

Solicitation name: Wrongful Conviction Review Program

Applicant: Mid-Atlantic Innocence Project

APPLICATION FOR

1. TYPE OF SUBMISSION Application		2. DATE SUBMITTED 03/02/2010	APPLICATION IDENTIFIER
		3. DATE RECEIVED BY STATE	STATE APPLICATION IDENTIFIER
		4. DATE RECEIVED BY FEDERAL AGENCY	FEDERAL IDENTIFIER
5. APPLICANT INFORMATION			
Legal Name Mid-Atlantic Innocence Project		Organizational Unit	
Address (city, state, and zip code) 4801 Massachusetts Ave., NW Washington, District of Columbia 20016		Name and telephone number of the person to be contacted on matters involving this application Shawn Armbrust (202) 274-4199	
6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN)		7. TYPE OF APPLICANT Nonprofit with 501C3 IRS Status (Other than Institution of Higher Education)	
8. TYPE OF APPLICATION New		9. NAME OF FEDERAL AGENCY Bureau of Justice Assistance	
10. CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE Number: 16.746 CFDA Title: Capital Case Litigation		11. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT Enhancing Investigation Methods in Post-Conviction Claims of Innocence	
12. AREAS AFFECTED BY PROJECT District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia			
13. PROPOSED PROJECT		14. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT(S) OF	
Start Date: 07/01/2010	Ending Date: 06/30/2012	a. Applicant	b. Project
15. ESTIMATED FUNDING		16. IS APPLICATION SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS?	
a. Federal	\$293,860	Program is not covered by E.O. 12372	
b. Applicant	\$0		
c. State	\$0		
d. Local	\$0		
e. Other	\$0		
f. Program Income	\$0	17. IS THE APPLICANT DELINQUENT ON ANY FEDERAL DEBT?	
g. Total	\$293,860	N	
18. TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, ALL DATA IN THIS APPLICATION/PREAPPLICATION ARE TRUE AND CORRECT, THE DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DULY AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE APPLICANT AND THE APPLICANT WILL COMPLY WITH THE ATTACHED ASSURANCES IF THE ASSISTANCE IS REQUIRED.			
a. Typed Name of Authorized Representative Shawn Armbrust		b. Title Executive Director	c. Telephone number (202) 274-4199
d. Signature of Authorized Representative		e. Date Signed	

PROGRAM ABSTRACT

APPLICANT'S NAME: Mid Atlantic Innocence Project (MAIP)

PROJECT TITLE: Enhancing Investigation Methods in Post-Conviction Claims of Innocence

DOLLAR AMOUNT REQUESTED: \$293,859.80

PROJECT GOALS: To more systematically and efficiently process innocence claims by improving our capacity to investigate, gather documents, and consult with experts, which will decrease our backlogs in those areas and increase both the number of cases we can process and the number of exonerations we can achieve.

STRATEGIES TO BE USED: (1) Hire staff investigator to conduct interviews and gather necessary documents; (2) increase funding for document gathering to learn more about difficult-to-investigate cases; and (3) employ expert evaluation of cases to better screen cases involving potentially questionable forensic analysis and properly test and evaluate evidence for clients.

KEY/MAJOR DELIVERABLES:

1. Produce a report outlining progress on the performance measures outlined in the grant solicitation and in MAIP's proposal.
2. Organize an event for the legal community that shares MAIP findings as it relates to the outlined performance measures.

COORDINATION PLANS: MAIP collaborates in the area with six law schools, more than 20 law firms, and two other innocence projects and will partner specifically with American University Washington College of Law to ensure that the grant is properly managed while MAIP focuses on the substantive legal aspects of the project.

Part I: Statement of the Problem

The Mid-Atlantic Innocence Project (MAIP) provides pro bono investigative and legal assistance to prisoners in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia with viable claims of innocence. Every month, MAIP receives about 50 new requests from prisoners claiming innocence. In 2008 and 2009, we received 1124 new inquiries. This high volume, coupled with our consideration of both DNA cases and the much more time-intensive non-DNA cases, requires our staff to spend a significant amount of time evaluating these requests in a four-step process. While we pride ourselves on our effort to provide each prisoner with a quick and appropriate response, our ability to do so is hampered by our lack of resources in three important areas: document-gathering, expert evaluations, and investigative services.

