/27/englewood-anti-violence-funding-cuts-layoffs/. Solomon, A. & Pearl, B. (2025a). *DOJ funding cuts: More than 550 organizations impacted, new analysis finds*. Council on Criminal Justice. https://councilоncj.org/doj-funding-cuts-more-than-550-organizations-impacted-new-analysis-finds/

[21] U.S. Department of Justice. (2015, May 1). *Justice Department Announces $20 Million in Funding to Support Body-Worn Camera Pilot Program* [Press release]. https://www.justice.gov/archives/opa/pr/justice-department-announces-20-million-funding-support-body-worn-camera-pilot-program

[22] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2015). *Body-Worn Camera Pilot Implementation Program FY 2015 competitive grant announcement.*

https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/BJA-2015-4168.pdf. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2016). Small Agency Body-Worn Camera Policy and Implementation Program (25 or fewer officers) FY 2016 competitive grant announcement. https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/BJA-2016-9276.pdf. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2017). *Body-Worn Camera Policy and Implementation Program FY 2017 competitive grant announcement*. https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/BJA-2017-11221.PDF. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2018). *Body-Worn Camera Policy and Implementation Program FY 2018 competitive grant announcement*. https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/BJA-2018-13574.PDF

[23] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2020). *Supporting Small and Rural Law Enforcement Agency Body-Worn Camera Policy and Implementation Program FY 2020 competitive grant announcement*. https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/bja-2020-17011.pdf

[24] Justice & Security Strategies. (2024). $6 million and 170 BWC grants awarded. *SRT Insights, 3*(5). https://www.srtbwc.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/SRT_Newsletter_V3-5-FIN.pdf

[25] *SRT BWC micro-grantee list*. (n.d.). Small Rural Tribal Body Worn Camera Program. https://www.srtbwc.com/micro-grantees-data-download/

[26] *Resources*. (n.d.). Small Rural Tribal Body Worn Camera Program. https://www.srtbwc.com/grantee-resources/. *Webinars*. (n.d.). Small Rural Tribal Body Worn Camera Program. https://www.srtbwc.com/Webinars/

[27] To conduct this analysis, CCJ queried the USAspending.gov database by the Assistance Listing, formerly known as the CFDA number, that corresponds with the Body-Worn Camera Program (16.835), and extracted data on the county in which each direct award recipient was located. CCJ obtained the list of microgrant recipients from the Small Rural Tribal Body Worn Camera Program website and manually identified the county in which each microgrant recipient is located. Direct awards and microgrants were then coded using the 2023 Rural-Urban Continuum Codes, a classification system that categorizes U.S. counties as either

metropolitan or non-metropolitan, and then further delineates metropolitan counties by the population size of their metro area and non-metropolitan counties by their degree of urbanization and adjacency to a metro area. Each U.S. county is assigned a code on a nine-point scale from largest metropolitan counties to most rural and remote non-metropolitan counties; metropolitan counties are assigned a code of 1-3, and non-metropolitan counties are assigned a code of 4-9. CCJ analysis found that 42% of primary counties served by microgrant recipients were assigned a Rural-Urban Continuum Code of 4-9. Of that group, 51 agencies primarily served counties coded as a 9, the classification reserved for the most rural and remote counties (i.e., those with an urban population of fewer than 5,000 that are not adjacent to a metro area). Note: For microgrant recipient agencies whose jurisdiction spanned multiple counties, CCJ sought to identify the primary county served (e.g., the county where a greater portion of the jurisdiction is located, the county that the jurisdiction's emergency services are integrated with, etc.). One of the 835 microgrants was omitted from this analysis because the jurisdiction of the law enforcement agency spanned multiple counties with different Rural-Urban Continuum Codes, with no identifiable primary county (e.g., awards to a statewide law enforcement agency). No direct awards were omitted on this basis, as USAspending.gov provided a single county location for each direct award. An additional two microgrants were omitted from the analysis based on gaps in available information. The publicly available list of microgrants includes only the name of the law enforcement agency and its state. In two cases, CCJ identified multiple law enforcement agencies of the same name located in different counties of the state, with different Rural-Urban Continuum Codes; CCJ was unable to verify the correct recipient of these microgrants. For information on Rural-Urban Continuum Codes, see: Sanders, A. (2025, January 7). *Rural-Urban Continuum Codes*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/rural-urban-continuum-codes. For list of microgrant recipients, see: SRT BWC micro-grantee list, n.d.