Our case-review process has five stages: (1) initial intake by our Program Assistant, who sends questionnaires to prisoners whose cases meet our basic criteria (correct jurisdiction, no longer have the right to appointed counsel, and present a factual innocence claim); (2) review of the prisoner's completed questionnaire and appellate documents by our Assistant Director; (3) screening of the full case documents by pro bono attorneys in cases the Assistant Director has deemed might be viable; (4) investigation by law students and/or private investigators supervised by MAIP staff; and (5) where the investigation has turned up persuasive evidence of innocence, litigation by MAIP and co-counsel at large area law firms. Of the cases opened in 2009-2010, 291 remain under active consideration at one of the first four stages of this process. In 163 of these cases, we are waiting for the return of screening questionnaires. An additional 24 of those cases are in line for screening committee review, and 29 cases are awaiting the documents necessary for screening committee review. Twenty-three are currently being screened by committee members. Eight have been assigned to student groups or private investigators. Five

cases are being litigated by MAIP and co-counsel, and one of those clients is due to be released because of this litigation. The remaining 17 2009-2010 cases are still in need of investigation, waiting until we have investigators with time to work on them.

We have set internal deadlines for ourselves at each stage of the case-review process and regularly track our success at meeting these deadlines. Data from these tracking reports has informed our needs assessment related to this grant application. It has demonstrated that we most direly need more resources dedicated to (1) the second stage, when our Assistant Director determines whether a case appears to present both a genuine innocence claim and the possibility of proving that claim, and (2) the fourth stage, in which investigators go into the field to locate the evidence and witnesses that will allow an attorney to go into court or the clemency process on behalf of an innocent client.

A. Our Need at the Evaluation Stage

As an initial matter, our evaluation of cases depends upon the ability of each prisoner to fill out a detailed questionnaire seeking essential information about the prisoner's case and his innocence claim. Most of this information is not obtainable from court documents.

Unfortunately, some prisoners are illiterate or otherwise cannot coherently describe their cases. This requires that we visit them in person to understand and assess their innocence claims. Our large, three-state jurisdiction – and the fact that prisoners convicted in Washington, D.C., are incarcerated all over the country – makes this step challenging, given our limited staff and travel budget. For this reason, some of the most vulnerable defendants' cases often languish.

Secondly, in order to evaluate cases thoroughly, we require legal documents that prisoners often do not possess. Copying court records is very expensive, and courthouse clerk offices often are understaffed and have poor record-keeping systems. It is far more efficient and

fruitful to visit a courthouse in person when seeking an old transcript, to ensure that someone has conducted a thorough search and produced all available documents. We do not have the resources to do this as often as necessary.

Finally, many cases require expert analysis to help us determine whether they present viable innocence claims. We often need a second opinion on whether a fingerprint comparison was competently done, whether a more advanced DNA technique might obtain different results, or whether a ballistics report is flawed. Our limited budget for DNA testing and experts would cover expert review in only nine cases (at \$1,000 each) and would not quite cover DNA testing in even two cases (at \$5,000 each). Our case screening is hampered accordingly.

B. Our Need at the Investigation Stage

After screening by our Assistant Director and then our screening committee, two to three cases each month are deemed worthy of substantive investigation. This is another major area in which our cases stall. In addition to the eight cases from 2008-09 currently being investigated and the 17 awaiting investigation, 47 cases opened in other years (before 2008) need some investigation. Fifty-three cases being investigated by students or private investigators are not being investigated as promptly as we would like.

This backlog occurs because finding new evidence of innocence, particularly in non-DNA cases, is remarkably challenging. In most of our cases, many of which are years or decades old, this evidence was initially so hard to find that it was not available at the original trial: a witness who was too scared to talk; a secret deal between a jailhouse snitch and the prosecutor; an exculpatory memorandum buried in the file of a police officer. Without thorough re-investigation, it is impossible to litigate an innocence claim in court or advocate for clemency, even on behalf of a client whom we strongly believe is innocent. This work requires

investigations that are conducted as professionally, competently, and quickly as possible.

Unfortunately, our current resources do not allow us to consistently meet these goals.

We currently rely on a combination of law school clinics and contract investigators to meet our investigative needs. Clinic students can and do perform excellent work on a regular basis, but they are limited by both time and expertise, and we cannot rely upon them at certain times of the year or to conduct certain interviews, such as interviews of real perpetrators or interviews that require overnight travel. Two years ago, recognizing this problem, we obtained a small grant from the Virginia Law Foundation to hire private investigators on a contract basis. While they do excellent work, they are expensive (\$100 per hour for fieldwork and \$50 per hour for office work, plus mileage), and our budget of \$20,000 (half the salary we propose for a staff investigator) will cover, at most, 10 cases each year. Given our volume of requests and the number of cases in which we need investigation, our budget and staffing simply are not enough.

Part II: Program Design and Implementation

To solve the problems outlined above, we are proposing to: (1) add a full-time private investigator to our staff; (2) increase our budget for document retrieval; and (3) add funding for expert review in select cases. We also have requested funds for associated travel. We believe that these improvements will address each of the challenges we have identified above and will satisfy the performance measures outlined in the announcement for this grant.

The core of our proposal is hiring a full-time staff investigator. Hiring an investigator will enable us to address three of the four problems we outlined in Part I of this proposal, improving both evaluation and investigation. A good investigator can interview defendants whose questionnaire responses are lacking, assessing their credibility and thus helping MAIP's legal staff evaluate their innocence claims. A staff investigator also can visit courthouses in

cases where telephone calls or letters failed to produce necessary records. At a later stage, a staff investigator could work efficiently through our backlog, which largely involves discrete witness interviews, without the need to rely on students, who are too slow, or contract investigators, who are too expensive. In the more complicated cases, a staff investigator can study lengthy files without charging MAIP by the hour and can conduct sensitive interviews of alternative suspects or recanting witnesses. Even in those cases referred to law school clinics, a staff investigator will be available to work with the students to devise strategies, plan interviews, locate information, and brainstorm solutions in tough cases. In cases that go to private investigators because of distances or complexity, our staff investigator will be able to defray some of the costs associated with certain tasks, such as locating people and gathering documents.

Along with the hiring of a staff investigator, we are proposing to increase our budget for transcripts and other legal documents. For the reasons outlined above, we often are forced to choose between (1) making a decision about a case based on insufficient information, or (2) delaying the screening of a case until we can visit a distant courthouse to read the file. Having enough money to obtain much-needed documents will significantly increase both the number of cases we can evaluate and the thoroughness and speed with which we can evaluate them.

We are also proposing to increase our budget for experts. In several cases, the lack of funding for expert consultation has slowed or completely stalled our ability to evaluate a case or provide evidence of innocence. Having additional money for such consultations would directly increase the number of cases we could review productively. DNA or fingerprint review will cost an average of \$1000 per case (four hours at \$250/hour). In Maryland, the defendant is required to pay for DNA testing, with an average cost of \$5,000 per case (three samples at \$1500 each, plus quantifications of \$500). The ability to pay for this testing and expert review at an earlier

stage in more cases will allow us to efficiently exonerate prisoners or reject their cases and move onto cases of prisoners whose innocence we may be able to prove.

Taken together, this combination of additional staffing and funding will enable us to directly meet the performance measures outlined in the grant announcement. Ultimately, it will increase the number of innocent people we are able to exonerate and, as such, increase the number of real perpetrators who are identified as a result of our work.