[28] Justice & Security Strategies. (2025). Success stories from the field: Positive outcomes using BWCs. *SRT Insights, 4*(1). https://www.srtbwc.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/SRT_Newsletter_V4-1-FIN2.pdf

[29] *Success stories*. (n.d.). Small Rural Tribal Body Worn Camera Program. https://www.srtbwc.com/success-stories/

[30] Success stories, n.d.

[31] Justice & Security Strategies, 2025.

[32] See map of partner agencies. *Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative*. (n.d.). National Policing Institute. https://ruralvcri.org/

[33] In April 2025, DOJ terminated funding for the Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative intermediary program. The two intermediaries, the National Policing Institute and the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, lost grants originally valued at $8,267,407 and $5,473,750 respectively. For archived information on the original intermediary grant awards, see *Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative TTA Provider*. (2021, December 2). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived January 2, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250102155055/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15pbja-21-gk-03942-rura. *Building Lasting Capacity for Violent Crime Reduction in Rural Communities*. (2021, December 2). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived January 16, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250116110713/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15pbja-21-gk-03941-rura

[34] CCJ analysis finds that approximately 72% (31 of 43) of RVCRI microgrants were awarded to law enforcement agencies located in nonmetropolitan counties [see note below regarding the omission of two microgrants from this analysis], compared to 44% (31of 70) of direct awards. To conduct this analysis, CCJ first extracted the list of direct award recipients under RVCRI in FY 2021, FY 2023, and FY 2024 (direct awards were not made in FY 2022) from OJP's interactive grants map and cross-referenced award identification numbers with the USAspending.gov database to obtain data on the county in which each grant recipient is located. CCJ created a list of microgrants from a map of funding recipients on the RCVRI website and manually identified the county in which each microgrant recipient is located. Direct awards and microgrants were then coded using the 2023 Rural-Urban Continuum Codes, a classification system that categorizes U.S. counties as either metropolitan or non-metropolitan, and then further delineates metropolitan counties by the population size of their metro area and non-metropolitan counties by their degree of urbanization and adjacency to a metro area. Each U.S. county is assigned a code on a nine-point scale from largest metropolitan counties to most rural and remote non-metropolitan counties; metropolitan counties are assigned a code of 1-3, and non-metropolitan counties are assigned a code of 4-9. Note: For microgrant recipient agencies whose jurisdiction spanned multiple counties, CCJ sought to identify the primary county served (e.g., the county where a

greater portion of the jurisdiction is located, the county that the jurisdiction's emergency services are integrated with, etc.). Two of the 45 microgrants were omitted from this analysis, as the jurisdiction of the recipient law enforcement agencies spanned multiple counties with different Rural-Urban Continuum Codes, with no identifiable primary county (e.g., awards to statewide or regional law enforcement agencies). No direct awards were omitted on this basis, as USAspending.gov provided a single county location for each direct award. For information on Rural-Urban Continuum Codes, see: Sanders, 2025. Rural-Urban Continuum Codes. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/rural-urban-continuum-codes. For map of microgrant recipients, see: Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative, n.d. For OJP interactive grants map, see: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. *OJP awards since FY2021 by solicitation* [Dataset]. https://charts.ojp.usdoj.gov/t/public/views/OJPAwardsDashboardallFiscalYears/AwardsBySolicitations?%3Aembed=y&%3Aiid=2&%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y

[35] *Shawano, Wisconsin Police Department*. (n.d.). Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative. https://ruralvcri.org/agency-profiles/shawano-wisconsin-police-department/. National Policing Institute. (2024). *2023 Annual Report: The Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative Microgrant Program*. Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative. https://ruralvcri.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Rural-VCRI-2023-Annual-Report_UpdatedGraphicDesign-1.pdf

[36] National Policing Institute, 2024.

[37] Bethel, AK. (n.d.). Local Initiatives Support Corporation. https://www.lisc.org/our-initiatives/safety-justice/our-work/rural-violent-crime-reduction-initiative/bethel-ak/

[38] National Policing Institute, 2024.

[39] National Policing Institute, 2024.

[40] National Policing Institute, 2024.

[41] Alfree, C. (2023, March 1). Tamaqua Police works to prevent sexual violence with federal grant. *WNEP*. https://www.wnep.com/article/news/local/schuylkill-county/tamaqua-police-works-to-prevent-sexual-violence-with-federal-grant-schuylkill-countys-sexual-assault-resource-counseling-center-wnep/523-1045415d-96a0-442f-87b2-f0357e769927. *Tamaqua, Pennsylvania Police Department*. (n.d.). Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative. https://ruralvcri.org/agency-profiles/tamaqua-pennsylvania-police-department/. *Vernon County, WI.* (n.d.). Local Initiatives Support Corporation. https://www.lisc.org/our-initiatives/safety-justice/our-work/rural-violent-crime-reduction-initiative/vernon-county-wi/

[42] *Rowland, North Carolina Police Department*. (n.d.). Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative. https://ruralvcri.org/agency-profiles/rowland-north-carolina-police-department/. *Pembroke, North Carolina Police Department*. (n.d.). Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative. https://ruralvcri.org/agency-profiles/pembroke-north-carolina-police-department/. *Red Springs, North Carolina Police Department*. (n.d.). Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative. https://ruralvcri.org/agency-profiles/red-springs-north-carolina-police-department/

[43] Martin, Tomasko, Faulk, Kim, Lecy, & Boris, 2025.

[44] Solomon, A., Cohen, B., & Pearl, B. (2024). *Reimagining justice at Justice: Investing in communities as co-producers of public safety*. The Square One Justice Project. https://crimelab.uchicago.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2024/07/ReimaginingJusticeatJustice_WhitePaper_Final-with-Cover.pdf

[45] Sharkey, P,, Torrats-Espinosa, G., & Takyar, D. (2017). Community and the crime decline: The causal effect of local nonprofits on violent crime. *American Sociological Review 82*(6),1214–1240. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122417736289

[46] Sharkey, Torrats-Espinosa, & Takyar, 2017.

[47] Jacoby, A. (2017). Social service organizations, discretionary funding, and neighborhood crime rates. *Crime & Delinquency, 64*(9), 1193–1214. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128716688884

[48] Brayne, S. (2014). Surveillance and system avoidance. *American Sociological Review, 79*(3), 367–391. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414530398. Lerman, A. E., & Weaver, V. M. (2014). *Arresting Citizenship: The Democratic Consequences of American Crime Control*. University of Chicago Press.

[49] Hohman, M. M., & Gait, D. H. (2001). Latinas in Treatment: Comparisons of residents in a culturally specific recovery home with residents in non-specific recovery homes. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 9*(3–4), 93–109. https://doi.org/10.1300/j051v09n03_05. Takeuchi, D. T., Sue, S., & Yeh, M. (1995). Return rates and outcomes from ethnicity-specific mental health programs in Los Angeles. *American Journal of Public Health, 85*(5), 638–643. https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.85.5.638. Yeh, M., Takeuchi, D. T., & Sue, S. (1994). Asian-American children treated in the mental health system: A comparison of parallel and mainstream outpatient service centers. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 23*(1), 5–12. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp2301_2

[50] Solomon, Cohen, & Pearl, 2024.

[51] For example, microgrants under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Outreach and Education Subgrants Program ranged from $1,000 to $5,000, while intermediaries under the Community Violence Intervention and Prevention Initiative were expected to award microgrants between $100,000 and $250,000. Coalition for Juvenile Justice & National Youth Justice Network. (2024). *2024 Youth Justice Action Month mini grants notice of funding availability*. https://img1.wsimg.com/blobby/go/d16e0e6c-0a9d-4cf1-987d-c35c6238e51c/Notice of Funding Availability 5.14.24.pdf. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2023). *OJJDP FY 2023 Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Outreach and Education Subgrants Program*. https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/funding/fy2023/o-ojjdp-2023-171797. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2024). *BJA FY24 Office of Justice Programs Community Based Violence Intervention and Prevention Initiative Site-Based*. https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/O-BJA-2024-172063.pdf