Part III: Management Structure & Staffing

MAIP's staff is extremely well qualified to handle the difficult work of screening, evaluating, and litigating post-conviction claims of innocence. Since its inception in 2001, MAIP has grown from a staff of all volunteers to a professionally run organization that effectively screens, litigates, and supervises students and pro bono attorneys. Since 2005, MAIP's staff size has increased from one person to four people. We have thought critically about our staffing needs at each stage of growth, working carefully to ensure that we are capable of furthering our mission and increasing our capacity.

Our current staff consists of three attorneys and one program assistant. Our Executive Director, Shawn Armbrust, is a 2004 graduate of Georgetown Law. As a Northwestern University undergraduate, Ms. Armbrust was instrumental in securing the exoneration of Anthony Porter, an Illinois man who came within 50 hours of execution for a crime he did not commit. Ms. Armbrust became the first employee at the well-regarded Center on Wrongful Convictions at the Northwestern University School of Law, where she spent two years coordinating intake, participating in investigations, and doing policy and public education work on innocence issues. Following a clerkship with United States District Judge Gladys Kessler, she joined MAIP in 2005 as its first attorney Executive Director, where – among other things –

she oversees MAIP's staff and overall operations, supervises investigations, and co-counsels with pro bono attorneys on MAIP cases.

Elizabeth Raman, MAIP's Assistant Director, joined the project in 2006. A Harvard College and Georgetown Law graduate, Ms. Raman was a law clerk for United States District Judge Edith Brown Clement, spent a year at the well-respected law firm of Crowell & Moring, and served for five years as an Assistant Federal Public Defender, doing both trial and appellate work on behalf of indigent clients. She brings a wealth of practical experience to her job, which primarily involves the coordination of our screening process.

Our Virginia DNA Staff Attorney, John Hardenbergh, graduated from University of Arizona College of Law in 2004. Most recently, he served as the Deputy State Legislative Counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union, where he spent significant time on post-conviction DNA testing issues. As such, his primary responsibility is overseeing a Virginia project to perform post-conviction DNA testing in nearly 1,000 old cases, a project in which MAIP has played a critical role.

Our program assistant, Daniel Satin, graduated from Northwestern University's journalism school, where he spent one year investigating the case of a possibly innocent man on Indiana's death row. He therefore joins MAIP with investigative skills and a wealth of knowledge and passion about innocence issues.

Our ideal staff investigator candidate will be a person with criminal investigative experience, either with a law enforcement agency or with a criminal defense practice.

All five MAIP staff members will bear some responsibility for overseeing the strategy outlined in this proposal, with the overall responsibility being borne by the Executive Director. The first stage of the intake process will continue to be overseen by our Program Assistant. Our

Assistant Director will be responsible for identifying those cases in stages two and three that require expert assistance, interviews, or document retrieval by the staff investigator. Our Executive Director and Staff Investigator will bear responsibility for determining which cases in the investigative stage require additional documents, interviews, or experts. In relevant Virginia DNA cases, the Virginia DNA Staff Attorney will bring such recommendations to the Executive Director, who also will oversee those issues at the litigation stage.

MAIP has helped secure the freedom of six innocent prisoners since its inception (five in the past 18 months). This is a noteworthy accomplishment, given MAIP's lack of professional staffing for the first five years of its existence. When Ms. Armbrust joined MAIP in 2005, the project had no DNA cases in litigation, and only eight cases overall had reached the litigation stage, primarily because volunteer students supervised by volunteer lawyers did not have the expertise to move cases forward. Since Ms. Armbrust has come on board, she has been instrumental in improving our internal operations and training for students as well as training more pro bono lawyers. MAIP has located DNA evidence in nine cases since 2006, is litigating evidence searches in three other cases, and is litigating an additional four cases where the evidence had been preserved before the case came to MAIP. We no longer use volunteer students or supervisors for investigations and instead have established clinics or classes at our affiliated law schools or use private investigators when necessary. We no longer simply refer cases to pro bono lawyers and currently are co-counseling in 13 promising cases. We also have taken a leadership role in a Virginia project to perform DNA testing in nearly 1,000 old cases and are beginning to represent some of those defendants with claims of innocence. Although achieving exonerations is never guaranteed, we have worked to improve our processes so that we

can maximize our chances of isolating and litigating the most promising cases among the hundreds of requests we receive each year.