[52] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. (2024). *Community Violence Intervention & Prevention Initiative (CVIPI Fact Sheet)* (NCJ 309413). https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/community-violence-intervention-preventio

n-initiative-cvipi-fact

[53] Lurie, S., Acevedo, A., & Ott, K. (2018, November 18). *The less than 1%: Groups and the extreme concentration of urban violence*. American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting. https://cdn.theatlantic.com/assets/media/files/nnsc_gmi_concentration_asc_v1.91.pdf. Papachristos, A. V., Wildeman, C., & Roberto, E. (2014). Tragic, but not random: The social contagion of nonfatal gunshot injuries. *Social Science & Medicine, 125*, 139–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.01.056

[54] Szkola, J., & Blount-Hill, K. (2024). A framework for understanding credibility: What makes credible messengers "Credible" in a New York City–Based sample of gun violence intervention programs? *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 52*(2), 294–312. https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548241291032

[55] Nieto, B., Costa, J., & Carrillo, P. (2023). *Leveraging intermediaries to strengthen the community violence intervention field*. Giffords Center for Violence Intervention. https://giffords.org/report/leveraging-intermediaries-to-strengthen-the-community-violence-intervention-field/

[56] In April 2025, DOJ terminated funding for nine of the 11 CVIPI intermediary grant recipients. The following organizations lost intermediary grants collectively valued at $34.3 million: Chicago CRED, Children & Youth Justice Center, Cure Violence Global, Equal Justice USA, Health Resources in Action, Latino Coalition for Community Leadership, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Metropolitan Family Services, and National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform. For archived information on the original intermediary grant awards, see: *Technical Assistance Support and Administrative and Program Infrastructure Development for CVI CBOs*. (2024, September 26). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived January 20, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250120140154/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-24-GK-03119-CVIP. *CCYJ BJA CVI Capacity Building Project*. (2023, September 28). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived January 23, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250123122500/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-23-GK-05198-CVIP. *Cure Violence Global CVUPI CBO Capacity Building Initiative*. (2024, September 26). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice

Assistance. Archived January 3, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250103050320/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-24-GK-03118-CVIP. *Building Community Safety in Louisiana*. (2023, September 28). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived January 23, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250123113500/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-23-GK-05199-CVIP. *Massachusetts Community Violence Intervention Capacity Building Initiative (MCVI-CBI)*. (2023, September 28). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived December 20, 2024, at https://web.archive.org/web/20241220133601/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-23-GK-05187-CVIP. *CVIPI Capacity Building*. (2022, September 29). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived January 21, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250121120119/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-22-GK-04709-CVIP. *Building Capacity for Safer Communities*. (2022, September 29). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived January 16, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250116181150/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-22-GK-04705-CVIP. *Metropolitan Peace Initiative Communities Partnering 4 Peace Capacity Building*. (2022, September 29). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived January 21, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250121114611/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-22-GK-04707-CVIP. *CVIPI Capacity Building for Community-Based Organizations*. (2023, September 28). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived January 23, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250123111656/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-23-GK-05193-CVIP.

[57] Information is publicly available on microgrant recipients for six of the 11 CVIPI intermediary organizations: Children & Youth Justice Center, Equal Justice USA, Latino Coalition for Community Leadership, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Metropolitan Family Services, and National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform. These six intermediaries collectively selected 25 microgrant recipients in 12 states: Alabama, California, Colorado, the District of Columbia, Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Virginia, and Washington. An additional three intermediaries—Health Resources in Action, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, and the Medical College of Wisconsin—have published materials that include the location of expected microgrant recipients, although the exact recipients have not been publicized. These intermediaries plan to award or have already awarded

microgrants in three states: Massachusetts, New York, and Wisconsin. See: Health Resources in Action. (2024). *Request for proposals: Massachusetts Community Violence Intervention Capacity Building Initiative*. https://hria.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/MCVI-CBI-RFP-updated-6-17.pdf. Medical College of Wisconsin Comprehensive Injury Center. (2025). *Wisconsin Community Safety Fund Community Violence Intervention and Prevention Initiative: Request for applications*. https://www.mcw.edu/-/media/MCW/Departments/Comprehensive-Injury-Center/CVIPI/CVIPI-RFA-MCW-Cooperative-Agreement_FINAL.pdf. National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform. (2024). *2024 in review: Building a safer, more just nation*. https://nicjr.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/NICJR-Annual-Report-2024_122124.pdf. *Our projects*. (n.d.). The Corrections Lab, John Jay College of Criminal Justice. https://thecorrectionslab.org/projects/. Robinson, A. (2025, May 1). After DOJ cuts grants, anti-violence groups in New Orleans fear layoffs, inability to help victims. *Verite News*. https://veritenews.org/2025/05/01/doj-cuts-grants-domestic-violence-groups/. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. (2024a, March 22). *Community violence intervention: OJP funding*. https://www.ojp.gov/archive/topics/community-violence-intervention#ojp-funding. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. (2024b, October 4). *Supporting youth and reducing violence in Seattle*. https://www.ojp.gov/safe-communities/partners-in-safety/supporting-youth-reducing-violence-seattle.