Part IV: Monitoring

MAIP is located at the offices of American University Washington College of Law (WCL) and recently began pursuing a more formalized relationship with the university. As such, MAIP and WCL have collaborated on this grant application, and MAIP would subgrant funds awarded to WCL, which has a proven track record for managing grant-related expenditures. This will enable MAIP to ensure that the grant is properly managed while focusing on the substantive legal aspects of the project.

MAIP uses an online case management system (Dabble), which tracks cases through each stage of our process. This includes careful tracking of case timelines, including when cases are opened, when questionnaires are sent out and returned, when files are sent to our screening committee, when they are sent to investigators, and when litigation begins. MAIP then produces a quarterly statistical report for our Board, outlining the number of cases at each stage and other important metrics. Analysis of these reports helped identify the problems outlined in this proposal and will serve as the basis for tracking case outcomes associated with this grant.

If we receive a DOJ grant, we will require our staff and any experts to keep time sheets so we can begin to measure our progress. We will then create fields in our database geared to each of the performance measures specified in the grant, including: (1) experts consulted on the case; (2) number of hours of forensic re-analysis services provided per case; (3) number of hours of screening, evaluation, and litigation services provided per case by our grant-funded investigator; and (5) whether we have identified an actual perpetrator in a case. We already track

how many post-conviction claims of innocence we obtain during the grant period. The database can easily be sorted to create reports on each of the grant performance criteria.

Our Executive Director will be responsible for reviewing timesheets, continuing to produce statistical reports, and monitoring performance measures. The Board of Directors will monitor these reports, and we will work with WCL staff to issue a report at the end of the grant period. The report will outline MAIP's progress in meeting the performance measures outlined in the grant solicitation, as well as: the number of cases in which our staff investigator interviewed defendants or witnesses; the number of cases in which we were able to obtain legal documents; and the extent and speed with which our backlog was reduced to ensure that we are meeting performance measures as outlined in the grant.

Our most significant barrier for sustaining this project is raising the necessary funds to do so, but we are working hard to alleviate that problem. Over the past year, we have applied to two new foundations, have sought inclusion in DC's Catalog for Philanthropy, and have applied for public funding from the DC government. Our annual fundraising event has continued to be a success. More significantly, however, we currently are engaged in a strategic-planning process that is heavily focused on increasing our capacity. Our preliminary strategy for doing so includes the need to reach out to corporate sponsors (instead of just law firms) for our annual fundraising event; the creation of a young professionals committee; reaching out to new foundations; and starting a capital campaign. To help find specific ways of achieving those goals, we have engaged a Board Fellow through Georgetown University's McDonough School of Business, who is researching both possible funding opportunities and the possibility of hiring a development consultant who can help us increase our capacity and ensure that we can sustain this project and continue securing the freedom of innocent prisoners.

Budget Detail Worksheet

Purpose: The Budget Detail Worksheet may be used as a guide to assist you in the preparation of the budget and budget narrative. You may submit the budget and budget narrative using this form or in the format of your choice (plain sheets, your own form, or a variation of this form). However, all required information (including the budget narrative) must be provided. Any category of expense not applicable to your budget may be deleted.

A. Personnel - List each position by title and name of employee, if available. Show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time to be devoted to the project. Compensation paid for employees engaged in grant activities must be consistent with that paid for similar work within the applicant organization.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
Executive Director		
Assistant Director		
Virginia DNA Staff Attorney		
Staff Investigator		
Program Assistant		
SUB-TOTAL		\$114,850.75

B. Fringe Benefits - Fringe benefits should be based on actual known costs or an established formula. Fringe benefits are for the personnel listed in budget category (A) and only for the percentage of time devoted to the project. Fringe benefits on overtime hours are limited to FICA, Workman's Compensation, and Unemployment Compensation.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
Executive Director		
Assistant Director		
Virginia DNA Staff Attorney		
Staff Investigator		
Program Assistant		
SUB-TOTAL		\$27,872.24
Total Personnel & Fringe Benefits		\$142,722.99