[58] The first cohort of microgrants is comprised of 11 organizations that received funding from the three intermediaries selected in FY 2022 (Latino Coalition for Community Leadership, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, and Metropolitan Family Services). CCJ analysis finds that 10 of the 11 (91%) microgrant recipients had not received a direct grant from a federal government agency prior to receiving a CVIPI microgrant. By comparison, in FY 2022, OJP made direct awards to 23 CBOs under CVIPI, six (26.1%) of which had not received another direct grant from a federal government agency prior to receiving a CVIPI award. To assess organizational funding history, CCJ queried USASpending.gov, a federal government spending database, by the name of funding recipient organizations. Note: some recipients received COVID-19 small business loans or direct payments, which were not included in this analysis. For list of funding recipients under CVIPI, see: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, 2024a.

[59] CCJ analysis finds that the median annual revenue for the first cohort of CBOs that received direct CVIPI grant awards was roughly $4.031 million, while the median annual revenue for

the first cohort of microgrant recipients was roughly $996,000. Annual revenue is based on each organization's tax filings, accessed through ProPublica's Nonprofit Explorer database. CCJ's analysis uses the tax filing for the fiscal year immediately preceding the CVIPI direct award or microgrant. Grant data from USAspending.gov shows that direct awards were made in September 2022; thus, CCJ used tax returns from the fiscal year ending in either June 2022 or December 2021, depending on the organization's schedule of tax filings. Per USAspending.gov, microgrants were made between April and October 2023. Based on the date of the microgrant award and the organization's tax filing schedule, CCJ used tax returns from the fiscal year ending in either December 2022 or June 2023. For one direct award and one microgrant, tax data from the preceding year was not publicly available; in these two cases, CCJ used tax data from the fiscal year in which the award was made. In addition, one direct award and one microgrant were omitted from this analysis, as no tax filings were publicly available for these organizations. For additional information on the first cohort of microgrant and direct grant recipients, see note 58. For nonprofit tax filings, see: Suozzo, A., Glassford, A., Ngu, A., & Roberts, B. (2025, September 25). *Nonprofit Explorer*. ProPublica. https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/. For list of direct award and microgrant recipients under CVIPI, see: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, 2024a.

[60] *Heal Memphis (Heal 901)*. (n.d.). Local Initiatives Support Corporation. https://www.lisc.org/our-initiatives/safety-justice/our-work/capacity-building/building-capacity-community-violence-intervention-and-prevention/heal-memphis-heal-901/. *Mute the Violence DC*. (n.d.). Local Initiatives Support Corporation. https://www.lisc.org/our-initiatives/safety-justice/our-work/capacity-building/building-capacity-community-violence-intervention-and-prevention/mute-violence-dc/. *Selma Center for Nonviolence, Truth, and Reconciliation*. (n.d.). Local Initiatives Support Corporation. https://www.lisc.org/our-initiatives/safety-justice/our-work/capacity-building/building-capacity-community-violence-intervention-and-prevention/selma-center-nonviolence-truth-and-reconciliation/

[61] Robinson, 2025.

[62] Heal Memphis (Heal 901), n.d.

[63] *Project Grant: FAIN 15PBJA24GG03114CVIP*. (n.d.). USAspending.gov. https://www.usaspending.gov/award/ASST_NON_15PBJA24GG03114CVIP_015

[64] *RVA League for Safer Streets*. (n.d.). Local Initiatives Support Corporation. https://www.lisc.org/our-initiatives/safety-justice/our-work/capacity-building/building-capacity-community-violence-intervention-and-prevention/rva-league-safer-streets

[65] RVA League for Safer Streets, n.d.

[66] Solomon, Cohen, & Pearl, 2024.

[67] Solomon, Cohen, & Pearl, 2024.

[68] In April 2025, DOJ terminated intermediary grants made under the Second Chance Act Community-based Reentry Incubator Initiative. Three intermediary organizations – Impact Justice, Latino Coalition for Community Leadership, and SoulFisher Ministries – each lost a grant worth $4 million. For archived information on the original intermediary grant awards, see: *Launching the Impact Justice Reentry Incubator to Increase the Capacity of Housing-focused Reentry CBOs*. (2023, September 28). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived December 19, 2024, at https://web.archive.org/web/20241219175423/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-23-GK-05460-SCAX. *LCCL Community Reentry Incubator Initiative*. (2023, September 28). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived December 15, 2024, at https://web.archive.org/web/20241215164142/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-23-GK-05461-SCAX. *The SoulFisher Ministries Trim Tab Boot Camp*. (2024, September 25). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Archived January 17, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250117104639/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15PBJA-24-GK-02977-SCAX

[69] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2023, March 28). *FY 2023 Second Chance Act Community-based Reentry Incubator Initiative*. Archived January 6, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250106054706/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/opportunities/o-bja-2023-171692. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2024, April 15). *FY 2024 Second Chance Act Community-based Reentry*

Incubator Initiative. Archived January 17, 2025, at https://web.archive.org/web/20250117092108/https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/opportunities/o-bja-2024-172081

[70] Solomon, Cohen, & Pearl, 2024.

[71] *Our model*. (n.d.). Latino Coalition for Community Leadership. https://latinocoalition.org/our-model/. Solomon, Cohen, & Pearl, 2024.

[72] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2023, September 28). *LCCL Community Reentry Incubator Initiative*. Archived December 9, 2024, at https://web.archive.org/web/20241209015455/https:/bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/15pbja-23-gk-05461-scax

[73] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. (2024, December 27). *Impact Justice: Changing the conversation, and reality, around homelessness*. https://www.ojp.gov/safe-communities/partners-in-safety/impact-justice-changing-the-conversation-and-reality-around-homelessness

[74] Impact Justice. (2024, October 30). *Impact Justice's National Housing Incubator awards more than $800 thousand in microgrants to six promising reentry housing projects across the country* [Press release]. https://impactjustice.org/national-housing-incubator-awards-2024/

[75] See description of subawards. *Cooperative Agreement: FAIN 15PBJA23GK05460SCAX*. (n.d.). USAspending.gov. https://www.usaspending.gov/award/ASST_NON_15PBJA23GK05460SCAX_015

[76] *InspHire*. (n.d.). Abe Brown Ministries. https://abebrown.org/insphire/. Simon, B. (2025, January 22). Abe Brown Ministries wins national grant to expand reentry housing program. *83 Degrees Media*. https://83degreesmedia.com/abe-brown-ministries-wins-national-grant-to-expand-reentry-housing-program/. Transitional living. (n.d.) Abe Brown Ministries. https://abebrown.org/transitional-living/

[77] Solomon, Cohen, & Pearl, 2024.

[78] National Alliance of Trauma Recovery Centers. (2020). *Trauma Recovery Centers: Addressing the needs of underserved crime survivors*. https://live-asj-ci.pantheonsite.io//sites/default/files/2025-09/TRAUMA-RECOVERY-CENTERSAddressing-the-Needs-of-Underserved-Crime-Survivors.pdf

[79] National Alliance of Trauma Recovery Centers, 2020.

[80] Alliance for Safety and Justice. (2023). *Supporting crime survivors by investing in Trauma Recovery Centers: Findings from a national survey*. https://live-asj-ci.pantheonsite.io//sites/default/files/2025-09/ASJ_TRCSURVEYADVF.pdf

[81] Alliance for Safety and Justice, 2023.

[82] Alliance for Safety and Justice, 2023.

[83] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime. (2024). *OVC FY24 Trauma Recovery Demonstration Project*. https://ovc.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh226/files/media/document/o-ovc-2024-172118.pdf

[84] *Notice of Funds Available (NOFA): NATRC Trauma Recovery Center Demonstration Project*. (2025, October 15). National Alliance of Trauma Recovery Centers. https://nationalallianceoftraumarecoverycenters.org/natrcnofa

[85] Notice of Funds Available (NOFA), 2025.