C. Travel - Itemize travel expenses of project personnel by purpose (e.g., staff to training, field interviews, advisory group meeting, etc.). Show the basis of computation (e.g., six people to 3-day training at \$X airfare, \$X lodging, \$X subsistence). In training projects, travel and meals for trainees should be listed separately. Show the number of trainees and the unit costs involved. Identify the location of travel, if known. Indicate source of Travel Policies applied, Applicant or Federal Travel Regulations.

Purpose of Travel	Location	Item	Computation	Cost
Transcript/prison visits in MD, VA, and PA (for DC clients)	MD, VA, & PA	Mileage reimbursement	400 mi/wk at .50/mile	\$20,800.00
Overnight visits to long-distance prisons/courts	Eastern Shore of MD	Hotels/meals (federal rate)	\$194/night at 5 nights/year	\$1,940.00
Overnight visits to long-distance prisons/courts	Lewisburg, PA	Hotels/meals (federal rate)	\$143/night at 5 nights/year	\$1,430.00
Overnight visits to long-distance prisons/courts	Richmond, VA	Hotels/meals (federal rate)	\$191/night at 5 nights/year	\$1,910.00
Overnight visits to long-distance prisons/courts	Norfolk, VA	Hotels/meals (federal rate)	\$156/night at 5 nights/year	\$1,560.00
Overnight visits to long-distance prisons/courts	Roanoke, VA	Hotels/meals (federal rate)	\$154/night at 5 nights/year	\$1,540.00
9/15/10-9/16/10 DOJ training in Washington, DC	Washington, DC	No hotel/travel (will walk)		\$0.00
TOTAL				\$29,180.00

D. Equipment - List non-expendable items that are to be purchased. Non-expendable equipment is tangible property having a useful life of more than two years and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. (Note: Organization's own capitalization policy may be used for items costing less than \$5,000). Expendable items should be included either in the "supplies" category or in the "Other" category. Applicants should analyze the cost benefits of purchasing versus leasing equipment, especially high cost items and those subject to rapid technical advances. Rented or leased equipment costs should be listed in the "Contractual" category. Explain how the equipment is necessary for the success of the project. Attach a narrative describing the procurement method to be used.

Item	Computation	Cost
TOTAL		\$0.00

G. Consultants/Contracts - Indicate whether applicant's formal, written Procurement Policy or the Federal Acquisition Regulations are followed.

Consultant Fees: For each consultant enter the name, if known, service to be provided, hourly or daily fee (8-hour day), and estimated time on the project. Consultant fees in excess of \$450 per day require additional justification and prior approval from OJP.

Name of Consultant	Service Provided	Computation	Cost
DNA Expert	Review of DNA tests performed by state labs (4 hours at \$250/hour)	14 cases at \$1000/case	\$14,000.00
Other Forensic Expert	Review of other forensic tests (4 hours at \$250/hour)	6 cases at \$1000/case	\$6,000.00
DNA Testing	Post-conviction DNA test (6 cases at \$5000/case: \$1500/sample & \$500 quant)	6 cases at \$5000/case	\$30,000.00
<i>Subtotal</i>			\$50,000.00

Consultant Expenses: List all expenses to be paid from the grant to the individual consultants in addition to their fees (i.e., travel, meals, lodging, etc.)

Item	Location	Computation	Cost
<i>Subtotal</i>			\$0.00

Contracts: Provide a description of the product or service to be procured by contract and an estimate of the cost. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source contracts in excess of \$100,000.

Item	Cost	
<i>Subtotal</i>		\$0.00
TOTAL		\$50,000.00

H. Other Costs - List items (e.g., rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial or security services, and investigative or confidential funds) by major type and the basis of the computation. For example, provide the square footage and the cost per square foot for rent, or provide a monthly rental cost and how many months to rent.

Description	Computation	Cost
Rent (new office for staff investigator): 120 square feet at \$58/square foot for 2 years	120 square feet at \$58 per square foot	\$13,920.00
Legal document copies: 400 pages/week at .50 per page for 2 years	\$200 per week for 2 years	\$20,800.00
TOTAL		\$34,720.00

I. Indirect Costs - Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a Federally approved indirect cost rate. A copy of the rate approval, (a fully executed, negotiated agreement), must be attached. If the applicant does not have an approved rate, one can be requested by contacting the applicant's cognizant Federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct costs categories.

Description	Computation	Cost
v		\$34,036.81
TOTAL		\$34,036.81

Budget Summary- When you have completed the budget worksheet, transfer the totals for each category to the spaces below. Compute the total direct costs and the total project costs. Indicate the amount of Federal requested and the amount of non-Federal funds that will support the project.

Budget Category	Amount
A. Personnel	\$114,850.75
B. Fringe Benefits	\$27,872.24
C. Travel	\$29,180.00
D. Equipment	\$0.00
E. Supplies	\$3,200.00
F. Construction	\$0.00
G. Consultants/Contracts	\$50,000.00
H. Other	\$34,720.00
Total Direct Costs	\$259,822.99
I. Indirect Costs	\$34,036.81
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	\$293,859.80
Federal Request	\$293,859.80
Non-Federal Amount	\$0.00

BUDGET NARRATIVE

PERSONNEL

FRINGE BENEFITS

TRAVEL

We anticipate that our staff investigator will need to travel by car approximately 400 miles per week. At the federally mandated rate of .50/mile, this results in a travel cost of \$20,800. We also anticipate that our staff investigator will need to make approximately five overnight trips a year to each of five different locations: the Eastern Shore of Maryland; Lewisburg, Pennsylvania; Richmond, Virginia; Norfolk, Virginia; and Roanoke, Virginia. Those locations often are difficult to visit in a day trip, and we either have clients housed in those locations or multiple cases based in or near those locations. We have applied the federal per diem rate for each of these locations (or nearest to each of these locations). The result is \$1,940 for trips to the Eastern Shore of Maryland; \$1,430 for trips to Lewisburg, Pennsylvania; \$1,910 for trips to Richmond, Virginia; \$1,560 for trips to Norfolk, Virginia; and \$1,540 for trips to Roanoke, Virginia. The resulting grand total for travel is \$29,180.

SUPPLIES

We anticipate that our staff investigator will need a Blackberry device for remote e-mail retrieval and a hand-held recorder to facilitate the recording of witness interviews. The Blackberry will cost approximately \$500 and approximately \$1200 for monthly phone bills over a two-year period. The hand-held recorder will cost approximately \$300.

CONSULTANTS/CONTRACTS

We anticipate using grant money to pay consultant fees. We are requesting funds to pay for review of DNA tests performed by a state laboratory in 14 cases. We anticipate that each review will take approximately four hours, at a rate of \$250 per hour. The subtotal for review of DNA results is therefore \$14,000. We are also requesting funds to pay for expert review of other forensic tests, such as ballistics or fingerprint analysis. We anticipate needing these services in six cases, also at a rate of \$1,000 per case, for a subtotal of \$6,000. Finally, we anticipate using grant money to pay for post-conviction DNA tests in six cases. We estimate that each case will involve testing three samples at \$1500 each, plus one quantification per case at \$500 each. The resulting subtotal is \$30,000. Adding these figures together, our total request for consultants is \$50,000.

OTHER

We are seeking funding to pay rent for office space for a staff investigator. We anticipate being able to obtain an office of approximately 120 square feet in our current building for the investigator. At the rate we are currently paying our landlord, \$58 per square foot, we will spend \$13,920 over the grant period on rent.

We are also seeking funding for obtaining legal documents from court reporters and court clerks offices. We anticipate needing 400 pages per week at the rate of .50 per page. Over the grant period, this will result in a total cost of \$20,800.

INDIRECT COSTS